



Economic Commission for Africa

AfricaSpeaks

Internet Governance

For more information on ECA's work in ICTs,
please visit <http://www.uneca.org/aisi>)



AfricaSpeaks

Internet Governance

Introduction **1**

The Economics of Internet Governance **5**

Content Development **7**

Policy, Structural and Organizational Issues **9**

Technical Concerns **17**

Introduction

Long before the first phase of the World Summit on Information Society (WSIS), and even before Internet Governance became a contentious issue, Africa had started to voice its concerns about the way the Internet was being deployed and managed. Under the framework of the African Information Society Initiative, the Economic Commission for Africa, (ECA) organized various online discussions, meetings and workshops with a view to encouraging debate and clarifying Africa's stance on this issue.

This publication reflects the various concerns from stakeholders. For a continent known as being a passive listener in international forums, Africa does today speak out loudly and clearly, not just for the sake of saying something, but with the purpose of enriching the global decision making process with sound, in depth and documented proposals.

Close to 2000 people have actively engaged in this debate through a process of thorough sharing and testing of arguments around the Internet Governance debate. This production captures selected voices as representatives of the collective effort, and is based on the assumption that, only a sick person knows the hardships of illness, and thus, is in the best position to help identify a cure.

Africa Speaks on Internet Governance provides a forum for prominent stakeholders and actors in the public and private sectors, civil society and international institutions to articulate their views and thoughts. They all agree on the fact that the contribution of the Internet to development has become an urgent and critical, but contentious issue for the world and especially for Africa. Although Internet usage on the continent has reached a modest 9% - which in itself is a phenomenal performance considering Africa's contribution to the world economy is barely 2% - its actual contribution to development is nevertheless very difficult to assess. Internet Governance encompasses issues for which mechanisms do not exist in Africa. The various issues under consideration cut across a wide range of topics such as:

- Social dimensions and inclusion;
- Affordable and universal access;
- Content accessibility;
- Cultural and linguistic diversity;

- Education, human capacity building;
- Open-source and free software;
- Internet leased line costs; and
- National infrastructure development.

More and more African countries are turning towards universal access to bring the 90% of its population on the other side of digital divide on board. Furthermore, successful models of Universal Access Funding (UAF) introduced in Latin America and Africa by more than 60 countries are indications that, if properly implemented in a competitive environment, these mechanisms can play a critical role in leveraging market forces to expand access to public telephone service, multipurpose community telecenters, and other ICT facilities.

Participants in the debates presented in this compilation caution that the issue of universal access has evolved from an issue that used to be purely telecommunications policy and regulation to one that is integral to achieving the MDGs. It has become therefore, a matter not only of universal access to telecommunications, but also access to ICTs in the context of human development. This is the reason why the issue of universal access is intrinsically linked with ICT for development.

The voices presented here do not believe that privatization and market mechanisms are enough to create an enabling policy environment for the extension of ICT services to lower income communities. On the contrary, they share the view that more needs to be done to ensure that the complex dynamics of capacity building, appropriate applications and content as well as access and affordability receive attention from policymakers and the development community as a whole. They do agree also on the need for a regulatory framework. Caution is needed however, in ensuring that and that communities retain the freedom to build their own universal access solutions on the basis of proven best practices, without being subjected to expensive and often, ineffective solutions offered by incumbent telecom monopolies.

Interconnection costs are also an issue of great concern. The growth and adoption of the Internet by African countries are being hampered by the high tariffs charged by monopoly operators and the inability of African ISPs to service their customers with adequate telecommunication infrastructure. From a business and profit point of view, ISPs could for

instance, pay for both ends of their international communication links. They could also meet transit charges to pass their traffic through to the rest of the Internet and to carry incoming traffic from developed countries.

However, this poses both a moral question, and a far more problematic question of south-south solidarity. The truth is, this reverse subsidy to the North has combined with the loss of revenue from incoming calls to exacerbate imbalances between developed and developing regions. The privatization of telecommunication operations in most African countries, in addition to the surge and cost of new technologies, has greatly reduced net financial flows within the continent. The largely state-owned incumbents have seen massive reductions in their primary source of revenue - from incoming international calls - due to the increasingly competitive international environment and the use of bypass technologies such as VoIP and VSAT.

This issue of inequitable access to the global Internet backbones has been the subject of contention for many years. The debate goes back as far as 1998, when the ITU began considering the issue. To-date, few benefits have accrued to African countries from Recommendation D.50, which in essence admitted that commercial considerations would likely determine pricing, but suggested that operators take into account the possible need for compensation for elements such as traffic flow, number of routes, geographical coverage and the cost of international transmission when negotiating peering arrangements. Africa Speaks on Internet Governance emphasizes that it is time to reduce costs for the smaller and more distant developing countries. It is advisable to adopt legal mechanisms that could impose symmetric peering and avoid building a future, based only on commercial arrangements.

The voices also caution providers to refrain from using their power to exclude smaller players from peering, forcing them into transit arrangements. They favor the acceleration of the restructuring of the communications sector, the establishment of national and international Internet exchange points, and the building of local demand for national and international backbones.

The establishment of national Internet exchange points will improve the performance of national networks and lower the costs of national traffic over international links. Local exchange points will also encourage the

build-out of local backbones. The halfway proposition developed by the African ISP Association (AFRISPA) has also articulated these requirements, proposing two specific steps:

- Create traffic aggregation through the creation of Internet exchange points and supporting emergence of regional carriers facilitating regional peering; and
- Create digital arteries to carry the traffic through regional fiber optic infrastructure and international fiber optic infrastructure.

These are the kind of moves that can provide Africa with the necessary “bargaining chips” as one ‘speaker’ points out. The continent is in urgent need of national and international backbones. This could be achieved through the opening of unlicensed radio spectrum, VSAT and VoIP and provide last-mile services, allowing users to interconnect with the national and international network providers. With this there can be greater access, the reduction of costs, and the encouragement of sharing and self-provision in under-served areas. It also has the potential to ultimately increase the demand for national and international backbones and stimulate investment for this sector, thereby encouraging content and application providers to roll-out national services such as e-banking/trade/commerce, distance education and e-government, which in turn becomes a further incentive for infrastructure deployment.

This is why many speakers share the belief that the Internet and its Governance will remain an issue of focus for many years to come for Africa. It demonstrates the potential of African opinion leaders, providing guidance and direction on the course of action which can best serve the continent’s interest. As Nii Quaynor from Ghana puts it, “Its better for us to stop talking as if someone has denied Africa anything. I don’t know where you come with the idea that we don’t own any thing about the Internet. I think many operating ISPs will vehemently disagree with you as they build their net, manage it and train people to keep it going. They have bought their networks! There are also others who are doing other things they own as well.”

This book is a collective resolve of a people taking their future into their proper hands. As such, Africa has spoken on Internet Governance!

Olivier Nana Nzépa, Ph.D.

The Economics of Internet Governance

“The economic realm and Internet Governance has hardly been explored in Africa and still remains a weak area. Yet, this should be an issue of central concern to Africans when it comes to Internet Governance discussions. Failing to do this will result in a great deal of cyber-colonialism where African intellectual property is usurped and used for commercial purposes by others, and worse still sold back to the continent. This debate goes far beyond exchange points and interconnection, there are issues such as copyright, privacy and a sound legal environment for ensuring the smooth functioning of the Internet for economic ventures, providing new and alternative means of wealth creation in Africa. What we need to ask ourselves is how content development backed by the right policy and legal frameworks, based on a solid technical infrastructure can produce the necessary conditions for harnessing the enormous economic opportunities available.

Aida Opoku-Mensah, ECA, Ethiopia

“African countries and institutions have a role to play in the IG space as key partners in resolving a number the issues and questions. It is the case that some of these issues are of particular importance to African countries, given their stage of socio-economic development in general and in particular their level of development as it relates to the development, deployment and the exploitation of ICTs systems and resources in their societies and economies.”

Clement Dzionou, “The Internet Government Space”

“One of the major issues in IG is the cost of Internet inter-connection. This has not been in favour of Africa and the developing world. African operators have to bear the cost of building infrastructure to the gateways and then paying for all the traffic, including that destined for the developed world, as well as down-stream traffic from the developed world.”

Waudu Siganga, Kenya, UN WGIG
May 2005, Questionnaire on IG

“...In most of African countries where there are no Exchange Points, ISPs have to route their services via the United States, thus forcing subscribers to pay the dollar equivalent in local currency to the ISPs.

Remmy Nweke, Nigeria

January 2005, Discussion List on

“WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

On the domain names issue, Africa so far has no local registrar (for the gTLDs) because no African corporation was able to raise the \$50,000 that has been requested by ICANN to qualify. So, if one wants the business to thrive, this issue should be properly addressed.

On the ccTLDs, African countries could organize their ccTLD according to best practices, which calls for national stakeholders who are fully part of the management and the number of secondary domain names could be substantively increased. In some other places/countries, the TLDs were technically managed by outsiders who are still reluctant to let the countries take over. Some countries are still struggling to get the management of their TLD back. In a nutshell, these distinct problems give a national component to the Internet governance, which also needs to be dealt with.”

“Regional political institutions such as NEPAD should make sure that best practices in managing the ccTLDs be spread to others. Also, these could help organize African participation and contribution to the international policy making for a. They should seek to provide seed money to jumpstart regional structures such as AfriNIC, just as others did in Europe, USA and the Asia Pacific regions.”

Pierre Dandjinou, UNDP

March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List

“The Internet is not just a means of communication. There is serious money to be made from the Internet. It is true that Africa only contributes to less than 9% of (global) Internet users but that is certainly higher than the continent’s contribution to International commerce. Internet Governance is therefore a question, not just of national sovereignty, but also of survival.

Nnenna Nwakanma, Cote d’Ivoire/Nigeria

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

Content Development

“We control very little content on the Internet (maybe 5-10%) and at the same time, we have very few servers hosting Internet websites in Africa. Most nodes are in USA or Europe. If Internet governance by Africans for Africa has to be taken seriously, we should have a reasonable bargaining chip to support why we want to control our own bit of the Internet. This will have to start by building our own content and having our own local yahoos, googles and altavistas, based on African content.”

“If we do not have a stake on the content on local Internet servers, then we should expect to be governed regardless of whether we control the Internet on paper. Just like the way many African countries fought for and got independence, but still do not govern themselves. Sovereignty is a misnomer!!!”

Bildad Kagai, Kenya

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“The Internet reality is that we want to govern where we have not sowed. Africa has developed almost nothing on the Internet and neither has it bought anything.”

“Even if we had control of ‘internet governance’ just on paper, it would be an exercise in futility. That is why I feel it should be done in tandem with development of ‘universal content’ e.g. geography, physics, chemistry etc,’ which must be released under the creative commons license or licenses that will give users similar rights. We might win the war on paper at national levels, but until then, we will need many more years of investment to make the Internet work for many Africans.”

Bildad Kagai, Kenya

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“Its better for us to stop talking as if someone has denied Africa anything. I don’t know where you get the idea that we don’t own anything on the Internet. I think many operating ISPs will vehemently disagree with you as they build their net, manage it and train people to keep it going. They have bought their networks! There are also others who are doing other

things they own as well. No one is stopping Africa from customizing anything, be it free ware or proprietary. If there is market interest, why is no one doing it? Is it because we don't have a "clue"? Or are we waiting for someone else to do it and then complain once it's done?"

Nii Quaynor, Ghana

January 2005, Discussion List on "WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana"

"...Issues such as IP networks, cyber squatting, consumer protection etc are problems that were/are experienced in the US and Europe as the Internet matures. I do not think we will experience the same problems and therefore should not put in a lot of time on that aspect of Internet governance. We have blatantly ignored the meat that drives the Internet (content). We have also ignored that that it must reside somewhere (local servers) and that there are issues regarding its development and how developers should be compensated so as not to exploit the users."

".... The fact that we cannot determine how spiders prioritize searches on the Internet and if some 'superior pay as you surf' websites get preference, are just some of the issues that disturb me. I would like to see elaborate Internet governance structures on these issues. Not the fact whether my domain should be a '.or.ke' and not '.org.ke'. It doesn't matter to me as a user and neither do I care about who pockets the 30 dollars per annum fee to register my domain name so long as the service is good."

Bildad Kagai, Kenya

January 2005, Discussion List on "WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana"

"What Institutions at African level can help all countries in e-education, content providing in local languages (how many African languages are coded, who does that, who wants to produce software, etc.), protection of our common heritage (African Intellectual Property Organization, etc.), human rights (Institute for Human Rights in Africa, etc.)"

Anne-Rachel Inné, ICANN

March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List

Policy, structural and organizational issues

“Perhaps we need to start with some consensus on what Internet governance covers - whether it’s the traditional narrow inquiry into the administration of the architecture of the Internet or a more expansive view. Certainly it will not be a very useful exercise, if “internet governance” becomes a hold-all for disparate internet-related issues.”

Dayo Ogunyemi, Nigeria

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana

“Why do people always bring Internet governance into the technical coordination area when we all know that there are huge gaps between the perception in that area and how it works in reality? Why should we not focus on more global issues related to Internet usage like content, security, intellectual property, regional and sub-regional policies to allow exchange points in poor countries (instead of using our poor revenues to pay international transits for local traffic), creating an appropriate environment to use ICT for development... etc?”

“For instance AfriNIC has a public policy discussion mailing list where IP allocation policies are discussed, with a clear policy development process where the community plays the most important role in defining these policies? In the past year, I can count on one hand the number of policies proposal/comments we have received from the community at large! Only a few technical people are making contributions.”

“.....In our continent how many know about the GAC (the ICANN Government Advisory Committee), about the ccNSO (country Code Name supporting organization of ICANN), about AfTLD (African Top level Domain Name Managers Association)? How many have ever tried just to subscribe and participate in their discussions? It does not cost a cent to subscribe to a mailing list and read! Should we not, at some point do our homework first before complaining?”

Adiel A. Akplogan, AfriNIC

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“One good thing that the National Information and Communication Infrastructure (NICI) plans have done is the creation of Internet development “governing” agencies in some countries, as is the case with the Nigeria IT Development Agency (NITDA). These agencies could be looked up to, to take charge of issues such as IP on IP networks, cyber squatting, consumer protection, cyberspace regulation, security and privacy concerns, at the national level, while the debate still rages on. I think that these national agencies, where they exist, should be empowered sufficiently to carry out these tasks.”

Lanre Ajayi, Nigeria

January 2005, Discussion List on

“WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“The debates around IG should be separated into two - management of the resource infrastructure (IPR etc) and content/applications. We now have AfriNiC in place - born out of a prolonged process. It’s ours. So who amongst us should control it? I think a model is beginning to emerge where all sectors of the society have representation in ICANN and AfriNiC. That’s how it should be. I would be wary of a model where either the private sector or government had greater control of this resource. The Internet is not very good at respecting sovereignty and we know from painful experiences across the continent what happens when governments make decisions on behalf of “the people”. Likewise the private sector has been driven too much by the profit motive when it comes to the Internet (very much contrary to the spirit of Jon Postel). So the presence of civil society and academics in any future governance model is critical.”

“...In attempting to “govern” content, African governments should first read the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, especially Article 19 and they should work towards migrating our hard-earned freedoms into cyberspace.”

Chris Kabwato, Zimbabwe

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“I know of the Electronic Communications and Transactions Act (ECT) of the Republic of South Africa. At least the government recognizes that there is business going on online and that there is a need to give a legal recognition and definition to that.”

Nnenna Nwakanma, Cote d'Ivoire/Nigeria
January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“Regarding electronic transactions and e-signature legislation, ECOWAS, Ghana and Uganda have on-going projects. Egypt has e-signature legislation, and Mauritius also has an Electronic Transactions Act. Many African countries are following the 1996 UNCITRAL Model E-Commerce law (the South African ECT act is based on this, with some modifications). Without going into details on the substantive merits and de-merits of the various passed legislations, let's just say having legislation in place doesn't mean that it is good legislation.”

“In my opinion, it's actually better to have no legislation than to have bad legislation in place. It may not seem that way, but when disputes actually end up in court, there are going to be some very unpleasant surprises in some of the countries that have implemented legislation. Of course, the optimal situation is to have a timely and properly considered legislative process that involves the private sector (who will actually be the drivers of e-commerce adoption).

On the issue of online consumer protection, this is a sorely needed element. It is probably best handled along with regulation of electronic payment systems. The challenge is that many countries do not really have consumer protection for regular offline purchases - creates the possibility of receiving protection if you buy goods using e-commerce but not if you walk into stores. Not a desirable outcome at all.”

Dayo Ogunyemi, Nigeria
January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“In the same way the Internet should be considered a business tool. The bulls-eye in the dartboard of the IG debate is actually ICANN. The question is should the role that ICANN is playing remain in private sector hands? Those advocating for an inter-governmental agency to take over

aver that:

- ICANN is a private company incorporated in the US and therefore only answerable to US jurisdiction;
- ICANN has distributed IPv4 TLD addresses unfairly, 60% going to the US, and the trend should not be transcribed to IPv6;
- Governments have little say in the affairs of ICANN, restricted to an advisory role through the GAC. Furthermore most Governments find it unprocedural to offer advice to, or influence a company registered in another jurisdiction. That would amount to waiving sovereignty;
- Current arrangements for governments to participate in ICANN translate to informal participation, and therefore lack legitimacy and acceptance by the majority of governments; and
- The US Government has too much influence on ICANN (through the current MOU, etc).

Waudu Siganga, Kenya

January 2005, Discussion List on

“WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“Over the last number of decades there has been general consensus that governments and government agencies are NOT the best suited to run telecoms. This has led to the overall wave of liberalization, private sector investment and involvement, end of monopolies and introduction of private sector competition, etc. This has in turn led to a wider array of services for consumers, which are of better quality and delivered in a timely manner. In Kenya for example, the fixed line telephony sector, which has been under government (agency) control has only 250,000 subscribers and a much larger waiting line. The service offering is of poor quality. The mobile telephony sector on the other hand is governed by the private sector in a competitive environment. Subscriptions are over 3 million and there is no waiting list because you simply walk into any outlet and are connected immediately with no bureaucracy whatsoever.”

“It has been proved conclusively that for telecoms to grow it must be run as a business, not as a government undertaking. Governments can play a role, but it should be very small, basically limited to facilitation.”

“ICANN has had its structural shortcomings. Part of the problems are

historical, stemming from the fact that, the Internet has US military beginnings and is a US “export” to the world. But it’s also true to say that by and large the Internet’s addressing mechanisms are operating fairly reliably and consistently. The key may lie in reforming ICANN (a process already under way), rather than transferring its role to an Inter-Governmental agency.”

Waudu Siganga, Kenya

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“Internet Governance should be structured around a board composed of representatives from the different sectors, such as civil society, government, private sector and Current Internet governance bodies such as ICANN, ITU, ISOC and W3C). Members could be appointed or elected for a fixed mandate, say 5 years. It would have to be geographically balanced.”

Adiel A. Akplogan, AfriNIC

May 2005, Questionnaire on IG

“Indeed Africa, and the world in a more general way, needs a more democratic representativeness at the level of the governance of Internet. The current model of governance presents advantages certainly, but is no longer in accordance with the geopolitics of globalization”.

“A new organizational model of governance should be established. This one should take into account regional specificities and/or at sub-regional level, at the level of development, culture, needs and constraints. These realities are not the same from one region to another. For example the laws governing on-line businesses are not necessarily the same in Scandinavia and in the Maghreb or Western Africa. An ascending hierarchical model should be investigated. Authority of governance should represent every country or sub-region.”

“It is not about the simple management of addressing IP, but about taking decisions related to the general functioning of the Internet in terms of regulation in its widest sense as well as technical adaptations. All the countries of the world have built and are still building the Internet. This common support should be managed as a universal good.”

Abdelaziz Sdigui Doukkali, Morocco

May 2005. Questionnaire on IG

“The structure of Internet Governance should be in the form of a Board of multi stakeholder union composed of: Governments, Public sector, Private Sector, Existing Internet bodies and Civil society. Existing organizations and institutions should be among the multi stakeholder union members.”

Esam M. Abulkhirat, AU

May 2005. Questionnaire on IG

“There is a need for an additional Internet Governance body. I think that a light and operational intergovernmental structure may be envisaged after 2006, in the framework of the UN system, in order to ensure global supervision. I think that an agency that is run on the basis of the same rules as the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG) should be set up. A bureaucratization of Internet regulation through a classical cumbersome structure must be avoided by all means. The existing structures do not involve all stakeholders on an equal footing. These are generally corporate and reflect either government-to-government relationships or civil society and private sector entities in separate bodies.

Joseph Sarr, Senegal/WGIG

May 2005. Questionnaire on IG

“The additional body for Internet Governance should not address all issues related to the Internet. It should focus only on public policy issues related to peace, development and security, culture, and language.”

Nii Quaynor, Ghana

May 2005. Questionnaire on IG

“The Internet should be governed by a multi-stakeholder Board including existing bodies charged with management. (private sector/civil society/ government/ etc. appointed for a four-year term in office under the supervision by the UN). The GAC itself should be transformed to become a multisectoral body.”

Kwaku Ofori Adarkwa, Acting Chief Director, Ministry of Communication and Technology,

Ghana, May 2005. Questionnaire on IG

“Internet Governance (IG) as applied to Africa is not only about

Internet administration/ coordination/policies, it is also about ICT governance in general. The preparatory work for the second phase of the Summit should encompass a thorough assessment of the ICT governance in Africa; in short, who is doing what in terms of better management of the ccTLDs, provision of easier access to ICT, designing appropriate policies for reaping the benefits of ICT and fostering national participation in global forums.”

Pierre Dandjinou, UNDP
May 2005. Questionnaire on IG

“In Africa, who are the broadband, network providers? How cheap is it? How can we reduce costs to make the Internet a universal service? How do we replace those ‘lost’ costs related to telecommunications for governments? etc..(ATU, Sat3, Afrinic, ISPs, local software, hardware providers, others....We should strive for sub regional then continental/global cooperation to allow dispute resolution in transactions. South Africa, Tunisia, Egypt, Senegal have systems in place; Can we replicate?”

“As much as I would like to see that ONE INTERNET ROOT truly internationalized, we will not benefit unless we do this homework at home.”

Anne-Rachel Inné, ICANN
March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List

“The lack of preparedness of most of our African countries is still a real issue. Although they are not very much publicized in the media, we are now witnessing a number of disputes over the delegation/re-delegation of ccTLDs in many African countries. The practice was to delegate the authority and responsibilities regarding ccTLDs to trusted individuals who did not necessarily have any connection with the government of the country concerned. About 7- 10 years ago, knowledge and understanding of the issues was very limited. As of today, many of these countries are trying to secure the re-delegation of the ccTLDs. ICANN has adopted the principles for the delegation and administration of country ccTLD that acknowledge the importance of the role of the government in that respect.”

Eskedar Nega, ECA

March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List

“For Africa in particular, but also for other parts of the world, in order to benefit from the Internet growth, investment from the private sector is key. That’s why, more than ever, operators, members of the Internet community and governments need to work together to gather the necessary conditions, in particular focusing on: lowest possible regulation level and enable competition; effective exchange of information between public and private sector; maintaining several technical possibilities to adapt to the Internet users’ choice; and last but not least the private sector must develop “services/content”, that will interest Africans in order to create revenue from the Internet (addressing in particular the needs of the small and medium enterprises).

Luigi Pessina, Italy

March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List

“ccTLD management in Africa has not always been perfect. I think the message is that things need to certainly change on the policy making within the international fora to guarantee the specific needs of African countries as related to IG, but we also need to do some homework.”

Pierre Dandjinou, UNDP

March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List

Technical Concerns

“In the allocation of Internet Domain Names, there are the TLDs, the ccTLDs and lower ones. I understand `www.xyz.za` is registered in South Africa `www.xyz.edu.za` as an educational institute, in South Africa `www.xyz.co.za` is a commercial entity. In the next 10/15 years, the provinces in South Africa will want domain names associated with their name. So I figure out that a hotel in Johannesburg may want to have `www.xyz.jb.za`, and the Cape, Gauteng etc ... Then the sectoral, schools in Johannesburg may want `www.xyz.edu.jb.za` Who will manage that? Who will receive the monies that come from that registration? What if that person for one reason or the other decides not to allow the Zulu People (for example) to have a domain name that reflects who they are? What if the Zulu people bring the matter to court?”

Nnenna Nwakanma, Cote d'Ivoire/Nigeria

January 2005, Discussion List on

“WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“One can naturally continue to increase participation by giving “clues” to would-be end user domain name holders. After all the excited discussions on what names “we” want, the real work is a single entry in the technology realm (implementation). Thus if we want to accelerate diffusion of domain names, its simple enough what to do. Quickly start to use your domain names....but we may have more difficult problems outside of the technical coordination to piece together such content issues, as security issues and other global issues e.g. IPR...in short, the concerns about governance may not be principally in the technical coordination/administration area.”

Nii Quaynor, Ghana

January 2005, Discussion List on “WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“...The technology at the beginning of the Internet did not favor an efficient allocation of address space. The ‘waste’ occurred when oversized allocations were given to early adopters because there was no better way of splitting the IP block at that time. But what could have happened if a reserve was set aside as some are suggesting per country? In some regions people would run out of IP address and in other parts they would

have a lot available and wasted. Those running out would develop solutions (such as another version) in order to move ahead and later on would force small users to use their standards. Or would they call for a redistribution of the unused space? What about routing implications?”

“... Things have changed a lot since the 90s in the area of IP allocation processes. Most importantly, the system is working very well. And those involved can testify. Regarding address allocation, IPv6 should no longer be considered as the primary solution for dealing with shortage of addresses - (because there is prove that we have IPv4 space available for the coming 40-50 years) - but as a big improvement of IP features to allow the Internet to be safer and accommodate upcoming technologies.”

Adiel A. Akplogan, AfriNIC
January 2005, Discussion List on
“WSIS Regional Preparatory Conference - Accra, Ghana”

“For the Internet governance component that relates to the administration/coordination of the Internet resources that are the IP addresses and the domain names, Africa has not integrated the rationale and processes for the last 10 years and was practically absent from most debates”.

“The continent is still the only one receiving its IP addresses from other regional registries (RIPE, ARIN and APNIC); Of course AfriNIC is being formed to cater for this. The size of the allocation is also another issue, since the current system favours large sizes while African Internet businesses (ISPs for instance) are not that big and could only thrive with smaller allocations. So the issue is whether Africa should be offered the opportunity to have IP allocation that really meet its needs.”

Pierre Dandjinou, UNDP
March 2005. UN-ICT Task Force: African Stakeholders Network Discussion List