

INTERNET INCLUSION: Global Connect Stakeholders Advancing Solutions

Washington, D.C.

5-6 October 2016

Internet Inclusion: Global Connect Stakeholders Advancing Solutions

Definitive opportunities exist today to accelerate progress in connecting the estimated 60% of the global population who remains unconnected around the world. The *Internet Inclusion: Global Connect Stakeholders Advancing Solutions (Internet Inclusion)* event sought to illuminate and capitalize on these opportunities by assembling key stakeholders from the global technology and policy communities for meaningful dialogue with one another—and by challenging them to sharpen focus on specific action they can undertake in the near term.

The 5-6 October 2016 multi-stakeholder workshop in Washington, D.C.—organized by the IEEE Internet Initiative in collaboration with Global Connect Initiative, Internet Society, People Centered Internet, and World Bank Group—explored technical, financial, and policy options and solutions for addressing infrastructure challenges and extending affordable internet access in underdeveloped and underserved communities and regions worldwide. Attendees included leaders from governments, multilateral development banks (MDBs), industry, the technical community, non-governmental organizations, and civil-society organizations.

A blend of dynamic, interactive workshops and panels, lightning talks on the status of digital inclusion plans, and regional and thematic roundtables involving dozens of speakers from different disciplines and markets provided an overview of the globally joined effort to connect the next billions of people. Also, participants organized into “thematic roundtables” in order to prioritize next steps and commit to action items toward making progress in extending affordable internet access.

Envisioning ‘Done’

In her welcoming remarks at *Internet Inclusion*, Mary Ward-Callan, managing director, IEEE Technical Activities, challenged participants to drive toward coherent action items and “ultimately look to get a roadmap to what I like to say is ‘done’—the end goal.”

That end goal, of course, is extending universal, affordable internet access to everyone on the globe. The U.S. Department of State’s Global Connect Initiative seeks to bring an additional 1.5 billion people online by 2020. Launched in 2015, the initiative has highlighted 65 new and existing international connectivity efforts valued at over \$20 billion. The initiative seeks to encourage foreign governments to integrate internet connectivity into their development strategies, double public and private funding for internet connectivity by 2020, and highlight industry-led efforts to bring the rest of the world online. It also seeks to encourage governments to adopt the right policies to create an enabling environment for growth.

“There is no better development tool than internet connectivity,” Catherine A. Novelli, U.S. under secretary of state said at *Internet Inclusion*. “It’s a platform, and then human ingenuity can take over ... (in) changing lives and lifting people out of poverty.”

Ann Mei Chang, chief innovation officer and executive director of the U.S. Global Development Lab at USAID, affirmed digital connectivity as “equally important” infrastructure to human wellbeing as roads, water, and electricity. “Why does (connectivity) matter?” asked Aniko

Szigetvari, global head of TMT Group, International Finance Corporation. “... If broadband penetration were to go from less than 5% to 10%, it would grow the global economy by that of a country the size of South Africa.”

While noting that merely extending raw connectivity to the unconnected would not automatically convey the benefits to humanity that internet inclusion is intended to deliver, “connecting people is the first necessary step,” said Constance Bommelaer, senior director of global internet policy, Internet Society. “Much more than needs to happen,” she said, such as skills and policy development. Diego Molano Vega, Colombia’s minister of information and communications technologies (ICT) from 2010 to 2015, built on this point, saying that many people in unconnected regions find useless the applications available to them once they do receive connectivity.

Sessions over the course of the two-day event in Washington expanded upon these themes. Speakers addressed the state of internet inclusion globally; the role of technologists working among all stakeholders to identify high-impact projects and to advance solutions; principles and recommendations for connectivity and human rights; key technologies for making the internet for all vibrant, affordable, and valuable; fueling economic uplift for local economies; innovative financing models; and empirical research into connectivity projects.

Very clear, critical gaps surfaced over and over again during the workshop sessions, and several important solutions became increasingly clear. For example, lack of shared knowledge about activity around the world remains a significant issue—what is needed on the ground, and what capital is available to be applied to connectivity initiatives?

In addition, participants noted a lack of measurement standards, clarity, and communication about what’s being measured; oftentimes, in fact, it’s not clear that anything is being measured. Also, across regions, the relevance of content (including language) is an issue. And though many needs on the ground are not being met because of an inability to connect to funding or other critical resources, funders do have money to invest—but they will not make those investments until return on investment is clearer.

Participants at *Internet Inclusion* took part in multiple sessions of group discussion at nine thematic roundtables. Conversation leaders were trained to convert the goals and needs that participants sourced into specific actions, and, indeed, participants proposed a host of activities designed to loosen the tangle of interrelated issues slowing rollout of universal, affordable internet access. With particular emphasis paid to collaboration opportunities and commitments to prioritized action, participants at each of the thematic roundtables proposed a range of valuable next steps to making progress on connecting the unconnected:

- *Improving Data for Internet Inclusion*—Find success stories of evidence-based policy that delivered results as intended.
- *Coordination on Basic Digital Skills Training*—Convene a stakeholder meeting around literacy’s relationship to “underconnectivity” and existing resources in this area, and perform a needs assessment.

- *Impact Investing for Connectivity*—Develop an end-to-end Funding Platform and Funding Class for Connecting.
- *Gender and the Digital Divide*—Create clear, gender-neutral guidelines for internet investment guidelines, and conduct a persona mapping exercise.
- *Infrastructure Development*—Repurpose end-of-life network equipment, connect projects with funding sources, and collect success stories.
- *Mapping Gaps for Connect to Thrive*—Survey 10 villages about a needs map prototype.
- *Sustainable Development Goals Impact Framework*—Develop multi-channel messaging.
- *eGov/ePublic Services*—Utilize the Gigabit libraries network and IEEE consultancy.
- *Youth and Connectivity*—Create a “National Workshop for Young People,” leveraging IEEE resources.

“Turning initiative into transformative action ... is hard stuff,” said Eric White, who leads the World Economic Forum’s Internet for All project. “But it’s what is required to move the ball forward.”

Improving Data for Internet Inclusion

Participants at this thematic roundtable discussed the data needed to understand the state of internet inclusion, people’s motivations for using the internet, and the effectiveness of the internet.

More data is needed about what current users are doing with the internet—both individually and in aggregate—and why non-users are not going online, they said. For example, with regard to people who have internet-capable devices but are not internet-enabled, participants noted a number of interrelated questions: Do they know what the internet can do for them? Are they equipped to use the internet as a tool in improving their daily lives? Is there local community support for them to learn and practice using the internet? Do they have a meaningful amount of data (i.e., pay as you go, what does the flow of data purchasing look like, etc.)? Do subsidized offerings lead to return on investment and sustainability? What are the viable paths for local communities to harness the internet for creating income-earning enterprises? Access to such data would help illuminate investment opportunities in infrastructure and services, either by private companies or, where private companies would not find it economical to invest, by governments.

Also, more data is needed about which internet-inclusion efforts have been the most successful in bringing people online; which ones have been most successful in bringing those online to services such as health, education; and, in particular, which have enabled communities to develop tourism and local products and services to bring in new sources of income. This would

help uncover the efforts that could best meet the relevant 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Participants discussed the need for a common vocabulary in areas such as numbers of users, beneficiaries, internet of people and internet of things, versatility of the data, distinguishing between number of subscriptions versus number of people who get access through a subscription, and the value of developing common language and possible standardization for internet inclusion.

<p>Main issues discussed:</p>	<p>All initiatives are dependent on more data to progress</p> <p>Identifying communities that are coming together, hubs of community activity, instances of dynamic activity leading to dynamic growth, etc.</p> <p>Why non-users are not going online</p> <p>Need for standardization</p> <p>Success of different internet-inclusion efforts</p> <p>1WorldConnected.org (more than 200 case studies, can hover over a map and see projects, low-bandwidth-version available)</p>
<p>Priorities for action:</p>	<p>Suggest case studies demonstrating value of evidence-based policy-making and having outcome data (e.g., reducing taxes on computers in Ghana leading to increase connectivity)</p> <p>Provide outside perspectives on 1WorldConnected</p> <p>Develop definitions of “operationalizable” research</p>
<p>Actions and commitments:</p>	<p>Explore whether 1WorldConnected is a hub that can be leveraged for stories around evidence-based policy that delivered results as intended, to be quantified and used to then help people make the case for policy, gender equality, etc.</p>

Coordination on Basic Digital Skills Training

Participants at the Coordination on Basic Digital Skills Training thematic roundtable distinguished “user” and “creator” digital skills—user skills as basic skills to make use of commercial devices and applications; creator skills as skills that could include programming capabilities and advanced content production. Those with creator skills can pursue jobs in the information and communications technologies (ICT) space, while those with user skills can make use of devices and services but not realistically participate in ICT-specific careers. While there is already a wealth of available training curricula for both user and creator skills, a range of factors may make it difficult or impossible for certain people to actually access or use that curricula. Cultural, social, and linguistic factors, as well as literacy variables, may all present obstacles. In addition, basic awareness as a driver of demand for training may be very low in some situations.

The group discussed whether organizations could share and promote their best/good practices in addressing digital skills more broadly with other entities, collaborate to create a central source of information on available digital skills resources from multiple entities, and/or develop shared research into specific gap areas toward developing specific modalities. Ultimately, the group identified its primary goal as maximizing existing resources for public access to training and skills.

<p>Main issues discussed:</p>	<p>Boundaries and definitions for different types of digital skills training</p> <p>Role of social/cultural issues in addressing necessary prerequisites for digital skills and the importance of doing so</p> <p>Different models of skills training (e.g., device-based, online, classroom, and remote)</p> <p>Examples of curriculum methods</p> <p>Role of gender divide in successfully addressing digital skills gaps</p> <p>Importance of multi-stakeholder engagement</p> <p>Abundance of available content and delivery methods—but insufficient mapping to needs</p>
<p>Priorities for action:</p>	<p>Develop needs assessment to address literacy (digital and otherwise) as it relates to “underconnectivity”</p> <p>Create a heat map of existing resources (people, offerings, etc.)</p> <p>Direct resources to needs, and develop additional resources as necessary</p>
<p>Actions and commitments:</p>	<p>Microsoft, Internet Society, and ITP will convene a stakeholder meeting on the three priorities and include an invitation to UN Education for All</p> <p>Internet Society, Mozilla, and IEEE will establish a working group to perform the needs assessment incorporating cultural barrier issues</p>

Impact Investing for Connectivity

Two tables at *Internet Inclusion* tackled Impact Investing for Connectivity from two related perspectives. One table focused on information needs; the other table, on creating a market for large-scale investors as a means to attract and validate sector investment.

Participants commented that the primary obstacles to encouraging more impact investment in connectivity are information gaps between the players in the space and potential opportunities. The challenge, they said, is less about the overall size of impact investment capital available than it is mobilizing that capital by bridging gaps among

- Investors who do not have insights into the potential projects available and do not have a comfortable understanding of the characteristics of some of these markets (geographic

remoteness, willingness to pay for internet services among lower income groups, population densities, household expenditure on ICT, etc.);

- Connectivity service providers who do not know where or how to reach social impact investors; do not know what sorts of information to provide to potential investors (not only business/financial key performance indicators but other potential social impact metrics that resonate); and who may not have the business and technical capacity to go on many “dates” with investors; and
- Governments (national, sub-national, and municipal) who may not be aware that the options for connectivity project financing are broader than just traditional private finance or public finance and who may not recognize that they maintain other non-financial assets that could encourage deal flow, such as policy and regulatory management (providing access to utility rights of way, for example).

Main issues discussed:	Information gaps among potential investors, connectivity service providers, and governments
Priorities for action:	<p>Develop an end-to-end Funding Platform for Connectivity that could bring together private capital financiers (angels, venture capitalists, debt-financing, private equity, etc.), donor funding (DFIs), regulatory government entities, and fundable connectivity projects. The Funding Platform for Connectivity would</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify potential connectivity projects that require funding, risk levels, government involvement, etc. • Provide a catalogue of good practice interventions (hardware, software, and business models) • Provide access to a track-team of successful investors who could provide guidance/mentorships • Demonstrate to governments (national, sub-national, and municipal) what policy/regulatory issues needed to ease entry of investment • Ease market entry for financing by providing market research, vetted deals, de-risking deals
Actions and commitments:	<p>Discuss the catalogue of interventions on the connectivity project side and business models</p> <p>Define the platform parameters based on existing models</p> <p>Articulate the metrics that impact investors are looking for in bankable deals</p> <p>Look at supply side interventions</p> <p>Share existing models, such as Peru</p>

One challenge of encouraging more impact investment in connectivity is about getting large-scale investors to bring scalability to bear. To date, there had been no class of investment of ICT-centric development that institutional and individual investors could put money into (i.e., a person or a pension fund invests in a sector that covers ICT-centric development).

With many effective interest rates for large corporations and banks at zero, the appetite for development finance in general and internet-development finance in particular should be robust. However, in order to trigger a wave of growth, several extra factors need to be put in place, such as an information/funding platform assuring particularly that data are structured to meet the emerging needs of a finance /investor class.

Main issues discussed:	Lack of investment class for ICT-centric development into which institutional and individual investors could put money
Priorities for action:	<p>Develop a Funding Class for Connectivity that would leverage the Funding Platform and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardize description of risk factors, upside, financial ROI, and social impact • Provide a mechanism to aggregate varying connectivity projects of similar types (regional focus, technology, etc.) into bundles that could attract large-scale funding • Provide a means for investors of any size to join, not as a charity/philanthropic vehicle (normally) but because of expected parameters of risk and return and social impact
Actions and commitments:	<p>Define the parameters that would enable creating this as an investment class</p> <p>Start working with a patient investor group</p> <p>Allied with the investor group, set out to structure a pipeline of projects to screen, qualify, and fund, starting at a reasonable scale</p> <p>Find a large-scale funding group (British or Singapore government, OPIC, IFC, etc.) to sponsor taking this to scale</p>

Gender and the Digital Divide

Participants at the Gender and the Digital Divide thematic roundtable agreed that the primary challenge is creating the right environment on the ground because it is clear the world so far has not rolled out access in a gender-equitable way. While there are many opinions about how to improve the situation, operationalizing those opinions has proven problematic. The group discussed tangible and tactical approaches.

Partnerships are key to progress in this area, they said. USAID and Alliance for Affordable Internet, for example, have created different data sets around key barriers. Perhaps opportunities

exist to build on partner projects (worst and best places for gender equality, for example). Projects could be evaluated to see if funding could be found. Participants at this thematic roundtable agreed that a key is to bring existing threads of effort in this area together, as opposed to creating an entirely new set of deliverables and paperwork for the same individuals involved in multiple initiatives.

Main issues discussed:	<p>Do not create something new</p> <p>Inspire people involved in international development/creating pressure</p> <p>Surveys should focus on behaviors (and not highlight the person or the country)</p> <p>Create a group resource for potential funding; what funding is available?</p> <p>Utilize USAID’s open source gender survey tool</p>
Priorities for action:	<p>Put together clear guidelines on gender-neutral internet investments that demonstrate why impact investors should care</p> <p>Perform a persona mapping, and uncover impact investors’ pain points</p> <p>Explore how to make life better for those affected</p>
Actions and commitments:	

Infrastructure Development

This thematic roundtable at *Internet Inclusion* described infrastructure development for connectivity as an empowering mechanism that enables sustainable socio-economic change. Infrastructure must achieve the purpose of adding value to the communities they are supposed to serve, participants said; plans must be holistic and get both regional and global buy-in.

Among the group, there were varying opinions on the role of government moving forward in connecting the unconnected. Some said governments will play a leadership role rather than investment; others argued that governments must play an investment role for projects in rural and low-income areas that otherwise would not be sustainable.

What is clear is that the traditional model of infrastructure development is under question, as connectivity demands collaboration among countries given that solutions must be both local and global. Consequently, policy innovation is essential to progress. In many countries, for example, connectivity is taxed—with revenues going back into the government’s general fund or to fund telecom development or additional connectivity. In many instances, telecom is still seen as a luxury. Though the industry has evolved, it has not yet made a compelling case to change this narrative. Connectivity must come to be regarded as part of the social fabric of infrastructure.

Infrastructure requires a macro view spanning workforce development and leveraging cohesive government policies including health, education, environment, and security, and integrating with

plans for sewers, electricity, roads, etc. Projects must be long term, participants said, continuing beyond the terms of individual politicians.

<p>Main issues discussed:</p>	<p>Need for statement that people can take to ministers—why you might care about ICT or connectivity in your country</p> <p>How do we measure success (e.g., deployment, adoption, use, etc.)?</p> <p>Government catalyzing a framework, lowering entry costs</p> <p>ICT ministers do not have power; finance ministers do</p> <p>Creating community-level champions</p> <p>Need model legislative statute for “Dig Once” projects, in which underground fiber links are installed as an integrated element of any major infrastructure program, such as building or renovating roads, railways, pipelines, utility infrastructure, and energy distribution channels</p> <p>Open Skies model, eliminating local ground licensing</p> <p>Should U.S. government push for other governments to subsidize network access as part of the Global Connect Initiative?</p> <p>Aggregating demand in rural areas</p>
<p>Priorities for action:</p>	<p>Connecting the last mile and how to make that sustainable</p> <p>Lack of understanding among governments worldwide on importance of connectivity as a fundamental piece of infrastructure and access as a basic human right</p> <p>Buildout of multipurpose access nodes that allow for network access to the general population at points of presence (model already established in India, Afghanistan, and Cuba)</p>
<p>Actions and commitments:</p>	<p>Hervey Allen with the National Startup Resource Center said he would put out a request to the group for end of life network equipment (switches, routers, access points) that NSRC can ship to targeted groups worldwide for effective re-use</p> <p>Camilo Salomon of Global Infrastructure Advisors said he could be a contact for funding if anyone has last-mile connectivity projects that present ROI</p> <p>Hervey Allen said he would request from the group success stories about last-mile connectivity worldwide so that Global Connect might be able to use them for press, web stories, etc.</p>

Mapping Gaps for Connect to Thrive

This thematic roundtable sought to visualize gaps per region that are preventing people from connecting or making a meaningful connection. Following its sessions, the group encouraged all participants at *Internet Inclusion* to join in thinking about what would be useful from a gap map.

Main issues discussed:	Need for a UI-type tool that would connect what people need with what people have, facilitating flexibility to quickly adjust and direct more impact
Priorities for action:	<p>Define what meaningful connectivity means (readiness is critical)</p> <p>With U.S. Department of State help, identify underserved locations and then survey 10 villages to better understand their needs</p> <p>Survey people who would use a UI-type tool, in order to decide what would be a good risk analysis for investing</p> <p>Understand what is the minimum viable data set that can be prototyped to learn by doing</p>
Actions and commitments:	<p>John Piletich from U.S. Department of State and Peter Whitehead to work together</p> <p>Jim Sterne with People Centered Internet asked event participants to email him (jim@peoplecentered.net) with input on how the proposed map might be useful</p>

Sustainable Development Goals Impact Framework

Main issues discussed:	<p>Connectivity is not isolated into a vertical Sustainable Development Goal</p> <p>There is a decentralized audience for information about the importance of connectivity</p> <p>Focus on including excluded groups, who see the world differently</p> <p>60 trillion dollars going into small family foundations directed by young people</p>
Priorities for action:	<p>Multi-channeling messaging</p> <p>Multiple assets from various sources (innovation, inclusion, and water)</p>
Actions and commitments:	

eGov/ePublic Services

Main issues discussed:	Governments deliver citizen engagement and services Trust at community level
Priorities for action:	Decision to start Connect organizations Add government engagement as it scales up
Actions and commitments:	Gigabit libraries network IEEE consultancy Ongoing bi-weekly meeting to explore synergy, coordinated by IEEE

Youth and Connectivity

Participants at this thematic roundtable discussed how youth can be the drivers of usage in regions with substantial numbers of unconnected people. While some level of connection and access is obviously necessary, youth adoption can be spurred with innovation hubs and technical training, they said. Opportunities exist for cross-training with businesses, educators, and other students. Such peer-to-peer programs must be perceived as “cool”—they should be fun, not work—if enthusiasm and true exchange of ideas are to take place.

Main issues discussed:	Regional variances on the definition of the term “youth” (13-18 is one segment, 19-35 is older segment, 13-35 overall) Challenges include a lack of motivation, a lack of funding for infrastructure, local government policy that might discourage access, and/or poor quality and speed of access slowing adoption Ideas such as launching “internet bookmobiles” to provide remote access and grow enthusiasm; committing TV or broadband spectrum to schools; innovation hubs (six-month program, partnership with private corporations and startups, www.santamonicayouthtech.com); pressuring Tunisian policymakers to privatize internet access or forward faster deployments Potential partners include universities, private corporations, and foundations
-------------------------------	---

<p>Priorities for action:</p>	<p>Establish one innovation hub per community in each region of Southern Tunisia, which lacks connectivity (only one provider, no competition, not a priority)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create demand with a “National Workshop for Young People,” to gain attention of the government and create a pressure point • Foster local and international partnership for funding and support • Create a sustainable model (technical/financial/training/support)
<p>Actions and commitments:</p>	<p>Introductions Committed to Skander Mansouri, co-director of Young Tunisian Coders Academy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambassador Daniel A. Sepulveda - Learned Dees, Africa Policy Advisor, U.S. Department of State • International Connector Tunisian Catalysts - Susan Maravetz, International Connector • Youth Special Interest Group - Internet Society - Mark Buell • Gary Carter - Collaborate on Youth Program • IEEE Youth Program Resources

Conclusion

In April 2016, global policy experts, engineers, scientists, development professionals, industry leaders, and others from an array of technology and industry domains gathered in Washington at the initial *Global Connect Stakeholders: Advancing Solutions* event. The October 2016 event in Washington drove the conversation deeper and encouraged participants to commit to concrete action. Speakers at *Internet Inclusion* noted their satisfaction that conversation had advanced beyond defining the problem.

“We like to live in a conceptual level,” said Mei Lin Fung, organizer for People Centered Internet. “It’s really hard to get people to commit to an action.”

“Now we’ve thought, what’s the smallest, fastest step that we can take? ...” she said. “Internet inclusion is a once-in-humanity opportunity. Only once will the whole globe be joined, and, if it’s joined in the wrong way, it’s just going to be terrible—we can’t allow that to happen.”

In the closing panel, Manu K. Bhardwaj, senior advisor on technology and internet policy to the U.S. under secretary of state, moderated a conversation around weaving together the thread of efforts discussed at *Internet Inclusion* into a fabric of success for internet inclusion.

Pierre Guislain, senior director, World Bank, said the Global Connect Initiative has helped stir demand among countries for more ICT and connectivity. “We are at the beginning of a new

increase in demand from clients who understand that there is a transformational potential, who understand if they want to leapfrog and accelerate growth and development, they will have to do something about connectivity,” he said.

Similarly, Marian Croak, vice president, R&D access and emerging markets, Google, concurred that Global Connect has helped stimulate activity, and she said that the associated IEEE meetings have helped integrate discussion across traditional silos of expertise and interest. She proposed that a more formal conglomerate of like-minded organizations with a widely recognized mandate for internet inclusion might be valuable.

Partnerships are increasingly crucial to Google’s connectivity projects in India and parts of Africa and southeast Asia, she said. “The problem is so enormous that I often tell my team we do not have competitors within this area,” Ms. Croak said. “We have only partners.”

Added Edmund DiSanto, executive vice president, chief administrative officer, general counsel and secretary, American Tower: “This is the inflexion point where the growth of the internet is starting to slow down. Something else is needed to get to the next level, and I think it’s an incentive. But I don’t think it’s such a big incentive . . . If we could coordinate the assets knowledge that we have—how to make this work—your cost basis for that is very, very low. And if you could combine that with a relatively modest incentive, it’s like a flywheel—give it a little kick, and it could be sustainable.”

Concluding the session, Konstantinos Karachalios, managing director of the IEEE Standards Association, said, “In the United States, people use the internet less and less, even though they are connected, because they do not trust it. If I had a magic wand, I would wish to restore trust to the internet—not by propaganda but by incentivizing and implementing trustworthy technical foundations . . . This has to go hand in hand together with connectedness; it’s not just a matter of connecting as many people as possible. There are three (elements) to this digital dream. The first is access. The second is inclusiveness, which is what we do with the access. And the third is something I will call ‘digital dignity’—that we connect in a way that enables us to be free citizens and not slaves to different interests who control our data and can prey on us. So, there is some work to be done here, in addition to just connecting them.”

IEEE, the world’s largest professional organization dedicated to advancing technology for humanity, is eager to work with finance ministers, MDBs, NGOs, and industry globally to continue the conversation about internet inclusion and to make additional progress in extending affordable access to more and more people globally. Please visit <http://internetinitiative.ieee.org> or email internetinitiative@ieee.org for more information.