

The Internet of Tomorrow Innovation and the Evolution of the Internet
6 December 2008

Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during Third Meeting of the IGF, in Hyderabad, India. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Let me repeat that we made a small change in program. The main session this afternoon will start at 3:00 and not at 2:00. And this session will run into the reporting back. We have gained an hour of session time. We have our interpreters until 1:00. So this session will stop at 12:30, and then we will provide an opportunity for organizers of national and regional IGFs, and maybe also of dynamic coalitions, to report in. But, please, these reports should be short and concise. And when I say short, I do mean short. We talk about two or three minutes. And you can say an awful lot in two or three minutes if you prepare it well and if it is concise. And I would also ask those who would like to report to come to the secretariat corner of this hall and announce so that we have a list of speakers. And we'll be able to manage the session. With that, can I hand over to our moderator. Where are you, Jonathan? Please, Jonathan, take on the floor.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Markus, thank you very much. Indeed. Welcome to our session on emerging issues. What we're going to discuss in the next three years, we are here until 1:00, is what are the issues that are really going to dominate in not just the next year, but the next few years, issues some of which we may have discussed over the past few days, issues that we haven't discussed. And what we're looking for from you is for you to come up with lots of bullet points. We want you to raise your hands, or you can also perhaps write down your question if you want, and send it to the front. But we prefer it if you just raise your hands, and we'll bring a microphone to you, and you can make your points. We're looking from this session for a lot of bullet points, things that can go on to the Cairo IGF next year, things that can be considered over the coming year. Now, those are partially going to be things that fit in with our five themes, of course, the opportunities and challenges associated with the growing popularity of the social networks and user-generated content, the impact of policy frameworks on creativity and innovation from an entrepreneurial perspective, the policy changes and frameworks in ensuring an Internet for all, the impact of the global nature of the Internet on jurisdiction and legislation, policy changes to providing an environmentally sustainable Internet. The five areas that were raised during the preparations for our meeting here in

Hyderabad. But then there are other issues in there. Let me throw a couple out now. We all know there is a credit crunch up. What is that going to mean for the Internet? What's it going to mean for investment? What's it going to mean for the new era of regulation? We seem to be over the past three months have moved very swiftly from a free-market capitalist era to one where governments are talking more and more in various areas of the economy about regulation. Is that new mood of regulation going to affect the Internet? That new mood amongst some governments. There's an emerging issue maybe. Maybe you think so.

If so, you can add to that. Maybe you don't think so. You can also say that. What about content? We've talked a lot about all sorts of issues here in Hyderabad. Content is a big issue. What are the emerging issues for Internet, for digital content? I'm a broadcaster. I come from the BBC. I represent a lot of broadcasters here, the EBU, the World Broadcasting Union. We're pretty sure there's going to be a growing demands and it can demand for high quality for the sort of material that only broadcasters with their resources can provide. But other people, the UGC is the only way forward. How are these issues going to work out and are the broadcasters right, as we think we are, when we say we think people want professional material on the Internet?

That's one thing they're going to continue to be very keen on and perhaps increasingly keen on. These are all the issues. Think of your bullet points. We're going to try to be a little structured in this debate. We are going to try to steer it in a logical form and try to make your points as succinctly as possible. As Markus said, you can say a lot in two or three minutes if you think about it. I'm going to introduce our panel as we go along. I won't introduce them all now. But let's start by hearing from our chairman today, who is S.V. Raghavan. He has been involved in digital issues in India for three decades now. He's chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee for the National Knowledge Network for the government of India.

>>S.V.

RAGHAVAN: Thank you, Jonathan. It's been a long journey for me personally, looking at interconnection not in a machine sense, but also in a people sense. Because way back in the beginning of the '80s, that India started thinking about introducing communication, as any other country would. And then came up with the ubiquitous e-mail system that came into work as the first application. Over a period of time, as you all know, as technology advanced and bandwidth became available at every place in the country, things started moving from simple electronic mail to the current social networks and exchange of information in all digital format between people. Many interesting things happened during this time. There are commercial concerns, there are societal concerns, there are cultural concerns, there are legal and environmental concerns. There are also the sustainable ecosystem that you need to develop to not only establish the network as it exists, but also to grow and be in tune with the requirements of the people, as well as the possibilities that technology provides. In the '80s, we thought we had a grand challenge and we have solved it. We were wrong. In '90s, we thought it was a grand challenge, introducing the Internet. We were wrong. In 2000, the new millennium, we thought we have solved the problem. Here again, wrong. What is happening today in Indian terms, if you look at Gandhian type of cooperative investment in the

bandwidth, it costs one cent per person per day of investment -- one cent, U.S. cent, per person per day of investment -- to get gigabit of bandwidth to every hut in every village. That's all it costs. The question is, really, who will do it? It's not a social obligation, explicitly stated. It is not a commercial venture that will be possible because you put things up front. So you look at capitalist economy, and -- one is a cooperative, the capitalist is a commercial, the other is a cooperative venture. You find that you drop in one cent every -- regionally for ten years, you find you have fiber. Technology makes it possible. Bandwidth is no issue. Now, managing this bandwidth is an issue. You find the local county or district, as we call it, or the state, or the federation, or the country, the sovereignty, if you look at it, the legal systems, the cross-boundary interactions, whether it is a commercial electronic transaction for electronic commerce, or for content being made available elsewhere, these become serious issues all of a sudden. And the legal system has to catch up with it. There are several types of systems other than the functionality. The bandwidth is only the functionality part. Then the users establish the usage part. And then the utility of the whole thing. Then the legal part comes in. Then you have the digital forensic part, in case of disputes. And then the resolution, with the judiciary system, everything gets into place. And when it crosses boundaries, especially the sovereign boundaries, issues become more complex. So these are issues that are emerging, because the possibilities are also expanding. On the content side, human beings haven't had experience of two things. One, simultaneity of events. The second, collapsing of distance. We have no way of comprehending. We are limited by the 120-degree right in front of you comprehension. That's the ability human beings have developed over time. Suddenly, you have the ability to see things which are beyond this horizon, beyond what we are trained to find. So that makes a challenge for an individual, a growing population. So ten years from now, what we want the population to be across the world will become an issue. We have to think about what kind of content we make available and how effectively do we make available. I am saying this especially because, most of the discussions center around how effectively to use the bandwidth and how effectively to use the technology and how high resolution things can be done and transported. To me, as a technical person that has become a nonissue. If you want to teach 10,000 people simultaneously, there's a pedagogical issue. I haven't learned the art of teaching 10,000 people simultaneously with interaction. The BBC kind of people have mastered the art of reaching 100,000 people, 100 million people simultaneously. Not interaction. It is that interaction and the pedagogical model that's going to make a huge difference. Because only when do you that you are reaching the last citizen, which we talk about in the Internet world in terms of access. Technology is not the serious issue. There are -- more and more will become available. Wireless will become gigabit-capable. The fiber will become terabit-capable. The cost is not the serious issue. The way you utilize the entire thing will become the serious issue. The way you enable the utilization will become a serious issue. The way you make it sustainable by making the successive generations understand and progress and think will become a serious issue. I would like the panel to deliberate on these things and then see what should be our far-reaching legislations, our far-reaching policy directives,

our far-reaching community understanding in driving the Internet the way it is to the way it should be in our perception. I'll come back and intervene at appropriate points in time. Thank you, Jonathan.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, indeed. Mr. Chairman, thank you. And an interesting point there particularly on this issue of interactivity, the big challenge for everyone on the Internet. My co-moderator is Stephen Lau, chief executive of EDS Hong Kong. He was also the first privacy commissioner in Hong Kong. And what Stephen's going to do is give us a bit of a synthesis over the next three hours of what we've been discussing here during the past few days. And we're going to split this into three bits. We're not going to give it to you all at once. And that -- but we're going to do it day by day. So, first of all, Stephen, the first day when we were dealing with these whole issues of, for example, how to reach the last billion.

>>STEPHEN LAU: Thank you, Jonathan, may I first say a few words of introduction. I'm new to IGF. And it's honor to be here. I'm a new kid on the block. I found this a very unique experience, having the opportunity to meet up with the multistakeholders with respect to Internet governance, from government representatives, private sector, civil society, academic, technologies, and all that. And I also have been exposed to issues which I don't normally get exposed to, because I'm a businessman. I'm in ICT sector. I'm also involved in data privacy. So I have been exposed to issues that I'm not normally exposed to. Particularly coming from a small place like Hong Kong, pretty well developed economy, but little diversity and little multilingualism. And talk about Hong Kong. Let me just take 30 seconds to do a little bit of info commercial for Hong Kong. You don't normally hearing about Hong Kong sort of infrastructure statistics relative to this particular forum, because we are not a U.N. member. We are a special economic zone in the People's Republic of China. So you don't know much about us. But let me give you a 30-second info commercial. Hong Kong, we have just close to seven million people. Our GDP per capita is, U.S. dollars, 31,000. Our telecommunication, external, is second only to Japan. In terms of our broadband penetration, it's 100% to all commercial buildings and 75% to all residential buildings. As far as households are concerned, it's 77% for Internet penetration. And as far as mobile phones are concerned, it's an astonishing 157%. So this is for your reference. So end of commercial. End of commercial. As I said, you know, it's a whole new experience for me here. And I'm going to provide a synthesis of the first day -- to stimulate discussion and to stimulate your bullet points in terms of emerging issues. I just want to say because of my co-moderation here, I have been spending all my time in the main sessions. And open dialogues. I have not been to all of the workshops. I've only been there fleetingly, like domain name tasting. So I actually had some workshop tasting. And I really find the discussion very much in depth, very stimulate, and according to some of my colleagues, as compared to past IGFs, you know, the level and the depth and the level of collaboration between the multistakeholders has been astounding and has progressed enormously. So let me just go to the

first day, synthesis for stimulation. We had an opening ceremony, upon which we had, really, top officials from India and from international organizations, to open the conference, which provided and attached the importance and the perception of the importance and the significance of the IGF conference. And I distill from that three points. One is that the presentation highlights the equity of Internet is achieved through local contents, universal access, and affordability. And the success of this model must depend upon collaboration of all multistakeholders, governments, business sectors, academics, and technologists. In general, compliments were paid to IGF being a unique entity, a platform upon which free flow dialogue and discussion from all multistakeholders is taking place. It can do what intergovernmental platforms may not be able to bring about as it brings together all the stakeholders without preconditions and stances on an equity basis. No need for a negotiated outcome to discuss sensitive and sometimes issues of seemingly conflicting interest in an open and in a frank manner. Though not per se outcome- and decision-based, the intended and achievable outcome for IGF is that the discussion would possibly influence those who are decision-makers. Our first day was -- the main theme is, reaching the next billion, realizing a multilingual Internet. The highlights included discussing this multilingual issue. It was noted that India has 40 million Internet users. The vision is to get to 250 million. Though with 22 official languages and thousands of dialects, India's overwhelming contents are in English, but not that much contents in other languages, due to its ICT boom, global needs, and global outsourcing export. So the need to tackle multilingualism is, namely, the needs of the availability of search engines for local languages, the availability of IDN, international domain names, progress in local scripts and hardware able to use those scripts, and local contents that not necessarily mean written languages, as some languages are oral, so audio and video parameters are important. And there's also a general inadequacy in numerical and digital literacy of people. There was a relevant discussion -- observation that development of multilingualism should not be what are to be provided, but necessarily what are to be provided should satisfy what are essentially required by the end user. So there was a call for effective framework for such development and the common technology for commonality and to be backed up by successful case studies. In the main session, once again, on reaching the next billion, but focusing on access, it was noted, it took 20 years for Internet to reach one billion users, whereas the second billion is expected to only take four years. And access does not mean just access to Internet. It's talking about an access ecology. This includes access to power sources, access to education, access to localized contents. And, generally speaking, there are five -- observed that there are five inhibiting factors. And we need to overcome that to enhance access. Capacity, including spectrum allocation; affordability, sometimes due to lack of competition; insufficient local exchange points for local traffic, such that overall costs are minimized; and there's a general business focus on e-commerce to drive growth and demand on Internet and sufficient push for community needs such as e-health and e-conservation. And, finally, the relevant human capital, human talents in developing economies sometimes tend to migrate to developing economies. Apart from these supply perspectives, access from the supply perspective is, how do we increase access? We

need competition to provide better choices in prices. We need to enhance the awareness and people of technology. And we need to provide services which satisfy the need of the end users. And in the open dialogue, there were questions raised, like, should we have tiered service, tiered services and pricing for urban and rural areas, the affluent and the less-affluent? Should we focus the next billion on our children, our next generation? How can we learn from a country like Finland, where the building of capacity and Internet penetration is highest within the E.U., European Union. It's achieved through light regulations, deregulations, and partnership with private sector to provide effective networks and services. And, finally, there's a striking and memorable reminder that the issue of multilingualism and access, reaching the next billion, is not just globally reaching the next billion, but a national vision for each economy to reach the last billion of its citizens. So we are talking about taking into account the changes in the demographics, topology, not just increased consumers in developed economies, but empowering the uninitiated, the underprivileged, the indigenous, the socially and the fiscally challenged. And such empower and empowerment requires access. And I'd like to stop there.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Stephen -- thank you very much, Stephen Lau, for setting the scene in the first of your synthesis. And we'll here some more a little later on. Stephen talked there about reaching the next billion. My next spirit is Ian Peter, who is coordinator of the civil society Internet Governance Caucus. he's also an Internet analyst and management consult. Ian, I think you want to talk about reaching the last billion as an emerging issue.

>>IAN PETER: Thank you very much, and good morning, everybody. I think it helps in examining subjects like this to, as best we can, pull ourselves away from your immediate environment and, as best we can, look into the future, and see if we can identify some of the issues and some of the factors that we are going to address. So, to me, the next billion is going to happen, and happen very rapidly. It will be over perhaps by the time we meet again. But the last billion, well, it's going to take some time. The first billion took 20 years, as was pointed out. I think by the time we get to the last billion, we have some order to difficulties and that might take us out another 20 years.

So in order to do so, I'd like to welcome you all to IGF 2028. The IGF 2028 meeting is taking place in Reykjavik, Iceland. I'll explain a little bit why we're there in my introduction here. I'm participating virtually from Australia for various reasons. And I'm on high-definition conference link from Australia, being able to participate from there. So thank you for the opportunity. The other piece of news I must relate 20 years enhance is, Australia has just beaten India in the cricket for the first time in 20 years. So that is a great thrill for me. Thank you. When I'm talking about the last billion, I should say that we -- that there are some people who are, obviously -- we're not talking about the last billion of the world's population. I think we can leave out everybody who arrived yesterday and/or probably everybody under the age before three. But we do start to pick up at the age of about three or four, as I know from my grandchildren, who hop on the net and play games. So we do have three-

and four-year-old users. I guess there are a number of people who simply don't want to have anything to do with that. So that's okay, too, I'm excluding that. I'm including in the last billion people who see there is advantage for their family, for their children, to be connected here and all the advantages that other people have from the Internet, they want them. So they're in and we're trying to deal with those. Let's get a profile of where they are, as best we can. So let's get of profile of where they are, as best we can. And let me say that quite a few of this last billion are in developed countries. They are in rural pockets, which have not been connected and are very hard to connect, in countries like Australia it could be the remote indigenous communities. Who are amongst the last billion. So we certainly have pockets still in developing countries. And we have urban poor in developed countries who also will be part of that last billion. But to a large degree, the last billion will be those who are slower in adopting, at this point in time, will still be so. And that will be the case. So there are areas on the planet that will need higher concentration than others in order to bring the equity that does derive from all of us from having access to this thing. Quite a few of the last billion won't be able to read or write. That won't be a problem for them because a lot of the uses they will have will be around gaming or around downloading, downloading videos, downloading music, these sort of factors. So that's not a problem but it is an interesting factor because then the tool for literacy that exists with the Internet sort of becomes a very interesting thing that starts to come to the fore. So these are the things that are happening. And the other factor that comes in with the last billion that's very interesting for us is multilingual. You ain't seen nothing yet. But the time we get to the last billion and some of the languages we have to deal with, it starts to become quite complex. Let's talk about the devices we use with the last billion, and very few of them are going to be computers. Most of them are going to be mobile devices. We are going to be in a mobile world. And some of these devices will be mobile phones, some will be sort of what we used to call PDAs and all sorts of smaller devices, but the computer won't be amongst the dominant devices at that point in time. That raises fairly interesting issues, and we will come back to those as we start to talk about infrastructure and so on. But as I said before, the dominant -- some of the dominant media we use at this point in time will not be the dominant Internet media with the last billion. The concentration will be more towards what our kids do, which is the downloading, the texting, the games. All these things come into this space. There's a ramification of these things with mobile and we will get to it. Let me talk about some of the issues and try and structure this a little bit. And I am not going to paint the whole picture, but perhaps raise some questions and some ideas which are a part of the picture for you to fill in yourself and see how you think we ought to address some of these things. Now, why are we in Reykjavik, Iceland? We are in Iceland because Iceland is the fastest growing Internet economy on the planet. Iceland, the basket case economically of the great depression of 2008 has jumped ahead because of the major project under way to create the carbon neutral Internet. Iceland's vast geothermal resources have been put to use, and major server farms -- in fact, most server farms in Europe, most major locations in Europe, a lot of government data centers in Europe have all relocated into

Reykjavik to get near the geothermal thing. Other areas of the world with good renewable energy resources have also jumped ahead, too. So there is a great new economy and a great number of new possibilities arising from this. Some of the other features that we'll see is most of us will have our biodegradable mobile phones. We have started with the carbon neutral Internet to start to address the major problems of junk.

And I know one of my fellow panelists is going to raise this issue later but in 20 years' time we can start to look at it. In getting to this carbon neutral Internet we have started to create a vastly different architecture and start to really use the way that the Internet works in a vastly different way. Let's talk about the infrastructure for this, because (inaudible) get to the last billion.

So it's probably maybe about the infrastructure, probably about six times what it would be at the moment. That would be nice. One of the factors that's interesting to look at is the high end users of Internet bandwidth at this point of time are using 10,000 times the bandwidth of the normal -- of the low-end Internet user. So there's a vast discrepancy. And what is going to happen is more of us are going to move to this bigger group, the 10,000 -- sort of 10,000 times normal usage pattern of Internet usage, and this will happen more and more as sort of Internet TV downloading, Internet videos. And this will happen more and more, particularly in developing countries. So I don't think we will have anything like 6,000 times. We might be looking at 60,000 times the current capacity is needed. I would say conservatively we are definitely looking at 10,000 times the current capacity by 2028.

That has a number of ramifications for the way we do things. He I mentioned video. We ever not just talking about the recreational video and YouTube downloads, we are talking medical video, the high-image conferencing which allows me to participate from Australia. These sort of things are all part of this too. This creates a number of issues.

One of the issues here is shared infrastructure. Is everybody going to roll out, ever telco, every ISP, going to roll out parallel infrastructure to across every country to try and do this or are we going to look at shared infrastructure models to create efficiency and to create this global network which we need. How are we going to cope with this vastly bigger issue? And what's this going to look like?

Let me give you a couple of ideas. First of all, we are looking at the mobile Internet to a very large degree. And as I say, the dominant use will be mobile. Now, back in 2008, the mobile device was a strange hybrid. It used non-Internet standards when it connected by voice, but some of them did, but in fact some of them, the cheaper ones went over to what is called Internet standards to use this and then there was Internet standards for dial-up and other standards being introduced and there was quite a bit of mess. Now, I think this eventually, to deal with the expansion of all of this, led rise to the new standards institution which was created in about 2010 which was the IETFITU. The IETFITU looked to harmonize all the standards which were going on in the Internet area and telephony area to create this big globally connected network. The major work of the IETFITU was the workshop which was trying to reduce the number of standards to less than 10,000. And this was consuming a lot of energy as people started to try to get this to a workable number of standards. However, there was the new organization which has just arisen and I ask you to think about how strong it was and this is the IETF. This is the Internet intersect initiative. This

was sort of like the WWW. Sort of figured that these are the guys that were never going to cope. The IETF was far too old, far too staid. The IETF didn't get it, and a lot of innovators have moved to the III. The III was looking at a clean-slate approach, and it had taken place, and many of the users were starting to use the III standards and the new III network. The III network had all these wonderful applications and became the platform for innovation because the other platform had got to the stage where innovation was becoming more and more difficult. And some of the people there remembered the thoughts of Robert Kahn at the IGF way back in 2007 who started to say the Internet standards and the Internet standards body are starting to ossify and become not capable of handling new areas of innovation. So that was an interesting fact that came in. I should wrap up fairly quickly but I do have to talk about governance because this is an Internet Governance Forum. So what does our governance look like in 2028? Well, it would defy all known management logic if the current structures in their current form were able to cope. They won't. By 2028, things will have been changed. Things will be moving very fast. I think the new motto which, because of the pace of all of this adoption, will be if it's about to break, fix it. And that will be the dominant motto by which we sort of start to look at the emerging governance models. One of the interesting questions around this is going to be jurisdiction. It will still be an issue. And we are living in lawyers' paradise. Internet is the lawyers' paradise where various countries all think they have jurisdiction of various thoughts over the same domain name. Where privacy issues and sort of issues as to who should do what are all out there. We have industry self-regulatory regimes start to go spring up, but governments are also, in their own way, setting up their regimes. Do we have an industry self-regulatory regime dealing with most of these issues or do we have a government regime separately? What is the structure that is going to deal with these tremendous emerging issues around intellectual property and privacy and individual rights and human rights and sort of the content that's offensive in one country but not offensive in another. How are we going to deal with all of those. So as I say, I think we are in lawyers' paradise as we start to deal with these jurisdiction issues. That's about it, I think. I hope 2028 provokes you to start to think. If I just summarize that very quickly, the areas where I think we have issues is how we deal with climate change and environment issues, how we deal with infrastructure, how we deal with access, how we deal with ossification and standards and how we deal with governments as we go forward. Very interesting, and I hope I provoked some thinking.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Ian, thank you very much, indeed, for painting a very vivid picture of 2028, and also Iceland will be happy you have given them hope in their hour of need. What about issues from the commercial point of view? Let's now here now from Herbert Heitmann who is director of global communications, head of global communications at SAP. And, obviously, the commercial world sees things often very differently to the open society world. But maybe we can get some common ground here. Herbert.

>>HERBERT HEITMANN:

Thank you, Jonathan. Maybe, also, do a quick introduction of myself because I am also new to the IGF. And since you stress that in my normal life I very much focus on communication, multilingualism and access got a new meaning entering this building here and listening to the presentation because you have to develop your own language which requires probably for many others who want to have access some sort of translation to understand why this really matters and why it's of relevance. And I would strongly urge all participants to, moving forward, focus on those kind of translational efforts so all the people who might be interested have a chance to participate and contribute, also, in our discussions here. In my comments today -- And maybe the other point is I am invited to the IGF not so much because I am in charge of communication for SAP but because I am chairing the commission for e-business, I.T. and telecommunication of the ICC which is the voice of business around the globe. Emerging issues from a commercial and business perspective, we discussed about this next billion, last billion, this whole forum is about providing Internet for all. But business usually go after the low-hanging fruits and they will be more likely among the next billion than the last billion. On the other side, innovation, creativity requires changes. And these changes clearly are in the field of the last billion. While I do believe there is kind of a constant exchange between new efforts, research, and approaches to reach the very last billion, I think it's important, I don't recall who said this, that it's the last billion who want to have access to the Internet. We don't want to force anybody to be happier than they are. But here in this area, I think there is certainly lots of need for creative approaches which can only be done in an environment similar to this here where all different kinds of stakeholders come together on an equal footing and first of all can share the challenging and collectively work on a solution here. These solutions for the last billion, that I am convinced of, will heavily contribute to even more affordable and proper and stable solutions for the next billion. This is the usual way how innovations push and influences the mainstream here. But there is another area impacting us probably even stronger and this is what you mention, global crisis. Right now it stills more like a virtual crisis. I am concerned that when we come together at the next IGF in Cairo it's a real crisis, real recession, because right now it's, quote-unquote, just the cash that doesn't flow. When the demand is gone, we are looking into a completely different picture here. This is therefore most likely that private investments in ICT and other areas will rather decline than grow. We come out of a double-digit growth environment, and this is very new approach for us. At the same time, we can see that -- and it's not a surprise, we need to be very careful, is that regulation, protectionism and to a certain extent nationalism is quickly getting back into fashion, which I think is a very, very concerning development. Those who looked in the New York Times yesterday and saw that Berlusconi suggested to put Internet regulation on the G8 agenda is just the latest evidence that something is happening here that we all together need to very carefully watch. However, I think the public sector has a unique opportunity in this situation. In the previous years, I often referred to the ICT readiness index, that the World Economic Forum puts together once a year, and you can see here there is a huge gap between the ICT readiness of governments and the businesses

in the different markets. We have mature markets where the government is heavily lagging behind the economy and we have emerging markets where the government is leapfrogging. This is an opportunity, particularly for those who are lagging, to catch up, and to not only be an enabler user but also an exemplar, to use the ICT for all the benefits we know, are aware of. And I think here is an opportunity and it will also buffer the effort of this crisis that we are somewhat concerned about. And business will have to explore new business models.

We'll also have the opportunity to explore new business models that in the past were very challenging because of the very same financial system that is now creating this problem was extremely reluctant to support, move into new models. What I am talking about this is this whole notion of on-demand, consumption-based business models. Just to give you an example, SAP is a company which is pretty highly valued by the investors, and the triggering factor is how much software license we sell, which is up front license sell, and that determines the value of the company. And the moment where we slightly try to change anything, there is an immediate concern and the value goes down so nobody touches this. Now, value of our and many other companies of today is very significantly different than what it was prior to September. There's an opportunity to explore new business models there because you cannot get hamped and punished so heavily like it was in the past. And it's also the customer certainly who in these times have much more interest in the kind of an on demand, ongoing consumption-based pricing model than these kind of up-front opportunities. It's not just in the ICT industry. We see this in our, to use another terminology, old economy customer, the manufacturers. Hilti is a producer, the global leader of drilling machines, very heavy-duty materials. They, since quite some time, tried to move into a business model where they, instead of selling drilling machines, they sell hoes, and that means they serve their customers more, that they sell them or want them to invest in drilling machines. With the exception of a few private men, I think nobody has a desire to own a drilling machine, but many people need hoes for construction, and this is what they want to sell. But to sell this, they need to become a service provider. And to do this on a global basis, they need to create a network far beyond classical supply chains. This network will be in constant transformation. This creates ecosystems of small, medium businesses at the local place of the customers. And all these kind of things very much depend on I.T. infrastructures, on the Internet, the Internet of things that was mentioned here, but also the Internet of service. And in academic terminology, I think it's the semantic Web which will heavily spur these kind of developments. This is the big thing that from a business perspective we are waiting for. We are looking into, we are investing into, but also I see that the different government institutions are putting strong emphasis on this. This is clearly the way to go from our perspective. And convergence which was a pick topic at the OECD ministerial conference, which was and is a big topic here, is another adding element here. Critical is cybersecurity, than more than ever before. Affordable access and reliable networks, I think this is not a given but I trust that this will be a given, but it's needed. That goes without saying. And then what are the other emerging topics? Sustainability is something which already today moved out of the marketing departments into the office of the CEO because it

combines a couple of really important issues which affect us, but affect every business, every corporation. Compliance, the most risky way to be thrown out of business, and therefore, not having a sustainable business will be noncompliance, so this is a must. Education and access to talent is another critical element. And then this whole, depending on how you want to describe this, green notion, environmental aspect that in some industries play a more prominent role than in others. It is very obvious that the public and also the debates here are very interested in green I.T. I personally believe that even higher relevance is what I.T. can do for this planet to become green. The whole impact on efficiency, on careful use of resources by using I.T. cannot be underestimated, and always needs to be put into perspective when we discuss green I.T. And last but not least, because this is mainly why we are coming together, on the policy framework side, the classical elements of policies, making the cash flow, credit affordable, taxation, appropriate also for industries that are new coming in the space of ICT, in the context of the stimulus packages, is a must. Intellectual properties rights will become more critical before, and mainly for the small business. When you have this ecosystem, it's not the big giant who is establishing the ecosystem. That's the thousands of little partners who sit on that platform who depend on a proper protection system for the intellectual capacity and investments here. And I think this requires a collective effort and it needs to be done in a much, much more harmonized fashion around the globe here. We certainly, from a business perspective, cannot stress enough how important it is to continue to foster compare competition all around the globe. And last but not least, what I want to stress here, even if this is the first IGF that I have participated in, but it was enough for me to experience, and I sense it needs to be experienced, that only such kind of a format where all the different stakeholders come together on an equal footing, and its changed, not with the intention to have by everybody agreeable declaration at the end of the event but really to have an open discussion, to learn from each other. And I have discovered so many new things by just participating in workshops and listening to discussions that this, in itself, I think gives a tremendous value. And I only hope that we can continue this and further advances. And with that I would like to conclude my issues inventory.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much, indeed. And let's stay with one of the subjects you touched on there which is sustainability. Our next speaker is Heather Creech who is from the International Institute for Sustainable Development. Obviously, it's the big, emerging issue as we look toward the next billion and the billion after that. How are we going to make it sustainable? Heather.

>>HEATHER CREECH: Thank you very much. My institute, ISD, has been around since 1990 which isn't that long a period of time when you are in the business of changing frameworks and mindsets globally. And so it's actually wonderful to sit here and listen to my two fellow panelists actually talk about everything that I'm about to talk about. You have, in fact, said many of the things that need to be said today. So forgive me if I go over some of the same territory, because it does

need to be reinforced, I think. Many of you will recall in Rio that sustainable development was identified as an emerging issue for the IGF. Here in Hyderabad, there has been a real focusing-in on -- particularly on climate change as a driving issue for many of the people who are in attendance here. I think we are all in agreement that the Internet is the most important piece of infrastructure of our time and that it underpins our economies, our cultures, our communities. And it is also beginning to underpin our governance, how we understand, how we need to interact with each other in a much more networked way around the world. How the Internet is beginning to break down the silos between sectors. How you have governments talking with each other across regions. How you have governments working with the private sector, the engagement of civil society and so on. Many of you may not be aware, in fact, going back to the early '80s, that the Internet was the key force in really unpacking the whole climate change challenge. This was a very interesting piece of history that is known in the climate change community but perhaps not so well-known here. What happened was that the scientists were beginning to do their models, recognizing that there were some potential real problems in terms of our greenhouse gas emissions and what that might do in terms of global temperature change. They started using the Internet that was available to them within the university networks to share the data. And it was the possibility of sharing these massive data sets and running these massive models through the Internet that actually led to the creation of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. Without that, we would not be where we are today in terms of trying to resolve the problem. The second thing that happened was the emergence of the storing forward email systems, the old Fido nets of the world. When civil society, when the NGOs began to listen to the scientists and pick up on the data, and when this started to become an issue for governments to negotiate around, it was actually the civil society community, the NGOs, working with the scientists who had better data than the governments themselves. And the governments acquiesced to the science community, to civil society and said, yes, you are right. Clearly, something is happening here. And that led to the negotiation of the U.N. framework convention on climate change. We need the Internet. I think what this community here at the Internet Governance Forum perhaps could benefit from is moving beyond grappling with the immediate issues that it faces, institutional arrangements, technical issues around infrastructure, the issues of rights and privacy and so on, to really grappling with why do we need to resolve these. What is the bigger picture here? What happens if we, in this room, don't get it right? I'm tempted to put forward an alternative scenario to what my colleague mentioned, one which is rather more bleak called VIP net, which is a world in which we have lost the battle on environmental issues, lost the battle on climate change, we've lost the economic battles, and the world has become restricted to a few elites using their own proprietary network to talk to each other and maintain their status. And outside of their little fortresses we have suddenly a world underwater, a world without clean water, a world with new diseases, a world with higher rates of infant mortality, a world of people trying to get by with basically nothing left, and the elites themselves restricted, with the elites themselves controlling all of the resources. That's the dark side. So what is the role of this

community in terms of ensuring and supporting those in the world who are trying to grapple with climate change issues, with issues around biodiversity, natural resource management, sustainable economies. First of all, one of the things that I have noticed emerging out of this forum is a growing appreciation that these issues facing the IGF should be treated in a more integrated way. There is an incredible potential with the Internet of things in terms of building sensor networks that will allow us to monitor how we are using our resources, what climatic impacts we're starting to see, how to monitor our flows of resources and so on. But we can't get to wireless sensor networks without having the transitions to new Internet protocols. We can't get to engaging every single citizen in monitoring their immediate environment unless we have access right down to the last person; the last citizen, as our Chair phrased it at the very beginning today. We have to get this right. I think the second observation that I would make is we need to look a little bit beyond the green ICT debate. We actually talk a lot about first-order effects, second-order effects and third-order effects. First order effects are direct effects, direct impacts, things that the industry itself can deal with in terms of getting energy efficiencies, in terms of managing electronic waste, those things that are directly within the control of the ICT industry. And industry is beginning to take this, quite legitimately, quite seriously. The fact that the ICT sector is moving sustainability into the office of the CEOs is an incredible sign of ownership and responsibility of this sector for its direct effects. But then we need to look at the second order, the indirect effects, and the role of the Internet community, the ICT community, in terms of looking at how it supports other sectors: Energy, transportation, other infrastructure. How can we help those sectors become far more efficient, more environmentally sustainable. And then we have last the third-order effects, the real transformation of society. How does the Internet community, the development and deployment of the Internet, how can that serve to really begin to look at a (stating French term), a wonderful expression in French which means making this a project of every citizen in the world to take ownership of their environmental footprint. The last observation I would make is the IGF is a wonderful forum, but from time to time it does feel a little self-reverential. And I think there is a need to take these issues and move them into other fora. There is a certain naivete in other fora about Internet issues. There is an assumption the Internet is simply going to be there. And we all know that there are risks and challenges as the Internet evolves that may change this. I think one of the things that we need to do in terms of moving our issues into other fora, in part, I'm thinking particularly of the climate change fora, is that we need to ensure that those fora get the incentive structures right, get the regulations right, that allows this community to innovative and to expand, and to ensure that this infrastructure is working in support of long-term sustainability. And I think I'll end there.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Heather, thank you very much, indeed. [Applause] Well, in a moment, it's your chance to put your hands up and give us those bullet points on emerging issues. We're going to be making a note of exactly what you say, so every word, every bullet point you put forward, they're going to go for

consideration in Cairo. They'll be things that, obviously, will you take back as well to your companies, your organizations, and your academic institutions. Before we go to you, I think our chairman has just got a couple of things that occurred to him as a result of the speeches that we've just heard.

>>S.V. RAGHAVAN: Thank you, Jonathan.

We heard, to our right, the summary of what happened until now in a very succinct form. And then Stephen, in his own informative and entertaining way, explained what to expect a couple of decades from now, followed by what are the business opportunities and models that are likely to emerging and how this will be sustainable. And climate change is an example of collaboration. I'd like to point out that there are a few things that we do with Internet in an abstract sense. For human beings, entertainment, health, education are the three important things, in that order. Normally, I would like to -- entertainment includes gaming and cinema, as we see it. That's most visible usage of Internet. Followed by health, because I worry about what needs to be done about my own well-being. If I am happy, if I am healthy, then I go for education. Anything else, and social networking, including e-mail and other types of collaboration, forms the other part. If we look at the media growth, both in the electronic and digital form, entertainment forms something like 85%. Education formed about 10%. And health, anything else, and social networking, formed about 5% in the past. When it came to digital and Internet world, entertainment forms about 50%. Health forms about 20%. Education is about 10%. And social networking and anything else is about 10%. Even though we personally feel a lot of things are happening. In terms of accuracy of recording and accuracy of transmission and able to reach, as 2028 scenario put it, lots of things will get generated. But there are individual administrative domains through which these have to pass. And what we traditionally refer to as a quality of service is a necessary prerequisite for making sure that this direct visibility and distance happens when you do remote interaction. The quality of service is a well-understood term in technical terms, terminology in technical terms, but very difficult to practice by service providers and across administrative domains and across sovereignty. So what we need to look at are two types of management, one called regulatory management. Another one is called enabling management. In the enabling management, even providing an infrastructure as a proactive measure by the state is an enabling measure. Some people try to do that. In India, we are doing what is called a national knowledge network, establishment of that which is multiple 10gigabit network at the core, moving to 100 gigabit next year. And what we call is a power line, minimum connection speed that you can have is one gigabit to come into the system. Climate change was the driving force for this particular application, because the kind of data that was exchanged. The second thing was high-energy physics. But soon what is happening is, collaborative research is picking up. So new paradigm is emerging, tapping the synergy across the nation in what is called collaborative directed basic research. The body of people who will generate tomorrow's technology, they'll do basic research. But what is getting done is that they are directed. They're not doing on their own, but they are working towards a cause of a better tomorrow. Climate change

is an ideal example. Nano science is an ideal example. They are working towards creating knowledge or a gadget or a device of tomorrow in a collaborative tomorrow. That requires this kind of interconnection. That requires across the public and private institutions. IPR becomes an issue, individuals become an issue, the ID becomes an issue, and all those things. The second thing that is happening is, the innovation opportunity lies with people. The more and more individuals who come up with brighter and brighter ideas and they would like to practice them at large and convert them with appropriate business models. So combining innovation, which is resting with individuals, for the benefit of the society, and translating it into financial terms, that is again becoming another challenge which countries are looking at. And when we talk about green I.T. most of the literature talks about when to start and stop the CPUs or the disks and so on and how to consume less and produce more. Another thing that's happening in green I.T. is, when you have these kinds of innovation put in, if I take this sheet of paper and apply pressure somewhere in between, that information is immediate and all of us can see it. But to show the same thing on a computer requires a huge finite element package to run on several CPUs and a huge amount of bandwidth to be transported and a huge, high-definition projector to show it in real time. You and I can see it incidentally. There is physics, there is engineering, there is major processing, recognition, rendering, all types of technologies are put in. That is what we are trying to achieve. If we can reach a level where these things become possible, I think that the real benefit to society comes in. That's where the innovation which is resting with the individuals, by and large, if it can be harnessed together for society's benefit, that will be a challenge. Nobody knows how to do it. Limited environments, like corporates, they know how to tap the potential, how to package them in the current I.P. regimes, copyright regimes, and regulatory regimes. What is the new regime that is required to spur this innovation in every individual for the benefit of society is also a challenge. A forum like this, when it is summarizing what has happened in the past three days and then hand it over to the next IGF for deliberations, it would be ideal if we can come up with some solutions on how this innovation, individual synergy and collaborative directed basic research can be brought together for a realization of the 2028 of our friend Steve.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Okay. Your turn now. If you put up your hand and you want to say something, then we'll bring you a microphone. We've been talking so far about environmental sustainability. We've been talking about the issues with companies. We've been talking about multilingualism, the whole issue of semantics and where we're going with that. But there are many other emerging issues. And we want your bullet points. Let's start with the gentleman over there. Would you get him a microphone. And if you could say your name. And we'll bring you a microphone. Stay where you are, we'll bring you a microphone. Say who you are and where you're from.

>>:Hello. John Carr from the U.K. Children's Charities Coalition on Internet Safety and the European NGO Alliance on

Child Safety Online. I think sometimes in this forum child protection or issues around child protection have been perhaps poorly understood or even at times misrepresented, I think, as being in some kind of necessary antagonism or opposition towards freedom of expression, privacy, or some of the other fundamental human rights with which the IGF is absolutely properly and entirely correctly concerned with. I don't see it -- that antagonism or that opposition as being intrinsic or necessary at all. We -- I work with children's organizations that strongly support exactly those same rights, freedom of expression, rights to privacy, and so on for children, just as much as we do for everybody else. And my suggestion is, and my concluding point, is that an emerging issue, hopefully, that we can take up in a sharper and more focused way at Cairo is finding a better -- developing a better understanding and a way of integrating the focus on children's rights to the same degrees of privacy and freedom of expression and so on into the broader agenda that the IGF is properly concerned with.

>>JONATHAN

CHARLES: John, thank you very much, indeed. Yes, perhaps give the microphone to the lady with her hand up.

>>:Sorry. It's Margaret

Moran, I'm a member of Parliament with the U.K. IGF. I want to re-emphasize the point that John made, but also go on to a slightly different point. One of the speakers referred to the fact that some developing countries will jump over the technology. We can see it here in India with the mobile penetration that will soon become broadband penetration. That, I think, is introducing new vulnerabilities -- child protection is the obvious one -- where we have the technology but not necessarily the social policy or protections needed. And it could open new markets, which is a horrible word to use, to make our children vulnerable. And I just think that this is an issue that the IGC needs to look at to see how we can cooperate and support each other to make sure that where those policies and protections are in place, we can help each other. The second point was to pick up on a point that you made, which was to do with media and the information. The wonder of technology is that, of course, we have unmediated media now. I'm a cofounder of something called Women's Parliamentary Radio in the U.K. which is actually a Web-based radio. And it's great, because it means that I don't have to rely on you, the BBC, to translate what I'm doing and my colleagues are doing in parliament to a wider world. Fantastic opportunity. The other side of that is what we saw in -- recently with the terrorist attack here in India, where Twitter was setting the agenda. What does that mean? We haven't touched on any of that at all. And I think there's a really big debate here which the IGF has to seize on.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Margaret an interesting issue. Miriam Nisbet from UNESCO, you have an issue on that. Perhaps get a microphone over here. If you can just tell everyone who you are, Miriam, and then --

>>MIRIAM NISBET: Thank you, Jonathan. I'm Miriam Nisbet. I'm with UNESCO, the communication and information sector. I

wanted to mention, it's not a new issue, it's not necessarily an emerging issue, but it is an issue that picks up on a number of comments that have been made throughout the last several days and this morning as well that I would really like to see a stronger focus on, and that is -- and it comes from the -- one of the action lines, access to information and knowledge from the World Summit on the Information Society. And that is access to public sector information, and particularly access to scientific information. Certainly we can all appreciate the importance of that with regard to climate change, environment, health. But, additionally, it's been recognized, very well established, that access to scientific information, particularly publicly funded information, data that's been produced, is important not only for the public to know about, but it stimulates research and development. It stimulates entrepreneurship and innovation, all of the issues that we've been talking about today. It also, I might add, really picks up on another theme that we've had, which is the multilingualism. What better way to get local content out there and available on all of these issues, but for getting the public sector information out there and available.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Indeed. Lady over there. We'll get you a microphone. Hold on. The microphone is coming to you.

>>:Thank you. Hello. I am Rabia Abdelkrim-Chikh. I am from Algeria and for a long time working in Senegal. The organization, NGO international, name is Environment Development Action. I'm going to try with my little English to summarize two points. I support and I agree with all was what said this morning and other session. But I have a big frustration, because I want to ask us, how is it possible for us to talk about governance of Internet without linking with the conjuncture right now. Why the conjuncture? Because the inequalities are becoming structural. Because they are becoming structural, they are now a big obstacle for the small processes we have started in slums, in area completely outside the flow of information. Because this, the situation -- we have to know that the situation is going worse for billion and billion and billion of people. We have to take this as background of the strategies we want to develop. The second point for me, it's not only a concern, is a worry, because, I'm sorry if it is not very polite for all, but I feel that we are producing exactly the same paradigm of balance of power. What do we think about people, the social movements, not all people? Are we thinking that we put Internet, will change the paradigm? If there is no political vision, strategic vision, not political as politics, but vision of a new world, if we don't listen to the majority of people, because they are not blind. They are not stupid. They have visions like us. And all that couldn't have success if we don't try with big effort to have those we are talking about, the last billion. I think that we are missing the part of the reality forces, the changes coming from the financial area, but will have an impact on our life, and, particularly, for the last billion we want to reach. I think that we have to put our visions and will in the reality. In one hand, the forces dominant are always inventing new situation and stopping this big dynamic coming in the 90, 90, for us. I am from Senegal. And the other forces who are

silent, because we have not given attention to them, to the capacity to give vision for governance of Internet. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES:

All right. Thank you very much. That's structural inequality. Interesting point. Ian Peter, what do you think, is it becoming structural?

>>IAN PETER: You think, it's something that having reflected on what was just said, I wish I had spoken about more in my introduction as one of the realities that will still be there in 2028. I think there is structural inequality. I think there are issues to look at here. I think the Internet as a tool for development helps to overcome that. There are issues that need to be overcome that are outside of the constraints of what we can do within the field of Internet and Internet governance. But I do believe we can make a meaningful contribution to that. And I hear what was said. Thank you. And I should say that these are issues that are very much raised with the Internet Governance Caucus. and people who wish to sort of involve themselves in that, it's IGcaucus.org. And we would love to have the voices. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Just very briefly, that was something you touched on, actually, in your opening remarks in a way, wasn't it, the inequality?

>>S.V. RAGHAVAN: The whole subject comes under what is called inclusive growth. The "inclusive" can refer to financial, geography, it can be literate levels, it could be cultural. All those are under "inclusive growth." Whatever policy directives that one attempts or suggestions to policy directors one attempts have to keep all these factors in mind. Because the difference in perceptions and difference in abilities will continue to exist. If the five fingers are not like this, we can't grab anything. If you want to grab growth opportunity, they have to be like this. Then only you can do the moving forward action. So I think the basic idea is to define things which are inclusive in nature. That will be my reaction personally.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much. More questions from you? Put up your hands, and we'll get you a microphone. David. David Wood from WBU, EBU. Let's get you a microphone somewhere.

>>:Hello. David

Wood from the World Broadcasting Unions. We began this week looking at the five and a half billion people who don't have access to Internet and asking how we can move to a situation where a lot more of them do access it. And part of the hypothesis is that by providing them with Internet access, we can help them with their material well-being and their life. I guess I just have a feeling in the back of my mind that things are not so simple as that. I think if you look what's happened in the last few months, you see how very important, actually, financial infrastructure is in all societies, in the west and the east. So I suspect that rather than having a circumstance whereby you bring

Internet and that helps, as it were, to add financial infrastructure, you might have to add the financial infrastructure first. So it may be that it's not a simple matter of just talking about access. The real -- the overriding, the umbrella issue is how we can improve the financial infrastructure, the availability of credit, and so on. This is something which is done in India, but in many other parts of the developing world, not so. I just have a hypothesis, Jonathan, that we shouldn't forget, that financial infrastructure, credit arrangements and so on are absolutely fundamental to all societies. And without them, it may not be possible to bring Internet to those next five and a half billion people.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: David, thank you very much, indeed. I have to say, I'm an economist by training, and I come from that background. And I think that's a big issue.

>>S.V. RAGHAVAN: Quick intervention. You must have an economics expert as your prime minister, and the problem will be solved.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: If only it was that simple. All right. Yes, gentleman there. Let's get you a microphone.

>>PETER HELLMONDS: Thank you. Peter Hellmonds from Nokia Siemens Networks. I want to comment on the gentleman who said financial system is very important. It's true. Financial system is important. But, in many parts of the developing world, it's clearly nonexistent. Or it may exist in the capital city and not much farther. And I think what ICTs can do, and the mobile world, which is quite strongly proliferating, even in areas where you don't have a functioning financial system, is allowing micropayment transactions, what we call M-banking. And I think you need to look at that as well as a future way of implementing a financial system in the absence of a banking system, okay? So that's my contribution. Thanks.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much. And we'll take some more comments on this. Because in the end, what have we seen over the past decade of the Internet development? We've seen banks willing to back what were often, on the surface, quite marginal projects in the hope that they would come good, and they could afford to do that. And I suspect those are exactly the sort of projects that have boosted the Internet over the past decade that are going to find it very difficult now. Every banking gamble is a risk. You never know which horse is going to come home. And they have been willing to back a lot of horses to come home and I think that is diminishing. Bertrand.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good morning. Just a brief contribution for the list of issues that could be put on the agenda of next year's IGF, because it's also one of the useful outcomes of this session. First of all, to say that I fully support UNESCO's comment about the item, access to public information and access to scientific information and data. This is very important. The second

thing, Herbert mentioned the notion of convergence. I think we should pay more attention to the policy implications of convergence, including in the different type of tools and devices. And, finally, we are moving from the Internet -- we have moved from the Internet to the Worldwide Web. And when people talk about the Internet, they mostly mean the Worldwide Web today. The emergence of social networks is actually bringing us to the next stage, where we have the Internet as an infrastructure, the Worldwide Web as the connectivity of databases, and the social net, which is the interconnection of groups. And the convergence between groups and feeds, like Twitter, that sort of thing, is bringing the social net. I want to raise this because there is an issue that could be formulated as the governance, slash, social net interaction, which means governance of the social net. We had a few items about child porn. And there is IPR questions and so on. There's the governance within the social net. What are the rights of the members of the social network when you have 100 million? And how are those rules established? Like the right to retrieve your data. And, third, which is something very interesting for the forum itself, is governance through the social networks. How can the social networking tools help things like the Internet Governance Forum work better, exchange and interrelate between the different forums that are emerging to deal with those issues? So --

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much, indeed. Don't worry, you'll get your chance. The lady there has been waiting. We'll get you a microphone.

>>:My name is Jayalakshmi. I work with an NGO called Center for Science Development and Media Studies in India. And my concern is to see more active consultation in the next IGF on three areas. One is trying to define what the commons are for the public. And when I mean that, when there is Internet, when there is infrastructure available, what is the kind of content that becomes accessible to the community that is useful for them to bettering their lives. So that's the first area we think that there should be more consultation, more discussions. The second area where I would like to see more engagement is looking at the accessibility question, the people with different abilities and the way they are not very consciously part of this -- I mean, they're not able to be part of this governance space, although they are -- there are technologies, there are tools to try and bring them on board. But I think there is more discussion required on that subject. The third area that I would like to see more engagement and discussions is about the local communities being creators of knowledge. Today, many of the users of the Internet are actually receivers of knowledge. But there is a lot of knowledge that comes in. And I agree that there is the space that has been created through social networks. But it's important to see how we can enable communities, who are the next billion or the next billions, to become contributors of the knowledge within the Internet. So it's the access to the knowledge and contribution to knowledge that will redefine, perhaps, how Internet governance will be structured in the future years. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much.

I'm aware of other people who want to speak. We'll get to you in just a second. Let's have a quick reminder of other things that we've discussed here at the IGF in the hope that it will spur some more debate. Stephen, I think, you can tell us about data where we concentrated on, cybersecurity, openness, privacy, these issues.

>>STEPHEN LAU: Thank you, Jonathan. I think we just now had some very good intervention which actually cut across or actually go beyond the first day, which was to do with multilingualism as well as access. But, however, keep them coming, because all issues are interrelated. And just an appeal to you is that in focusing on a certain issue which is of importance to you, and therefore for this forum, I think that there are enough experts in the IGF, and the stakeholder, a lot of these issues are keenly being aware of. I hope that when you bring the issue, if possible, bring some measures, suggestions, action that could bring us further down this road towards the stakeholders' discussion in IGF. Now, with that sort of supplement, let me just talk about the second day to provide further stimulus in terms of your participation and your suggestions. The second days was dealing with promoting cybersecurity and trust. And in a session on mapping issues and our current capabilities, we talked about dimensions of cybersecurity and cybercrime. We were reminded that innovation by cybercriminals is increasing. And with the Internet not originally designed with security in mind, so we need to prepare and really be prepared, you know, for maybe worse or for the worst. And we did talk about cybercrime, the different types of cybercrime, like the traditional -- not traditional, but usual, like money laundering, prostitution, child pornography. Then we have new or newer forms of cybercrimes, like hacking, DDOS attack, denial of service, critical infrastructure threats. And we move on to the increasing use or the more noticeable use by terrorism using the Internet for propaganda, fund-raising, recruiting, launching threats and coordinating and logistics. Obviously, the community, it was pointed out, has fought back with cybersecurity networks, SIRTs, we call them, security incident reporting teams, at various level, corporate level, national level, regional level, coordinate and exchange information. But these efforts, as pointed out have their challenges. Noticeably, the crime scene is unlike traditional. Is geographically and global spread, exacerbated with over 200 countries connecting to Internet. Technological advances also create further complexity, by the elusiveness and location of IP addresses. Many legal problems, as well. Jurisdictional, extradition, different legal laws, and provisions. And there's also the emergence of cyber havens as per tax havens. I think that the initial community should somehow take a grip of what constitutes cyber havens. How could it come about? Why they are perceived as such? And to be able to do something about cyber havens. And also, with so many CERTs, you know, now, as I said, regional, global, national, and regional and corporate. And there was this interesting issue about like the Ghostbusters. In times of emergency, which one to call. The experts are also keenly aware and painfully aware of the complexity of the problem of locating crime scenes and so on and so forth. And demands coordination in a labyrinth of legal maneuvers. So a lot of discussion for how long to provide for such complexity and reduce it to more simple form. There's

also an issue pointed out, observation, on developing economies, the creation of deterrence and SIRT in themselves pose problems because of cost, lack of talent, and also lack of awareness. So therefore it is welcome that the ITU has created the Global Cybersecurity Agenda, which is familiar to most of you, establishing a global expert group of stakeholders on a way forward. Five pillars working on: Legal measures, technical and procedural measures, organizational structures, capacity building, and international cooperation. A lot of talk, discussion, has ensued. Now it's moving on to action. And the primary project as a global common cause, the protection of children. And I think this is laudable. And the question now to you is, you might like to consider, which cybercrime should be a suitable one for the next focus of attention? In discussing the session on fostering security and openness, there was a strong focus on child protection with the following risks, content, contact by predators and harassment. Harassment, commercial offers, or children's addiction to surfing on the Internet in exclusion to other activities which was viewed as a negative influence and also privacy as well, whether you have true consent in terms of data acquisition. One very interesting, particularly to me -- I just want to mention, this is sort of my personal synthesis and distillation. So if I have certain omissions, please excuse me; all right? And I'm sure you can bring them up just to ensure we have full coverage. The issue of cybersecurity for ensuring women's rights. In particular, sexual rights of women, in a critical space where their well-being, respect, freedom of discrimination and fear should be protected. Internet should provide a secure platform where the access to sensitive information -- for example, safe sex, abortion erotica, sexual well-being, et cetera, sexual preferences -- should be kept private. So how can we do better to improve this aspect? Privacy and personal data protection is another serious issue. With new forms of Internet usage, social networking, profiling, identity theft, pervasive application, like RFID, intrusive application like body implants, for positioning and tracking. It was referred by Professor Rodotà as the digital tsunami. So obviously there is tension between security and protection and privacy, though the two could be optimized through interoperability. I think it's a new term for such optimization that's introduced by my colleague, Joseph Alhadeff from Oracle. And Assistant Director General from UNESCO Mr. Abdul Waheed Khan, went a step further to seek for synergistical convergence of openness, privacy and security, and reminded us as well that accountability accompanies the source of the flow of information. And just a few more points about the open dialogue on cybersecurity and trust. The business organization is reminded, as well as, in turn, organization also assure that they would protect the privacy, data privacy, for their employees, for their customers, because it not only is a matter of protection of rights of individual or compliance with law; also be viewed as a business imperative, a differentiation and competitive advantage. There was a good discussion on who is responsible or accountable to tackle cybercrime. Some argue that it should be the person who is aware of the danger should be the one responsible. Some argue it should be the government that we're dealing with. As we are dealing with law enforcement issues, some argued it's a collective responsibility for the multistakeholders with everybody having a role to play. (saying name) also pointed out that cybercrime

should include not just those commonly perceived. The suppression of information flow and freedom of expression and the suppression of sexual preferences and treating them as crime should be regarded and considered as cybercrime. The final two points is a colleague from Microsoft emphasizing that balancing cybersecurity, openness and privacy should not be a zero sum game. Technology and other measures could be used to provide optimization, like authentication for anonymity with identification, and also the provision of choice in our dealings in the cyber world. A sober reminder that a tension between security and privacy is not just about security and rights, but security and responsibilities. The example in the developing economies is a lack of awareness or lack of resources rights. Rights sometimes cannot be exercised. And finally there was an interesting intervention that international Web sites dealing with adult contents deemed pornographic, while making millions in profits, have caused big expenses and costs in other countries that have to provide filters to shut off access by the citizens. I hope my summary of the second day on cybersecurity and trust provide another further stimuli to stimulate further discussion.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Stephen, thank you very much.

We will come back to you just a second. First of all, I think the chairman wants to make a comment.

>>S.V. RAGHAVAN: See, when we talk

about ICT, information communication technologies which go on the Internet, we hear a lot of possibilities, experiences, and a lot of desire for social change. These are the three heads under which lots of articulations can broadly be classified. If you look at directing them in some way, the governance can have three basic connotations. One, a technology governance, content governance, and behavior governance. Like, for example, when he summarized about security, privacy, and responsibility, it comes under behavior governance. So technology governance, content governance, and behavior governance need to have high-level articulation, and they will, in some sense, will be domain specific, culture specific, what is allowed in one may not be allowed in another and so on. The results of what we do, it has to be translated and provided in languages, so multi language a technology that's there to stay. The second type of governance which is required which is related to all the three is security and privacy related governance. There has to be global understanding on what one means by terminology associated with security or privacy. One simple example is health record. I have been asking my medical friends and also the secretaries in the ministry of health to whom does the health record belong. Is it belonging to the patient? Is it belonging to the doctor or the hospital or the insurance company or the laboratory which does the test? It's unclear. Or the service provider who holds it. We don't know. It's unclear to whom does it belong. An international understanding on whose health record is held by whom, and then all technologies about opening up specifically for one doctor and another will come into play. In insurance we have the term called second opinion. Here is a health record which is in public domain more or less. Everybody sees this public record other than me in the hospital. Where is the question of second opinion? It is only relate to go the

monetary transaction and nothing else. Whereas it has to relate to my health record and my well-being and my interest in it. So these kinds of issues I'm sure, in other areas, there are related issues which talk about ownership establishment which also leads to privacy of information. This is one articulation of governance. It requires international understanding. More and more that we do, this practice of ICT in the large, what is happening is the entire infrastructure, whether it is technology or content or practice, the business practice, the whole thing is becoming a critical infrastructure for the stakeholders. That critical infrastructure protection, if you type CIP in the Google or Yahoo!, whatever, search engines today, it will first take you to the U.S. articulation of critical infrastructure protection and President's Advisory Committee's recommendations and so on. These are the order it is coming up. I have been watching for the last one year whether there is any change. This is in some sense an understanding of what is a critical infrastructure. They talk about a physical infrastructure. There are also other content infrastructure. They are all becoming part and parcel of your life. The entire health information system is part of a critical infrastructure. Any innovation into that is a serious problem to the stakeholders. So how do we govern? What rules will govern that? How do we articulate that? How do we make a position paper, worldwide, after consultation, can be an issue. If you look at security and privacy and technology terms, universal ID, authentication, and access to information in a specific form is going to be the sequence of flow. But if you take ID by itself, I don't know how many nations have multi-purpose national ID cards, and how many international multi-purpose ID cards are available, whether it is required or not and how an understanding can be reached. And how across sovereignty, across administration, authentication can be done. There are technologies available. When you talk about governance, it also talks about the understanding, appreciation, and business ability to carry on day-to-day work. In practicing those technologies, tools will come into picture. I'm sure the elite audience will be able to reflect on this. Once you do all these things, logs are created and information has to be extracted for evidence purposes, has to go to courts of law. So what will that mean? What route will it follow? There is no federated information infrastructure which can compose evidence which are digital in nature assuming all the digital evidences are structured in their format. There are many which are unstructured. They have to be collated. So that's another serious issue where governance makes sense. And of course the ownership, like I gave you the example of health record. These are some of the governance issues which are the emerging issues, when you talk about technologies, possibilities, experiences, and social change. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN

CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, thank you. And Stephen.

>>STEPHEN LAU: I

wanted to make a minor observation from what the chairman said, just a small point. The chairman talked about the ownership of who owns the medical data. Is it the patient? Insurance company? The doctor? The clinic? And all that. Let me say that -- and obviously we can debate afterward, whatever. As a former privacy commissioner, to me, the

answer is short and sharp and unconditional. Medical data, being so sensitive to one's well-being and so private, ownership must be the person, the patient. All the rest, whether it is an insurance company, it's a clinic, a doctor, whatever, they are just the custodian of your data. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Stephen, thank you very much, indeed. Okay. Lots of hands and lots of people have been waiting. Let's start here, a gentleman. We will get you a microphone. Can we bring a microphone down to this gentleman here. If you could say who you are.

>> Yes, I am Guru from I.T. for Change. It's an NGO in India. The gentlemen previous spoke in a previous intervention about inclusion being a key issue and emerging issue as well. He was only quoting the Geneva WSIS Declaration of Principles which is actually the goal of IGF, to build an inclusive, people-centered information society. I want to say from an emerging point of view, when we talked over the first hundred thousand people on the new Internet, the first million, first hundred million, there was a particular way the Internet grew. And the challenges that the growing Internet faced were of a different nature. You know, we had the Moore's law. Because of connectivity, kept coming down, technical advances, make sure that more and more people could get connected faster and faster. I suspect that as we go along and as we are looking at the remaining six billion and looking at the more and more marginalized and poorer sections of society, it is not going to be the technical issues that are going to be the key problem. It is going to be the socio-political issues that are the issues. And I'll take a (inaudible) to the (inaudible) dedication which also the U.N. conference worked on, the 1990 Education for All. And when they said Education for All, they were very clear that it's not the technical part of setting up a school that's at issue. It's how do you get children of poor families, whose parents are working, who are belonging to families that have been exploited for generations who coming in. So I suspect when you are looking in Cairo -- and I suspect the fact that the IGF is happening in Hyderabad this year, Rio last year, Cairo next year, is the global community saying that development and the needs of the last billion are very critical. I think the power of education is very clear. To reach education for the last million or last billion, in India it's not enough for the schools to be set up by the government, but India for example has a free meal program because they know children won't get meals at home. The textbooks are given free to the children who are poor, free uniforms. There is a very strong public policy, public investment that is happening in education to make sure everyone is part of the education process. And Article 26 of the universal -- United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, the 60th anniversary of which we will celebrate next week, very clearly says it's a fundamental right. So if you are looking at an inclusive society where everybody is connected to the net, I hope in Cairo and over the period of the next one year, we are looking at crucial socio-political issues that come into connectivity, what public policy, what all of us in a multistakeholder environment can work together to achieve that.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: For the sake of clarity, you think there's an element of social engineering required here.

>> Absolutely.

It's a developmental issue. And I think the gentleman spoke about social change. That has to come to the front of the agenda because the challenges are going to be socio-political in nature and not only political.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much. Two gentlemen have been waiting over here for a long time. First gentleman in the dark jacket. We will get you a microphone. Brown jacket. Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I think it should be working. Hold on.

>>JEAN-JACQUES
SUBRENAT: Hello. Yes.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: If you could say who you are.

>>JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Jean-Jacques Subrenat, now a member of civil society but also a member of the board of ICANN. Speaking here in a private capacity. I would like to make a proposal. I submit to this forum for transmittal to the next IGF, if this forum thinks it's worthwhile, a proposal for a movement, or perhaps a sort of international initiative which could be called ILFP, Internet Liberties and Freedom from Predation, or predatory practices. Among all the things mentioned I would like to take up something Mr. Stephen Lau mentioned in the second day, in the morning. He put a very valid question, and I'm not confident that the proper answer, complete answer was given to him. Mr. Lau asked specifically, in combating predatory or cybercrime practices, what is the weakest link in combating this. I remember that. I'm not sure you got the answer. So I would like to take an analogy from public policy and from multi-lateral experience to submit to you, Mr. Lau. Say, for instance, disarmament policy. It is only efficient if three conditions are met. First of all, that it is inclusive. That means that people sign up that are really members and parties to that. The second is that the regime or the process has to be verifiable throughout the chain. And the third element is that it must be subject to sanctions. And that is often the breaking point or the weak point. Now, I would suggest that because the things we are talking about, especially cyber criminality, is taking up a huge amount of resources. For instance, someone mentioned that Spam accounts for about 80% of traffic today. That isn't tolerable, especially in the context that Jonathan Charles was mentioning earlier today, which is a crisis. It's a crisis not only for the financial institutions. Underlying that is a much deeper crisis of resources, energy, et cetera. So I think it is all the more our duty to address that in the larger picture of resources and economy. Now, to be practical, I would suggest that if such a proposal were to be taken up in Cairo next year, it would have to look at the following points. The idea is to -- or would be to create or to suggest some sort of overall global code of conduct. Pieces exist. In fact, very good pieces exist, whether from UNESCO, Council of Europe, the ongoing work in ITU is very valid. But

I think that each of these has a great contribution, but perhaps not yet the global contribution. ITU, for instance, is government centered, understandably. So is UNESCO, et cetera. Council of Europe, I heard some remarks from friends from other continents that, yes, of course, but we're not Europeans. So in a way, they don't entirely subscribe not to the ideas but to the fact that it has a label which says Council of Europe. So we have to get over that. I think the idea would be to establish, and where else than IGF, a platform of agreed principles which could be subscribed to on a voluntary basis, not only by governments but also by industrial groups, by NGOs, by representatives of civil society, et cetera. Now, I come back to -- And that's my last point -- the problem of sanctions. As I mentioned in my answer to Mr. Lau, the weak point is generally sanctions which are non-operative. I think the great thing about Internet is that it is shifting the notion of responsibility, but also the notion of influence away from government only to the global view. And the public view, the public perception is an element of reputation and influence. So I would suggest that for lack of a proper system of sanctions in the system I am suggesting, we should have a system of score board where there would be a sort of rating which could be submitted to the public appraisal. Because ultimately, I believe that now we are in a world not only of sanctions, because influence is more through example than through force.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much, indeed. And before we come to the gentleman next to you to ask his question, the Council of Europe were very active, obviously, as you mentioned in coming up with a variety of policy responses to these issues. And they can't be here sadly, today, the Council of Europe because they decided not to come because they have sent us a video contribution. Jan (saying name) is the director of the Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs of the Council of Europe, and this is what he sent to this conference. We can see it now. (Video):

>> The Internet is a resource for freedom of expression and for the right to seek and impart information and ideas, regardless of frontiers. Access to it is essential for our everyday, professional and private lives. Without it, we are in a way homeless and senseless to many things around us. So much so that we are now hearing cause for a right to the Internet. Access has become a necessity rather than a luxury. Wednesday, December 3rd, the Council of Europe deputy Secretary-General launched an idea for a new multilateral treaty on certain minimum principles and states undertakings including positive obligations to ensure the ongoing functioning of the Internet. This idea was also raised in respect of critical Internet resources in an IGF workshop earlier this week. It is also reflected in Spain's priorities as the new chair of committee of ministers of the Council of Europe. The sense of the deputy Secretary-General's idea is that despite the ownership and the control of the machinery which brings us the Internet, there is a need for states to assure shared responsibility for the functioning of the Internet. This is to ensure, for example, that malicious acts within the jurisdictional territory cannot block or significantly impede Internet access to or within fellow members of the international

community. A new treaty would promote solidarity and cooperation between states, to improve the quality of life and general well-being of all citizens. It will also underline the public value of the Internet beyond commercial interests, in full respect of international law, including human rights law. In conclusion, access to the Internet and the security, privacy, and openness of the Internet are a shared responsibility. Signing up to a new multilateral treaty which ensures the functioning of the Internet would be of fundamental importance to keep the Internet open and free in the interest of ours and future generations.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Jan (saying name) from the Council of Europe. I see lots of hands over there. Let me deal with the gentleman waiting over here first of all to ask his question.

>>CARLOS

ALFONSO: Thank you, Carlos Alfonso from Brazil. I would like to comment on two basic issues. One of them I think is an old issue already on the Internet, which is the overselling of upstream bandwidth to downstream users. And it's old and it's present. It's a big problem. But the other problem is that the control of the stream, in which providers of bandwidth, of broadband also, are linked to media interests. And they provide preferential treatment regarding streaming for their service, regarding streaming for other services. And this is increasingly becoming a problem. I think in the future, it will be even more serious. And also, this goes on with controlled interactivity. Internet as we knew it was completely interactive. We could treat ourselves as peers when we were interacting with the Internet. And increasingly, there is a control of this interactivity, and in many cases, Internet is becoming just a broadcaster of multimedia. What is going to lead us in the future? So what is, I hope, some of these questions which relate to net neutrality and the quality of service which is provided will be considered fraud in the future and be treated as any serious white-collar crime. But today, they are not, and we are in the hands of these big providers. And this is a very serious situation which we hope in the future will change for the better, not the worse. The other question is the Internet of things, which will be also the Internet of persons becoming things, like Stefano Rodotà told us, and Professor Lau already described. But Professor Lau already explained it, so I don't need to elaborate.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much, indeed. Let's take some comments over here. Gentleman over here. If we can get a microphone over here.

>>:Tony Vetter from IISD. I just wanted to expand on the issue of cybersecurity, to look at it from the perspective of cyber warfare. I'm just wondering if there's a role for the IGF community to look at the issue of the Internet as a global commons and treat it in a similar way that it has been treated for outer space. The U.N. has declared the space treaty, the militarization of space.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Interesting thought.

Thank you very much, indeed. Gentleman there. We'll get you a microphone. Okay. Gentleman behind you first and then you.

>>:Yes,

(saying name), international federation for information processing. I will speak in French. I'd like to go back to two opposite presentations of (saying names). To some extent, looking at them, you see what was achieved in 2028 or what would be, or, on the one hand, on the contrary, of the I.P. network. So the question is, how can we manage this? What kind of governance will we adopt so that we don't fall incorrectly or badly into the (inaudible). What can we do so that we don't go by the wayside in that direction? So, no doubt, there's a certain amount of political willingness to step up that is necessary. We are all players in this, and we have to realize we're all involved in the policy. So I think if we can agree on this, we need to be given elements of assessment so that we can be sure that certain rights are respected, the right to access. That's been underscored. Right to access to the infrastructure. Right to local content. And that corresponds to people's needs. The right to security, as Mr. Lula underscored. And also bearing in mind perhaps that there are some shared resources -- shared responsibilities with regard to the delegate from Gabon said that it's possible that cybercriminals in the future might end up being in the developing countries. And those countries, developing countries, won't have the means to be able to combat on detect these cybercriminals. So we have to at that point think about sharing resources as well as the responsibility in order to be able to provide for all these rights. So right to security, right to inclusive participation is the last right. I think we're all thinking about multistakeholders, and we're looking at it philosophically, which is very interesting, and it's entirely new. And that's the whole issue of participatory democracy, a deliberative, deliberating participation. So the focus, I would suggest, for our next meeting, might be more in the area of verifying where we are, where do we stand vis-à-vis these rights. And as the former commissioner of the data in Hong Kong will no doubt agree, it's not just about focusing on cybercrime, but we need to focus on what rights need to be protected, what rights need to be guaranteed and ensured. I think these are the positive links of the chain of governance. Many have already been underscored and were underscored in the Rio meeting.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: -- comment there, how do you stop falling into this VI PI network idea.

>>IAN PETER:

Absolutely. And I'm sure Heather will have a thought or two on this one so that we can respond to these scenarios. I think one of the things that -- a lot of the comments I'm hearing from various people in the room around the whole idea of principles rights and the area of principles and rights --

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: (inaudible).

>>IAN

PETER: Yes. In the area of Internet, we've done pretty well in terms

of having structures in place that deal with technical coordination. We haven't done very well in terms of the structures that deal with principles and rights. And I hear the idea of a treaty has come up. We've certainly got a dynamic coalition on principles and rights, and suggestions that this become a major theme next year. And I think this is very important that we find a way to do this, and then we find the way to, having placed some sort of -- be with a statement of principles or whatever, we have some new initiatives in this area, such as the global network initiative, where a lot of the businesses have started to come up with some common principles. That's important, as one response. But overall, on a multistakeholder basis, I think the whole idea of coming up with some common principles and rights is important. I think the other thing that's important to avoid the disaster scenarios is that we start to, as we look at Internet governance in the Internet Governance Forum, look at the issues which are beyond technical coordination. We tend to focus on those areas. So let's look at the issues beyond technical coordination, which it does include these principles and rights. And what do we need? Is this industry self-regulation? Or what is it? But we need something. There's obviously big gaps here that need to be addressed. But at the same time, in the areas where we have technical coordination, we need to look at what are the policy implications of this. It's almost a no-no within business for technical to make decisions without business involvement and without looking at, you know, the implications of this. So what are the policy implications around what we're doing? So I think there's a few areas to address. So we need to find the way to link policy and public policy into technical-only coordination. But we also need to look at how we deal with these whole issues of principles and rights as the Internet goes forward so that we do get these common agreements in place. And then I hope we can avoid -- I won't call it your scenario, but the one that you described.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES:

Heather, maybe you want to say a few words on that.

>>HEATHER CREECH:

Yes. Just quickly, I'd like to pick up a little bit on some of the very early comments around the need for access to scientific information. I'm struck by the difference between the protection issues, protection of personal information, but the absolute requirement to have full public access by everyone to environmental information. And we need somehow or other in constructing a sense of principles and rights and responsibilities that responsibility to make information about our environment, about our resources available to everyone, that we really need to look at these issues in the larger context of how we're managing the world in general.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES:

And, Herbert, just -- obviously, you've been listening to us. From the commercial point of view, what are your thoughts that you're formulating after what you've heard?

>>HERBERT HEITMANN: Very

briefly, I think in business we have a tendency not to fix what is not

broken. So I would recommend that we work on what works and what's existing. And there are things like the U.N. global compact which has been put in place many years ago. And I think it's a tremendous example of success. And I would encourage all participants here and others to look at this and see how this can be used to address the problems that we are hearing and that are real and serious but not invent new approaches without having seriously explored the existing ones and their effectiveness.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: All right, Herbert.

Thank you very much, indeed. Gentleman with the microphone. Have you got a microphone? We'll bring you one, if not.

>>:Hello. I'm (saying name) Patel, commissioner with government of India with the Department of Customs. Now, I want to make one observation. When we are looking for ten years ahead in future, to learn the lessons, we need to look back what we learned from ten years back down the line, what we learned from the past experiences last ten years. What I have observed is, I had net access for last ten years now. What I observed is that the lack of specificity, lack of qualification, lack of definition in the precise qualified terms which establishes the rights, liabilities, and responsibilities on various multiple multistakeholders, let us say in ten years back, we never had terms like attack or phishing, we never had words like this thing. Now we are negotiating a treaty like cybercrime treaty. Do we have any definition of what is cybercrime? So unless we have a precise, qualified definition and a precise term in whatever authority it may be, international consensus or national authority, whatever treaty or whatever you are going to be using, let's -- for example, I will tell you one thing. In WCT, WIPO, there is no definition for the technical protection measures, TPM. And since there is no definition of TPM in the first place, we -- all these two conventions, WCT and WPP, these almost fail at ground level. Any person with a copyright will know this thing. At the ground level come to the (inaudible) right level is almost like a failure. Because if we never define in the first place what we mean by technical protection measures. So in the future also, when we define, any forum, (inaudible) we define what exactly in specific terms qualifies in (inaudible) or law. So when you establish this right in talking in a vacuum, it leads nowhere. Qualify, first thing. In the coming ten years, in Cairo, next IGF, or whatever meeting you are meeting, first qualify whatever the terms used which establishes right, liabilities, credibility. This is one part. Now, coming to the second part, what are the challenges before us? Now, the generations, we are not -- by the time we are 20 years, will be in old age homes or maybe in our graves. But last night I was watching -- I have a son, eight-year-old son. He was watching TV on geography, hatching process for an extremely poisonous snake in Arizona and America. And he was asking me, after watching the program, he was asking me a question, he is an eight-year-old son, he was asking me a question that why chicks come so quickly out of eggs and why snakes take so long time to come out of egg. So I tried to answer him that chicks have two legs, so they just jump out, okay. Snakes don't have legs. He has to roll out slowly. But the point is that he was not able to understand. He said, "No. What are the babies? What are the

babies? They should take same time to come out of the respective eggs." So these are the kind of challenges, these are the kind of generations which we are facing in the next period of the Internet in another ten or 20 years down the line. So we need to have that kind of content or that kind of technologies who can satisfy the children who are now eight years, ten years or kids like that.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES:

Just clarify on your first point, when you talk about codification, under what jurisdiction would you imagine it taking place? How do you see jurisdiction in this?

>>:That's not easy. When you talk about jurisdiction, jurisdiction is artificial term. Before that, you have to look at the sovereignty. What is meant, sovereignty? When you say France, what is meant by France? Or when I say India, what is meant by India? Is it a geographical boundary or international boundary? Or a culture? Or a people? Or a state? Or a government? Or individuals? So what exactly mean by it? So first, when you ask a question about the jurisdiction, jurisdiction is artificial concept. It can be (inaudible) also. By law, Indian Penal Code provides provision for extraterritorial jurisdiction. So jurisdiction, let us say not rely on jurisdiction. Jurisdiction is an artificial term. It doesn't -- no value (inaudible). So first talk about sovereignty. Okay. So that is what I want to say.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much, indeed. Let's address gender balance. The lady has been very patient over there. If you could say who you are.

>>:Thank you very much for giving the word to a woman. I just want to follow up with -- pick up on Jan's last comment and follow up on Dr. Rodotá's comments about the rights of privacy in digital world. I just want to make sure that it's important the need to discuss the organization, the data protection legislation based in those international standards that already exist, and act respectful of the rule of law that are based in democratic institutions, and that least, but not last, that are respectful of -- last, but not least, that are respectful for fundamental human rights. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much, indeed. More hands? Gentleman here would like to say something. We'll give you the microphone.

>>:My name is (saying name) Sonare. I am representing Ambedkar Center for Justice and Peace, a global Internet organization specifically focusing on India. My question is, we are talking about the next billion. But most of the people of the next billion are in India. Total population of India is more than a billion. And 81.4% of people of India, they live in the countryside, they live in the villages. It means about 850 million people that are in the villages, that are in the countryside. And it does not exist today Internet. It does not exist. And of these 850 million people, about 250 million,

they come from the untouchables, and the tribals, they are so poor and marginalized and neglected, and their earning is less than a dollar. And for the UNDP 2005 report, India had 44% of population who is earning below a dollar, below a dollar, not even 50 rupees. So how a person, a family earning 50 rupees or a dollar spends half a dollar or rupees on Internet cyber café. So the question is about basic fundamental rights. We have been demanding since 2005, our organization participated in Tunis in 2005, so we wanted that all the countries should make a law that all the citizens, whether it is -- their citizens are poor or rich, irrespective of their income source, it should become the fundamental right. Otherwise, it will become the property, Internet will become the property of only the few people, the rich people. If it is the case as in today in India, it is today a luxury. If anybody says the Internet is called in this manner, a (inaudible) it should not become. And this forum is a very great forum, Internet Governance Forum, and we are proud to be part of this forum. So these 850 million people, they also constitute about 120 million child labor and 60 million bonded labor. With all these people, they are also the citizens of this world. So they should also have the right to the Internet and accessibility. So IGF 2003 and next IGF in Cairo, they have focus on this accessibility and at the same time affordability. It is not only accessible. Somewhere the Internet may be accessible, but people are so poor they are not able to afford it. So we should find out some way of how these poor people have the accessibility, they are able to make use of it. So this is my question. And thank you very much.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: A fundamental right,
Mr. Chairman, I suspect you've spent a lot of time thinking about this.

>>S.V. RAGHAVAN: I did talk about inclusive growth, financial, geography, literal, and cultural sense. I also mentioned in my opening remark that our study shows it costs only one cent, American cent -- maybe it's about -- less than a rupee -- to connect at a gigabit rate every hut in every village. That's the study. There is a political will that's required, administrative will, NGOs, companies, finance, research, entrepreneurs, philanthropists, to come together to make it happen. Technology is in the pocket. That's only 5%. The rest is to make it happen, 95%. There are several factors in the society which contribute towards any benefit that is found by humanity to reach every part of that humanity. More of that governance. We have been talking about principles, rights, accountability, responsibility, and fixing liability. These are issues that have to be very precisely, succinctly defined. Because all these things are -- tomorrow, somebody has to dispute and resolve the dispute in a court of law. Everything has to be precisely defined. And these have to be within the administrative domains of sovereignty of nations or whatever. I agree with the gentleman, "jurisdiction" is an artificial term, like company is an artificial entity. You create it; you can destroy it. In all these, what we missed out in the discussion, in my personal opinion, is information assurance. How do I know what information I am seeing on the Internet is correct information? Who is endorsing it? I believe that it is correct information. So there has to be credibility rating

that is accepted across the world which can be associated. We have just taken the baby step in that direction, saying that I go to the Web site, I look at it. Because I see Verisign certified. So I can also cut and paste that in my Web site and say Verisign certified. When I have Internet, most often the browser says "not recommended," blah, blah, blah. And I click on it and go ahead. Not on a single occasion I stop to observe what is normally considered necessary in discussions like this. How do I change my behavior? What is information assurance as a subject? It's not security, it's not privacy, it's not protection. Whatever you are seeing is the right information, who is going to say that? Whose responsibility is that? No matter how we design a system of governance, let's say we all come to the conclusion the whole world is saying, "This is the way to do it," all of us agree, 6.5 billion signatures on paper. The whole system should be observable and controllable. Otherwise, it's not a system. And it has to be stable. It has to perform. If it does all of this, my life will depend on it. It has to be reliable. If it is reliable, my life depends on it, it has to be available 24 by seven. So all these will be additional things which one has to worry about. What it takes to get the respective countries and national resolve in respective countries to make it happen, how can a common firm -- I mean, common gathering like this, which is the Internet Governance Forum, can act as a catalyst, can act as a motivator for doing these things? These are the issue worth looking at. I think we are trying to get a system of tomorrow. And that system should be observable and controllable.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Mr. Chairman --

>>S.V. RAGHAVAN: And that requires precise definitions all around.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Yes, indeed. Gentleman there. Get you a microphone.

>>DAVID APPASAMY:

David Appasamy from Sify Technologies. I am really coming off what my fellow Indian said here. He made an impassion plea for those 850 million people and also what our chair had to say just now. Rather than a multilateral kind of agreement, as recommended by the Council of Europe, perhaps it's time for the IGF to think and to reflect and recommend to the U.N. that they add to the declaration of human rights, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that access to Internet should be a human right, and that in future, whenever countries perhaps are rated according to the human development index, access to Internet is a primary part of that. Only then, I think, will there be the political will or the resolve to make it happen. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES:

Thank you very much. I'll take some more of your comments in just a second. I note the gentleman there at the back. But first let's have another synthesis of where we stand the past few days. Stephen, really the third day's discussion was all about the management of critical Internet resources in the Internet.

>>STEPHEN LAU: Definitely.

Before that, let me make a couple of observations. In the open dialogue about privacy and openness and cybersecurity, I actually made intervention about, you know, in looking at the complexity of enforcing and investing, creating cybercrimes, due to the complexity, I said the strength of a system is as strong or as weak as its weakest point. And about this complexity, I was asking, where are the weakest point or where is the weakest point upon which we can focus and upon which we can make remedial measure. I did not include it in my synthesis was because there were so many other significant things I wanted to convey to you or remind you of. And I think -- lack of time, I think I gave myself the courtesy of not including that. But I was so glad that the ICANN colleague who provided, you know, some observation in a personal capacity and for which I thank you. Second observation I want to make before I move on to the third day was, another intervention reminded me about Internet of things. And I remember that in my inaugural lecture as a veteran professor, I did talk about -- my lecture was on privacy and its implication on the Internet of information, meaning where we are now. And then Internet of things, which have to do with RFID and devices hooking up on the Internet and very much emergent scene. And then the Internet of people. Are you talking about implants for locating and tracking of people. And it's interesting, because it led me to remember that, recently, the World Future Society, at its annual or this year's prediction of ten most important or expected predictable technological phenomena within the next ten years, and among one of those was, you and I, everybody in this room, within ten years, will have your own I.P. address. Not devices. You, as a person. Okay. But with those two observations, let me just move on to the -- yesterday was the last day. We had a session on critical Internet resources. The first theme was talking about the transition from IPv4 to IPv6. Now, as I said, this is a personal statement and a personal summary. I understand IPv4 and IPv6 in terms of what is required and all that. It's not my strong suit. And I apologize if I do not give this session justice in my rather short summary. And I'm sure my colleagues from that session and experts in this room will eloquently and knowledgeably express their views on relating emerging issues. Suffice to say that I gather that there are challenges with coexistence of the two protocols, challenges to methods and standards for coexistence, the preservation of investment in IPv4, and the cost to upgrade networks and application services, which for some do not match with the benefits from upgrading to IPv6. In fact, some question what are the benefits of IPv6. But to me and to many also the depletion of IPv4 addresses really offers a vital scenario. When it runs out, you need to move on. And despite assurance from technical experts, there are still apprehensions or possible failures of this technological promises of IPv6. There is also this issue of the black market and legacy space of IPv4 addresses. This is a controversial issue. And also there's respect to how big or how small this legacy space is and whether a transfer market should be resisted or should be allowed. And a very succinct and very relevant observation is that IPv6 is not a technical issue. It's more of a business and a social issue. So, therefore, given the two protocols, offering a pressing issue of time and deadline, your views on emergent issues and how to tackle or minimize such potential problems are

definitely welcome in this session. The second session on the managing critical Internet resources had to do with global and regional and national arrangements. It was a very, very lively discussion. In fact, it focused -- in fact, almost focused straightly on enhanced cooperation. Enhanced cooperation in global Internet governance, as originally proposed in the WSIS Tunis Agenda for the information society which led to the creation of -- one of the major contributing factors that led to the creation of IGF. And we had lively discussion.

We had a panelist from Brazil who gave a good example of enhanced cooperation from the country, particularly on the protection of child -- in terms of child pornography, good examples internationally, ITU and UNESCO, and nongovernmental would be IETF and the W3C. But he did make an observation about ICANN, though not for profit, is a market-driven and revenue, and there's a lot of revenue for domain names, and the fact that it is sort of perceivably under one government, he raised an observation, a concern over that, either it should be no government or should be all governments, all right. And so -- and also mentioned that GAC, the GAC, the Government Advisory Committee, within ICANN is an advisory body and underrepresented by developing economies. And so he raised that sort of concern. The panelist from the U.S. talked about two drivers, the two major drivers for enhanced cooperation. He noted the very uneven distribution of mobile connections in the different continents, and so a lot of work needs to be done there. And the second driver has to do with innovation. And he also gave examples, the ITU as a good example for international enhanced cooperation, that is, on standards, and global cybersecurity agenda with regard to telecommunication. And OECD is on the more kind of economic engine for global -- and also he mentioned about IGF as a good example of enhanced cooperation. The representative from -- the panelist from Latin America talked about the ingredients of enhanced cooperation. Major one would be the technical responsibilities, talk about technical policies, talk about public policy, as well as should be a globally based policy. In the open dialogue, in the open dialogue -- oh, before we end, in open dialogue, Emily Taylor, the eloquent moderator for the session in the synthesis of the session particularly on the enhanced cooperation, to her, there was a different flavor of the meaning of "enhanced cooperation" by the various panelists. And through references and interpretation of different paragraphs and provisions of the WSIS Tunis Agenda, so there seemed to be a gulf or chasm or differences of such interpretation and approach thereof. And she used the term, very interesting one, there seemed to be a parallel universe in action here in terms of the perception and practical implementation. And I think this enhanced cooperation should be and likely to be of continued discussion in IGF. In open dialogue, China, representative from China, echoed Brazil's concern about the governance of ICANN. And on being challenged to the Brazil panelist by the floor, the lack of government involvement in ICANN, lack of involvement from governments in ICANN, the Brazilian panelist leads that better interaction between the ICANN board and the GAC would improve things, that currently there is not enough interaction or relevant interaction, and also inconsistent interaction. There were also remarks that there should be more parliamentarians to come to or attend IGF matters. And also more senior executives, CEO and equal basis should be involved and engaged in IGF. And

parliamentarian from U.K. was concerned the term "enhanced cooperation," because, as a politician, he suspected there's a sense of -- inclination towards institutionalizing, in some ways behind this term, and we could, kind of control government or legislation, or regulation, which, to him, is not an effective tool. Okay. Finally, there are general good comments on the work of IGF. While there are general good comments on the work of IGF, I understand from the intervention there's a letter from 91 individuals and organizations expressing concern that IGF has largely failed to address key public interest and policy issues in global Internet governance, in particular including that of this term "democratic deficit." In dealing in global issues and in most multistakeholder environments, I like to believe that such difference of opinion should not be unexpected. And further exploration of such sentiment and discussion should be part of the ongoing consideration. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Stephen, thank you very much, indeed. We are going to run this session for about another 10 minutes because I know Markus has something after that. Gentleman in the back.

>> Hello, I am (saying name) representing the Internet observatory of Belgium, which is the multistakeholder platform for Internet governance in Belgium. I would like to build upon a few statements that have been made this morning concerning social networking sites, but also the protection of minors on the Internet. In several workshops, we have discussed the difficult triangle, the difficult relationship between security, privacy issues, but also business opportunities of the Internet. And we have discussed the shared responsibility of governments, of businesses, but also of the Internet user. However, this responsibility of the Internet user presupposes knowledge, knowledge about the purposes of the databases wherein personal data are included. This responsibility presupposes also knowledge about the business models that are used in social networking sites, and also other very popular and very interesting ICT applications. We have observed, unfortunately, in our research that there is a lack of transparency of several Web sites concerning their purposes, what they are doing with those personal data. And this transparency is also, in some Web sites, and there has been tremendous good work done by some major Web sites and social networking sites, but maybe a proposal for our next IGF could be to discuss not only legislative initiatives, initiatives of self-regulation, but also technological tools. And maybe discuss the concept of privacy by design. Namely, that you include privacy as a USP, as a unique selling proposition, when you are developing new tools, new interesting platforms on the Internet. So privacy by design in a technological sense, but also by providing information that is understandable for consumers, because a lot of privacy statements on Web sites are written by legal experts for their colleague legal experts, and not for Internet users and not for teens or kids. Finally, I would like also to propose for next IGF discussions, mutli-disciplinary discussions about social networking sites, other popular applications, but also another phenomenon. Namely, the blurring boundaries between entertainment, information, and commercial purposes. For instance, in the context of

online use by teens, the Adver games that are very important and very attractive for teens and sometimes tempting minors to give personal data. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude also for several organizations that have presented their very good work on informing, educating teens in their countries, empowering teens by giving them information about how to deal with certain risks online, and how to make the good decisions, how to make a balance between risks and benefits. So I hope in the next IGF that we will have multi-disciplinary discussions about those topics.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES:

Thank you very much. If you could just pass the microphone to the gentleman they rows in front of you. And if I could ask you to make your point very swiftly because we are running out of time.

>> I'm

sorry, the context of the emerging trend, I would like to say one thing, very specific things. That what we are seeing in the devices that give access to the Internet are already visualized long back, nearly a hundred years before us by mathematical (inaudible), a gentleman from Italy, Neil (saying name). He visualized all these devices: lap desktop, lap hand-top, whatever you want to call it. And he could not design a particular term how to describe. But nearly 100 years before, he visualized such things will come in the future. So when talking about emerging trends, he designed a term like a complex numerical symbi-organisms. He designed a term for this instrument, describing these equipment or devises a complex numerical symbi-organisms. And he said these complex numerical symbi-organisms will come in the future, and he was discussing whether they are living or dead. So maybe there is a case, a strong case to revisit the work of Neil before the next IGF.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Let me stop you there.

We have a few minutes. I would like to give each of you 30 seconds to a minute to sum up what you take away from this. Ian, I ask you to start now.

>>IAN PETER: I have to speak very quickly.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: You do anyway.

>>IAN PETER: Let me come down to two areas of issues that sit for me. One is around a lot of the interventions around the whole area of what might be public policy, principles, and rights where we don't seem to have structures at the moment. There are many suggestions, treaties, a bill of rights, statements of principle, self-regulatory regimes. All of this needs to be discuss. And perhaps that area is the future of this particular forum. I think that needs to be interestingly looked at as we go forward, as the public policy issues as they arise from the nature of the Internet. The only other comment I would make is on the nature of the only mobile as we go forward. Is my mobile in 28 going to be one where I can choose my search engine provider or is it going to be one where my provider tells

me what I can see. Have I got the openness and access that I have got now. Do I have the interoperability across platforms I have now. These are the critical issues for me in that space. And I do look forward to seeing you all in Reykjavik in 2028, and I look forward to the report of the working group on defining enhanced cooperation.

>>JONATHAN

CHARLES: Thank you. Herbert.

>>HERBERT HEITMANN: Thank you very

much. I think it is important and the discussions here this morning show again to really be open and aware of all the multiple issues here.

I haven't sensed a single individual in this whole forum who didn't show appreciation for raising awareness for issues. But I would also like to remind all of us that we wouldn't be where we are with this, do we have the next billion or not yet, but this already enormous amount of billion citizens on this planet to have the access and having the capability without businesses, small ones, medium ones, large and super large ones investing in this. There is no reason not to trust they will continue to do this and therefore drive these kind of developments which all (inaudible) in the right kind of direction.

>>JONATHAN

CHARLES: Heather.

>>HEATHER CREECH: Thank you. I agree with all

that has been said already. Just a couple of thoughts of my own, particularly around the very vibrant discussion around the idea treaties and agreements and so on. In my opening remarks, I talked a little bit about how the IGF with move itself and its influence into other fora. And I am actually more interested in how one strengthens the existing agreements and treaties that we have now rather than going down the road of creating yet another treaty. Many of you may not be aware that we have over 70 multilateral environmental agreements alone.

And the challenge, of course, is not having another treaty. The challenge is making the treaties that we have now work. So that's one of the things that I would put on the table, especially around the area of rights and responsibilities and so on. And the last comment that I would make is just encouraging the IGF as a model in itself rather than being sort of a formal structure, treaty-oriented forum. A forum that's trying to find a new way of networked governance, soft governance to come to agreement outside of some of the traditional silos that we tend to get into when we talk about treaty processes.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Thank you very much. Stephen.

>>STEPHEN LAU:

Okay. I will be very, very short. I pick up two particular points here, or two particular words or focus. One is sustainability. I think for us to reach the next or the last billion, sustainability in terms of access to information, sustainability in terms of respect of the information flow and human dignity. Sustainability in terms of cybersecurity and privacy. And all this sustainability, what it points

toward is how the people use the net. At the end of the day, that's one word: Trust. If you don't have trust, you can forget whatever we said so far in all fora. The final point is people use the word silo. Once again, I like to borrow Emily Taylor's point about parallel universe. If you look at all our stakeholders, multistakeholders, be they academic, be they civil societies, governments, technologies and business entities and all that, they have been parallel universes, but then a portal opens up. That portal is IGF. And that portal is now actually providing increasingly conduit, channels, gateways, upon which these parallel universes are communicating, having dialogue, collaboration. And I like to believe that there will be more gateways to be opened up for further elaboration. Maybe there will be more parallel universes out there. We should be -- then call into it, and hopefully in the foreseeable future in our vision that all these universes would be integrated for the overall interest, in the overall interests of ourselves, our world and humanity. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN

CHARLES: Let me give the final brief thought to our chairman.

>>S.V.

RAGHAVAN: First of all, let me acknowledge and appreciate the fantastic work that IGF is doing, and allowing me to share some of my understanding and the excitement I went through in the last 30 years. In a nutshell, what we are discussing are, as I said earlier, technology and content behavior governance. And we are interested in ensuring that security and privacy in a form is understood and practiced by people. And because it is a critical infrastructure, information infrastructure, protecting it is in the interest of everybody. So we come up with ideas of governance which help you do that. So the process of doing it, we are going to define principles, rights, accountability, responsibility, liability, so on, and create a system. And we should make sure that that system is controllable and observable. Like Heather said, there can be any number of agreements that are signed. Coming from educational institutions, we have 349 Memorandum of Understanding which are signed with sister educational institutions around the world. If you look at what is operating, maybe 10 or 15 of them. And that because of one passionate individual behind each one of them. So we not only create these formalisms and structures. Let's also find passionate individuals everywhere in the world inside every stakeholder -- the government, the NGOs, the business, whatever -- who believe in what we are saying and what we are discussing. And to put it in Lau's words, what we are trying to do with the technology is a business transaction in a trustworthy environment. So trust, technology, transactions is going to be the paradigm for the IGF. So that has to be reiterated. I'll end my remarks with a simple Sanskrit sentence which says, (speaking in language other than English.) Everybody in the world, all. Everybody in the world, let them be very happy. That's all we are looking at. Thank you very much.

>>JONATHAN CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Thank you to our panel, thank you to you. I would like to call on Markus now, who I think has quite a few words he wants to say to you. But thank you very

much for being involved in this session. Markus.

>>MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Jonathan and chairman and all the panelists. We said we'd give half an hour to the reporting of the various initiatives we have, so we have basically ten minutes left, but I have asked to see with the interpreters whether they would kindly do some overtime, maybe add another 15 minutes. I know I have the representative of Switzerland who would like to report on his -- the European initiative on Internet governance. Please come to the microphone. Do you want to come forward and do it from here? The panelists, of course, can go back to their seat and sit comfortably. Tomas.

>> Thank you. Actually, it's not my initiative. The good thing about our initiative is it's not owned by any particular entity. This initiative that I'm talking about is something that emerged in the last few months in Europe. And basically, since Athens, there was discussions whether or not, and if so, how to organize a discussion on Internet governance on European level. But until June 2008, nothing concrete showed up, so that at the ICANN meeting in Paris in 2008, a group of people sitting there having a beer in Paris realized that if we don't do anything, nothing on European level is going to happen this year. And this group of people were a few government representatives, a few business people, a few people from civil society. We set this together. We were calling it something, I forget the name, organizing committee. We were looking for a name for an event, and Wolfgang Kleinwächter had the beautiful idea to call it EuroDIG, European Dialogue on Internet Governance. We decided to fix a date in October and we started the thing without any structure, without any resources. And we were very happy that the Council of Europe offered to give us his premises in Strasbourg at our disposal and join the team very actively in order to make this event possible. We, after the summer break, we developed a program that was based on the points to be discussed in Hyderabad, but we tried to focus on the European perspectives. Not with the aim of having agreed principles or something, but something that would reflect European approaches and also the diversity of the European approaches. In the center of that was the notion of fostering security, privacy and openness on the same time. That means not only go for maximum of security or maximum of openness, but to increase quality of life of which all those three elements are a part of. The interesting thing about this event was that we had three months' time to organize it, and we had no resources, but the thing more or less spread by itself. And when the event was held in October in Strasbourg, we had almost 150 participants. From Spain, up to Iceland down to Turkey, from all stakeholders. And it was a very interactive dialogue. We also tried some new formats. We tried to go even further than the IGF. We were trying to avoid panel discussions and putting the speakers in the public and test whether and how it was possible to have kind of most interactive discussion, with diverse success. The outcome of that event was we wanted to have an outcome in a written form, but we didn't have the time to negotiate. We didn't want to negotiate, so we called this "Messages from Strasbourg." They are available on the Website, eurodig.org, and it's messages that the organizers played the parole of

editors in saying that these are the messages that we have heard. It doesn't mean that these are the only messages. They can even contradict each other. This is the way we tried to come up with something that you can have in your hands. And we also had participation from the European Commission and the European parliament, which also are planning to get more active in this issue. And we have -- there was a meeting at the European parliament in November where people met and decided to go on together and try to do things together the next year to reinforce this European initiative. Thank you.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, TOMAS, short and concise and having no resources ring a bells. Sounds like the IGF itself. The representative of Italy would like to report. Please, would you like to come up here.

>> Thank you, Mr. Kummer. My name is Claudio Lenoci. I am speaking on behalf of the Italian delegation. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the organizers for the fruitful discussion that we had in these days. And after participation to some workshops in the last days, we can say today that we share the positive outlook of this initiative. And we would also further underline the importance, as Internet Governance Forum. We had during some sessions speakers speaking about Internet not as an event but a continuous process. We totally share this vision. We think also the enormous relevance of Internet in opinion of Italian delegation is to put more emphasis and more attention on the principles and the rights of Internet. Someone spoke about principles and the rights of the Internet. And our opinion is that this aspect of governance of the Internet must be underlined in the next months in the future, looking ahead to the next IGF meeting in Cairo. We consider important to have -- and this is also from the discussion in some sessions -- that the problem of principles and the rights that are linked to the principles and the rights of human rights of humanity must be linked more to United Nations' role and to the United Nations', also, effort. And we ask also a major leading responsibility from the United Nations. We want to remind that Italy is strongly committed, as we did in the last two years, to reinforce the process. We had the first dialogue forum in Italy, in Rome, on Internet rights in 2007. We had the second edition also in Cagliari in the Sardinia region some months ago, centered on the aspects of this issue, Internet and principles of rights. As reported during the sessions which participated our representatives, I remember Professor Rodotà, but also other representatives of our delegation, we launched a proposal that is -- all proposal must be agreed by the others. This proposal regards convening of all dynamic coalition in an event that we would organize in Italy -- this is Italian proposition -- to organize in Italy in the next months before the next meeting in Cairo an event with all the dynamic coalitions participating in order to sum up proposals and to express this proposal to the meeting of Cairo. This is -- we would make this in the context of the G8 Italian presidency of next year, during this we will analyze also the problem of how to overcome the digital divide. Italy is presenting in these months before the G8 presidency a special proposal to force the emerging economies, developing countries, for e-governance for development. I

would like to conclude, thank you, Mr. Kummer, for giving me this opportunity at the end of the morning for the fruitful work you carried out. And we wish to consolidate and strongly commit to this process in the future.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there other national, regional initiatives. Yes, you're going to report about the meeting you had in the LAC region in Montevideo last August.

>>:Thank you, Markus.

Good morning. I will give you a short report about our activities in the LAC region, the Latin America, Caribbean region. My name is (saying name) from LACNIC. And we had the meeting in Uruguay, Montevideo, Uruguay, joined with APC from Brazil and LACNIC, with the support of IDRC. And we arranged this meeting, because we talked that we need to involve more the Latin American and Caribbean community into the global Internet governance issues, and on the other side, to contribute with the global discussion from our perspective to this. This meeting was arising following the forum of this meeting, the Internet Governance Forum of Hyderabad. And each panel has four or five speakers, from different sectors, private sector, civil society, and governments. And open mike space, like these discussions. At the end of the day, we had a final panel to summarize the discussion. And the chairs of the panel prepared a summary, a paper to send to the MAG. We had, of course, remote facilities, facilities to allow remote participation, webcasting and chat rooms, live translation on the floor, and a fellowship program to participate. The figures for the meeting, we had 100 attendees, 36 women and 64 men, from 17 countries from our region. Participants from governments, like Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Costa Rica, Panama, Uruguay, Venezuela. ISP associations, private companies, civil society organizations, and other, academic, too. And we hosted some other activity from other organizations, like a talk with the ITU and an ICANN consultation meeting. And from the ECLAC, that is the Latin American organization who follow up the regional Internet society plan, ECLAC. But as the time was short, we decided to organize an online debate during the 8th to 11th of September. And we organized in four days the mailing list to discuss the same panels, the same issues, connecting the next billion, promoting cybersecurity and trust, emerging issues, and Internet critical Internet resources. We have a summary in English and Spanish to facilitate the discussion. And in this case, we have 91 persons who participate. And one-third of them was at the Montevideo meeting, from 14 countries. As a result, I think one of the most important output was the summary paper that was sent to the MAG as an input for discussion to prepare this meeting. The Latin American and Caribbean participation in these issues was increased because we had several people that couldn't attend this meeting. And we are -- during 2009, we will have the next meeting, prepare for the Cairo meeting. Okay. Thank you.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Ernesto. And now the U.K. experience, please.

>>:Thank you very much, indeed. And can I

congratulate you, Markus, on bringing this to the main stage, because I think this is one of the most significant developments that we have seen in the last year, that there are a series of national and multinational engagements which I think is changing the IGF itself from being just the place where things happen to being the place where perhaps things are brought together. And yesterday, I think those of us who participated in the discussion which Bertrand mediated to share experiences I think were all encouraged to hear that so much was happening from several places. Last year, you recall I asked for a commitment space on the Web site so that we can make promises about what we were going to do between that IGF in Rio and this one this year. And I hope we'll follow that practice again so that we share our intentions and the work that's done through the year in preparing for next year event in Cairo. At that stage, we promise to establish the U.K. IGF with the four partners, involving government, involving parliamentarians, involving industry, in particular, and involving civil society. We have done that not so much just as a preparation for coming to the IGF, but now developing strands of work, for instance, the development of a crime reduction partnership, and to put a big emphasis on best practice. The Nominet best practice awards this year were bigger and better and threw more ideas than last year. And I would like to suggest that for next year, we promote the best practice ideas and developments from all participants to a main stage presentation, short ones, videos prepared in advance, so that we can concentrate, then, on discussions, on lessons, on questions and exchanges. But there is so much happening that that sort of exchange, I think, would greatly develop the way in which we use each IGF to share experiences and then take a leap forward. I do think that dealing with best practice, for instance, in our case, parliamentarians became engaged with schools through the Pitcom Awards, are worth sharing. I think we would like to see things that other people have done so that we promote action outside the IGF as well as debating the principles, ideas, and issues that have come up during the course of today's debate so that there is a consistency and a developmental process between principles and practice.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this. Are there any other national or regional experience to be reported? Yes. Adiel, please. The CEO of AfriNIC.

>>ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. I just want to report two initiatives in Africa, briefly. One is the eastern African IGF, which has been set up in Nairobi. And the main objective was to take all of the team of the IGF locally and discuss with the East African community on how to deal with those issues. There is another initiative that took place this year in Dakar, Senegal, in October also for west African country on Internet governance in general and the way forward to IGF. Those two initiatives show that, in the region, people are still feeling that the issue needs to be dealt with regionally. And they have a lot more initiatives that are coming up for '09 to try to address those issues and prepare for 2009 IGF, which will be, actually, in Africa. A few recommendations and few promise has been taken, for instance, in Dakar to involve more policymakers in Internet governance discussion, both in Africa and globally, so that they can

use what they learn globally, like, attending IGF meeting, to solve their problem locally, but also organize more shared experience events in Africa with different countries at different levels can share their best practices, can share how they overcome different issues to put different stakeholders together and address the issues. So in 2009, we are looking for having more regional IGF in all the identified regions, reaches the results of the success of those two events, to have more input and specifically prepare more for the upcoming IGF in Cairo.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, Adiel, I think those are very promising developments in Africa. Is there regional, national, if not, dynamic coalition. Mikes here. We have to be short. I think we don't have much time.

>>:Thank you for giving us the floor. Max Senges for the dynamic coalition on an Internet Bill of Rights. We had two workshops, one about mainstream human rights and the work of the IGF that we used to do a needs analysis. We invited representatives from all the dynamic coalitions to get together, because as you all know, human rights are not divisible and they're all interrelated. So what we heard in that needs analysis was that there is a need for a platform for the different coalitions to exchange information and update each other on what they're doing. So as a result, we invited a representative from each of the dynamics, and the ones that we haven't talked to, please step forward, and we would like to include you there. So we have a special channel to coordinate a little bit and encourage a dialogue between the different coalitions. Then we heard from some of the coalitions that it will be important to find new ways to energize the work of the coalitions. They have not been as dynamic as we would like them to be. So this is something, I think, that would be interesting to talk about, how can the IGF provide more support and enable the dynamic coalitions to be as energetic and dynamic as possible. Then we heard from a representative from the private sector I think an important point, how to frame the contributions and the participation of the private sector and of governments to speak in their own capacity, to speak as representatives, how can that be framed and made more easy to have this multistakeholder dialogue. And we're looking into framing that and developing statements and framing that membership in our coalitions. And then in the second workshop, the yearly open meeting of our dynamic coalitions, we clarified that we are in fact there to enable this dialogue or platform between the different coalitions, to showcase the results and bring together the results of the different coalitions so there is one place to see what human rights actually mean in the context of the Internet. And that is the Internet bill of rights. We also presented our new Web site that hopefully will help to mainstream our work, where we developed a new graphical identity so we can now go out and actually campaign for rights on the Internet and become more of a -- campaigning in that sense. We had Professor Benedict propose some interesting ideas on how to look at the W3C and the IETF and their ways, and having a process to mature documents and actually come up with results that are standardized instruments in the theme of rights and their interpretation and instruments online. We had Chengetai Masango from the secretariat

there to give us the perspective on what is within the mandates of the dynamic coalitions. And we are happy that all our work is within the mandate. And he agreed to help us to connect to other U.N. bodies, in particular, the human rights bodies and entities within the United Nations system, so we can establish a relationship and work towards collaboration with them and report to them or have collaborations with them. So some other results of this year's IGF are that we have a representative from Switzerland who agreed to become a full active participant in our coalition and a representative from France. And we're also talking to other governments and looking forward to have more than. Google joined the coalition and agreed to seriously explore how we can link up to the global network initiative, which is a self-regulating institution that was just created. And, of course, as the representative from Italy already reported, there's an offer to organize the midterm meeting on rights and principles on the Internet in Italy. And we're definitely looking into how we can make that happen. And a representative from UNESCO came up, so we are working with UNESCO to look whether we can make it part of the biannual Genoa conference. And last, but not least, I would also restate, as Peter and the Italian representative has already done, that it would be great if we could have rights and principles a main theme on the next IGF in Egypt. Thank you.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, we have the way forward discussion this afternoon where we can address these issues. Just -- we really have to stop now. Just two short points. All workshops are requested, all dynamic coalition meetings, to file a report, and with it state that when giving -- when allotting slots for meetings next year, only those will be given a slot who have submitted a report. So it will be in your interest, but I think it will be uploaded. And when we produce next year's book, we will have more space. So we will also be able to include reports from the workshops. I think they deserve to be made available to a wider audience. Well, we make that available on the Web. It's basically the usually, say what you are, say what you discussed and who was involved. The last thing I was going to say was, don't forget to make a comment on YouTube. We have a booth in the IGF Village. There's still some time. It doesn't need to be long, 30 seconds. Chengetai had something to say? To stop. Yes. That was the intention. Okay. We meet again at 3:00. Enjoy your lunch, and leave your statement on YouTube. Thank you very much.