Internet Governance Forum
Hyderabad, India
Taking Stock and the Way Forward
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.

>>NITIN DESAI: May I call this meeting to order.
 Thank you very much.
 We are now entering the last session, the last substantive session of the third IGF.
 This is the session where we have to take stock and look forward, the way forward.
 I'm not going to say much in the beginning, just a few words on the logistics. We will have to be fairly disciplined in our use of time, because we have to have a closing session after this. And that's quite important, because that's the session at which we will hear the chairman's assessment of what came out of this meeting and we will hear from the host of the next meeting, in Egypt. And we do need to leave enough time for those two very important contributions to our work.
 So I would urge whoever participants in this panel to take as little time as possible.
 I will leave my remarks for the end, when I will have to try and put something together on what are the views expressed here.
 Let me therefore begin by simply posing three sets of questions.
 The first question that we are to address in this meeting is about this particular session of the IGF itself.
 As I note, IGF in terms of its format and modalities has evolved. And this third IGF had a structure and a format which was significantly different from the past. It was partly -- it was changed to a very large extent in order to give people a greater sense of engagement and involvement. So I would certainly wish to get your assessments of the format, whether you felt that the changes in the format had secured greater engagement and involvement by all of the people present here.
 The second thing is part of the same complex about review of the IGF that I would mention, is that I certainly feel that at the third IGF we have reached a point where we cannot just focus on process; we also have to ask ourselves, what do we take away from this.
 And I would like you to address that question as to whether the structure, the format we have does allow you to get something out of the meeting which you can take away and change the way you operate as a user of the Internet, as a service provider, as a manager of the Internet.
 Again, related to this, the idea of the IGF is not to secure agreement amongst all parties. That's not the intention. This is not a negotiated forum. And it is very much a forum where we have to listen to each other in a spirit of honest debate of a sincere dialogue.
 I would certainly wish to hear from people here as to whether anybody here is going to go away with his or her views modified in some way by what he or she has heard here.
 So this is one complex, the review of the IGF as it has evolved, any reflections that you have that you can take into account for future meeting.

 This brings me to the second question that I would pose. What suggestions you may have for the Egypt meeting, which the Multistakeholder Advisory Group would take on board. There will, of course, be other occasions when you can do this, because we will have the consultations on the agenda for the Egypt meeting later. But I'm sure there are many people here who will not be able to be -- participate fully in those other discussions, which will be held, presumably, in Geneva. So any reflections you have on that would be valuable.
 Finally, one of the things, as was mentioned by -- right at the beginning of this meeting by the UNDESA assistant secretary-general, one of the things that we need to do over 2009 is to do a review of the IGF so that the member states can take a view on its continuation beyond the five years, what we call the review process.
 This will, of course, be discussed extensively in February when the -- when we have open consultations for two days in Geneva, followed by a meeting of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group. And much of the discussions will take place there.
 But I'm sure people here may have reflections, thoughts on this, and we would definitely wish to hear them so that, again, this can be taken on board and into account when we meet in February.
 These are the three sets of questions I would pose.
 To summarize, this IGF, the next IGF, the future of the IGF.
 I'm going to ask the panelists to give quick comments on these topics in the beginning and then open the floor. And then let's take it from that point onwards.
 We have the panel here. And why don't I start from my left and proceed in this direction.
 So first is Mr. George Papadatos.

 >>GEORGE PAPADATOS: Thank you, Mr. Desai. I will try to stay -- I will be very brief and try to stay as close as I can to the points that you have made.
 We all know that the big bang was Tunis. And there, a Heavenly body, according to some, was launched in orbit. And that was the IGF.
 But like all last-minute compromises reached at 3:00 in the morning, we -- there were a lot of gaps regarding the continuation of the existence of the forum. And this is one of the points that will come up in the future.
 What does looking forward mean to me? It means where are we going to be in the next IGF and beyond, what adjustments must be made to this institutional experimentation, and what are the mechanisms of getting there.
 First question, can this multistakeholder body decide its future?
 My answer is, to a large extent, no. And if you look at the mechanisms that will be initiated in the U.N. until it reaches to the General Assembly, there are several filters. And this is something we all have to be very careful. And I think what this body wants should be very well reflected in this process and very accurately. However, I have my doubts about that.
 Second question. On the basis of the first three IGFs, are there any adjustments needed? Even going into the next IGF, the answer is yes. There needs to be more funding to have a viable and predictable IGF. And up until now, I understand that there are only very few contributors. And there aren't any plans in the future for more contributions.
 So this is something that has to be addressed.
 Then part of this question relates to the decision-making process.
 I think that there are some weaknesses in the decision-making processes as far as transmitting what this audience wants to what will transpire in the next IGF.
 So some lessons can be learned from the regional and national IGF processes that can

be adapted to this model here.
 Then we need to bring more governments into participating in this forum. The answer is, if you want some of your ideas to have any bearing on policy decisions, one way of doing it is through governments. And it is my understanding that some governments have lost interest. I also think that parliamentarians should be engaged in the process. They are involved in key committees in parliaments that make legislation and also influence policy.
 As far as next year, I think that we have to adjust agendas. We have to have a good choice of speakers. We have to prepare the session a lot earlier and make it more attractive to everyone.
 Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I now turn to Ravi Shanker.

>>N. RAVI SHANKER: Thank you, sir.
 I would also like to be brief.
 As a process, the IGF needs to have continuity, as well as change.
 We need to analyze what has been done so far and synthesize whatever are the new inputs that need to be factored in.
 I'd like to dwell on the fact that the multistakeholderism needs to be truly reflected, the sense that while we are asking for academic, industry, media, civil society, in addition to the government representation, the last man standing is an aspect which we need to look at.
 Here, it seems to be a little close to look body. I would prefer that there should be the last mile, the last man standing and will update to this discussion fora. The process needs to be broad-based, a little more breadth and depth to the Internet governance. And that way, we would have it truly into the multistakeholder forum which we are having.
 What is needed for Egypt? I think the discussions at the MAG meetings would have to factor in all the inputs that have come during the course of the comments, during the course of the workshop, during the course of several coalitions. If these could be listed into what have been the responses positive and what are the thoughts which are needed for change, I think that gives us a guidepost onto what we need to do.
 A repetition should be avoided. And that is one facet we need to look into.
 I would think that there is a need to build an institutional kept into the whole IGF process. And that is an activity that could be perhaps discussed at greater length during the course of the MAG meetings.
 Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you.
 Can I turn to Mr. Brueggeman.

>>JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Thank you very much. I will also try to keep my remarks brief. But I do want to give a sense of the feedback and impact that I was hearing from some of my business colleagues also about how far we have come and as a way of looking forward and building as we go into Egypt.
 And I think business came into this process maybe with some trepidation, but I think really feels there has been a lot of progress made in developing trust and increasing the level of engagement in the discussions. And I think this building process results from the way that the multistakeholder process is able to incorporate a wide range of views and allow a somewhat bottoms-up discussion that is organic and is changing and

evolving as we go from one IGF to the other.
 So the changes that we see going forward, I think, can build and expand on the success that has really brought us to this point.
 And so a couple of specific feedback and comments that I've heard this week is that people thought the dialogue was very good and that the agenda has -- and the issues that are being discussed, people felt like there has align progress made in refining some of the policy discussions and in building on the discussions that had occurred previously.
 So looking ahead to next year, continue to try and keep the focus on making the agenda relevant and topical. I think, for example, there was discussion of economic -- the global economic issues this year as an example of how the IGF can be very flexible and respond to things that are happening in real time.
 Another point is to continue to increase the interactivity of the conference. Got a lot of positive feedback from my colleagues about the workshops. And some of the workshops allowed for audience participation, direct question and answering. And the recommendation would be to try to expand the potential for that.
 And, finally, I think there is a feeling that there are some interesting developments happening with the national groups and also the regional IGFs that is helping carry the IGF discussion forward throughout the year and also expanding the dialogue to include more participants, helping to disseminate the policy discussion that's happening in IGF, as well as bring a broader set of views into the process, and that that's a very good development and also should be encouraged and fostered going forward.
 So we are very excited about the progress that's been made, and we look forward to next year.

>>NITIN DESAI: Katitza Rodriguez.

>>KATITZA RODRIGUEZ: Okay.
 Thank you, sir.
 I would like to thank the secretariat and the Multistakeholder Advisory Group members for your kind invitation. I would like to start, expressing my sympathy to the family of the victims in the recent attacks in Mumbai.
 I would like to express my appreciation to all of you, government, intergovernmental, and civil society and academic who are present in this important meeting and also those of you who had been prevented to come, although they could commit to come nevertheless.
 We were missing you, me, in particular, during the important privacy discussions that would have been benefited from your contribution. Keep in mind that this forum is founded on the active involvement of all of us. We hope to be in full composition next year in Cairo.
 Let me now reflect on the last three days. I will make a few suggestions that I may propose for the next IGF.
 It is good that the interface on cybercrime -- cybersecurity on (inaudible) is now explored together with privacy issues. Those subjects are strictly interlinking and deserve such a combined reflection. And the discussion should continue taking the privacy dimension.
 However, this framework should not limit the discussion of privacy. We have observed that the discussion in the conduct of cybersecurity and cybercrime necessarily take the avenue of criminal actions and how will be meaningful prevented without illegally restricting fundamental human rights such as privacy and freedom of expression.
 However, this discussion does not cover the wider dimension of consumer and Internet

users' privacy in otherwise perfectly legal venues set up in spaces such as e-commerce of online uses.
 Because of this restriction in these topic combinations of privacy and cybercrime and security, the full potential of the discussion for the (inaudible) touch on information, privacy, and data protection has not been addressed in the main session as it should be, nor has it been taken into account in the report back in the morning sessions.
 I would like to propose to you that information privacy and data protection be considered here as an independent topic to be addressed in the main session in the next IGF in Cairo.
 In relation to privacy, security, there were very meaningful contributions during the morning session. For example, those done by Mr. Rodot regarding the use of intrusive technologies and their implication of privacy. The implication of privacy of location-tracking technologies such as biometric RFID technologies could attempt to be discussed.
 I also would like to pick up the proposal made in the morning to discuss these in a multidisciplinary approach, economical, social, legal, and technological point of view, and to include sessions of privacy integration technologies, technologies that are considered privacy in its design.
 Other topics were privacy and social networks, and specifically attention on minors.
 Finally, it would be nice that during the organizations of the forums, the members of the advisory committee could work with the communities working on these issues to create a debate during the main sessions. The most important part is that we are all the stakeholders together discussing in these venues. We would like to have a more real debate. The problem is in the granularity and not in the general statement.
 Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: I am grateful to the panelists for being very disciplined in their comments so that we have -- at 3:30, the floor is now open for discussions.
 People can just -- the gentleman there, Mr. Michael. Then the lady here, the lady there.
 Can I take three at a time, because otherwise, I will lose track.
 Can we have the mike here, please.

>>ALUN MICHAEL: Thank you very much, indeed.
 I scare myself, never mind anybody else.
 Can I first congratulate India as our hosts on the tremendous welcome that they have given to us. And that's particularly to be praised in the light of the events in Mumbai with which we've all sympathized.
 And congratulate everybody who's actually here. I think it's good that at least most of the people who were intending to participate are here.
 There have been very good sessions in this IGF. I believe we have moved forward considerably, and there has been a positive response to some of the issues that were raised last year, particularly in relation to greater engagement.
 Personally, I will go from this event with greater confidence in the process, particularly because we have seen what is an almost spontaneous development of people getting together multistakeholder approaches, national IGFs, regional IGFs, call them what you will, which indicates that we are moving out of an event to a process that goes on which simply comes together in an event like this.
 And I hope that will be very much reflected in the agenda in Egypt next year.
 It seems to me that we need to focus our program much more closely on the search for consensus. The strengths of the IGF is that we are not a decision-making body or a

treaty-writing body, so that gives us, in the IGF, the freedom to work in achieving consensus and arguing about differences, dealing with principles.
 We're bound to have the sort of discussion we had yesterday about ICANN and its future, but I thought much more to the point was this morning an excellent discussion on emerging issues which pointed to the real agenda. Internet governance isn't just about ownership or technology or even ownership and technology. It's about the interface between people and businesses and nations and the Internet.
 It's about the implications of change, and it's about development.
 So let's promote the fact, with all those stakeholders, including business, including government, as has been said from the platform, let's promote to those participants that the IGF is the safest place to work at developing the consensus that we need on issues that are actually moral, cultural, economic, and even personal in their nature.
 As regards the issue of data protection or data privacy, can I suggest that wherever possible we shouldn't go off into one silo. So, for instance, if we go into a debate data privacy we should at the same time debate data sharing, for instance for the purposes of reducing crime and increasing personal security.
 If you debate those issues in separate silos, you end up with incompatible answers. And if we try to bring difficult issues together, we won't get much further.
 Can I suggest as far as next year is concerned, just a couple of points. That we make the annual event much more focused on the work that's done through the year by coalitions, by networks, and national events, and promote them, as I was very pleased you did this morning, to the main stage.
 That we share the work of national IGFs and regional groups in the same way, things like the East African IGF are extremely exciting. And that these should be shared at the main stage, with information prepared in advance so that we don't have long presentations, but we focus on debate, sharing, and questioning.
 That we promote best practice to the main stage. We hear almost accidentally about how many good things are happening in many parts of the world, and we made our own presentation from the U.K. in a small workshop.
 I would like to hear more of this in well-prepared, perhaps short videos so that we have a lot of input, and then have as much time as possible for debate.
 The next suggestion is very painful for me. It's a self-limiting suggestion that we limit all contributions, including panelists and chairs, to 3 minutes, allowing people to speak more and for debate.
 And increase the preparatory use of net-based exchanges, video exchanges and telephone conferences.
 Finally, just to reflect one plea from the stage. I do think we need to see parliamentarians from all countries more engaged in this process. That needs to be a mainstream of parliamentary activity, not a separate one just for the IGF.
 And I would ask people to perhaps encourage their parliamentarians, and certainly what we will do from the U.K. is to argue within the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the IPU, and perhaps through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in our case for mainstream engagement of parliamentarians with the work of the national and regional IGFs as well as the main event itself.
 Thank you very much.
 [Applause]

>> Thank you. My name is (saying name), and I am here speaking on behalf of the gender dynamic coalition.
 Now the gender dynamic coalition has met actually twice during the last few days, and I would like to take this opportunity to speak on behalf of the coalition, where I would

like to share some of our thoughts as well as recommendations. And I think we will be trying to address some of the points that the moderator has asked in terms of questions.

I would like to start by putting on record that we appreciate, or at least the coalition appreciates the recognition that was given in terms of discussions, in terms of gender, and that women actually constitute a fundamental stakeholder in the Information Society.

So we think that this is an important beginning, and that we hope that there will be more efforts in terms of fully integrating gender or gender concerns in the work of the IGF.

Now, I think it's also important to recognize that in terms of the multistakeholderism, that the three main sectors that are IGF's defining features are not monolithic, unitary and consistent actors. Hence, greater effort is required to bring women's diverse perspectives to the forefront in each of the stakeholder groups. So ultimately a rights-based approach, something we have heard quite a lot in the last few days, in terms of Internet governance is really the only safeguard for women to fully enjoy the potential benefits of the Internet.

So that's what's happening in the last few days in terms of the contributions or the spaces given in terms of women's rights.

Two of the themes, I think, that really took part, or at least featured discussions in terms of gender perspectives were the access themes as well as the openness, privacy and security.

It clearly illustrated the ways in which Internet governance implicates rights of women, and rights that are essential to women.

So the coalition feels that access to Internet is very, very critical to women to access information that may not be otherwise available to them. And to facilitate the full realization of these rights.

So for women from marginalized communities, the Internet can also function as the harbinger of citizenship rights, bridging their rights to be informed with the duty of government institutions to inform the constituents. So the provisioning of the Internet is very, very fundamental in terms of social policy issue. Policy that aims to make the Internet available only to one billion at a time we feel is not an adequate response. And from a right's perspective, access to Internet is, indeed, crucial to all.

In terms of discussions on the openness, privacy and security, it is clear that they have very gendered angles as well. The Internet is fast becoming a means of asserting IP and proprietizing and commercializing knowledge.

The process divests knowledge of the communitarian and public value upon which the daily lives of the vast majority of women rest.

So in addition, women's ability to assert rights beyond national territory and shape human rights debate and development alternatives cannot happen in a context where the Internet is increasingly controlled by states and corporations.

Many women do risk their lives to share information about injustices on the Internet.

I just request a little bit more time.

How do we actually guarantee that women's rights will be addressed?

Now, just like women's rights to education, to health and livelihoods, we feel that the rights to Internet cannot be bartered in the name of revenue models or public-private partnerships.

So the right to Internet cannot be marginalized in the befuddling rhetoric on the right business models.

So while the markets may have a role to play, gender justice can only be guaranteed through appropriate global, regional, national and global policy.

So in Athens the participation of women stood at 30%, and 31% in Rio. While this is relatively good participation, we do call upon the stakeholders of the IGF to ensure that in Cairo this is reflected in the visible of women as speakers, panelists and workshop proponents.

Women and gender experts should be actively included in all endeavors of framing the regulation mechanisms and policy models. And, in addition, we feel that it is essential that gender perspectives are included in all public policy debates regarding the use and development of the Internet.

So we do call upon the international community to devote the next IGF theme to a theme of rights-based approach to the Internet. And for a majority of the world's women, the Internet represents an enabling paradigm that can guarantee not just their communication rights but expand all of their rights.

And as long as women's rights have not been addressed, the dream for an "Internet for All" will remain unrealized.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: The lady in the red first.

>> Thank you very much. Good afternoon to you all.

My name is (saying name), I am from Brazil and I am from the remote participation working group.

This group was created in the beginning of this year by individuals from several countries with a common concern to enhance remote participation in the IGF.

In the last open consultations, we made a public proposal for remote participation which consists in the creation of IGF hubs.

These hubs are local meetings which exhibit the Webcast of the IGF and may also interact with people in the event, sending text as well as video questions using the Dimdim platform.

These local meetings also hold panels and roundtables to discuss the issues of the IGF from a local perspective.

The IGF Secretariat has endorsed our statement in the open consultations, and the creation of IGF hubs.

We thank very much for this support.

We sent a call to mailing list and got in touch with regional organizations.

The result was a creation of eight IGF hubs in Argentina, Brazil, India, Pakistan, Columbia, Serbia and Spain.

This is a sign there is interest for remote participation. We only have to open channels and publicize them.

These hubs have been interacting with the main sessions and the workshops during the last few days, and have provided good feedback about their experience.

We have also had feedback from individuals in blogs dedicated to the IGF and in Twitter. Dave Durbin from Australia says on Twitter, "The best streaming of a conference ever."

Participants of the (saying name) hub used it as a staring point to create a local committee to discuss ICT related issues.

We had some technical problems in audio and video in some sessions, but overall experience was smooth and problem free.

The remote participation working group together with the Dimdim team is collecting numbers and opinions, and we are organizing an evaluation about the remote participation in the IGF.

We hope it can be published in the IGF home page.
 We would like to share this information with you all and ask the IGF Secretariat to continue providing support to this initiative to engage in the remote participation evaluation and to acknowledge remote participation as an important part of the IGF.
 And we ask all of you here to help to give publicity to it because we don't feel it's our project. We feel that it's the project of everybody who is concerned with remote participation, and the coalitions and workshops that were dedicated to it.
 Thank you.
 [Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you very much.
 I want to thank all of the people who have been involved in organizing this remote participation. And certainly, the information on this will be on the Web site, and we will continue to work so that we keep improving it.
 The gentleman who has been waiting there, and then let me just -- is there somebody -- there. Everton from there, and then I will come back here.
 Yes.

>> My name is Sivu Subramaniam Motosami (phonetic). I am from ISOC India, Chennai, but I want to share my observations as an individual.
 This is my first IGF, and I have a lot of respect for the participants here. But my individual impression is that we have a lot of experts here, but the expertise in some cases does not stem from a complete understanding of the fundamental issues.
 We are on the third IGF, and because we are on the third IGF, is it right to assume that we are halfway through the process of evolving Internet governance or is it probably right to think of the way forward -- the way forward is to go back to the fundamentals and probably ask what is the Internet and what is the impact of the decisions made here in its full depth.
 In other words, is the way forward -- is the best way forward to go back to the fundamentals and understand the Internet in its full depth? To make all stakeholders, all participants understand the Internet in its full depth?
 And then decide what needs to be done.
 Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Everton.
 And then the lady there.
 And then the gentleman in front.

>>EVERTON LUCERO: Thank you, Mr. Desai.
 As this might be the last opportunity that I will speak in this session, I would like to take the chance to congratulate our Indian hosts for the excellent preparations and conduction of this meeting.
 Everything was outstanding.
 [Applause]

>>EVERTON LUCERO: I would also like to join those who shared their solidarity to the Indian -- the people and the government of India related to the tragic events at Mumbai.
 Mr. Chairman, Brazil came here with a strong delegation. We brought two federal Senators be our Ambassador to India came down from Delhi to join our delegation.
 We had one vice Minister, officials from different agencies of the government,

nongovernmental organization representatives, also representatives from the private sector, members of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, two federal prosecutors, diplomats, and those who remotely participated from Brazil, as our colleague has just said.

That shows the interest and the commitment of our country to contribute to this forum to the best possible extent.

I would like to refer to another event, though, which is also a multistakeholder one and took place in Rio de Janeiro from 25th to 28th November this year, 2008. That is a few days ago.

It was the Third World Congress Against Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents.

It was an initiative of the Brazilian government together with UNICEF, ECPAT and NGO group.

That environment, which was also multistakeholder, was able to negotiate and adopt the so-called Rio Pact. The Rio Pact to prevent and stop sexual exploitation of children which consisted of a declaration and a plan of action.

Just for you to have an idea of how it reads, I quote from the beginning of the Rio Pact. And I quote, "We, participants representing governments, enter governmental, nongovernmental organizations, human rights institutions, the private sector, law enforcement and legal community, religious leaders, parliamentarians, researchers and academics and the civil society," unquote and then it goes on to the plan.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the proof that a multistakeholder environment is able, if there is political will, to reach meaningful conclusions to tackle problems that are of global importance.

That meeting had 3,500 participants from 170 countries.

Why can't we do the same? Of course we can, but what is lacking among us to reach the same kind of result? Concrete result.

I believe it is political will. But how can we get political will, then?

Well, first of all, it is through discussion. There is no other way.

We need to build trust and understanding, we need to lower our barriers, we need to understand and respect the other's points of view.

And it has been done through the three sessions, three IGFs that we have had so far, and we should pursue and continue on that way, bearing in mind that we are not coming from all over the world only to see each other and talk, and then go back home.

Of course, the setting here is different because it is different if we have an event that is oriented towards one specific common goal, like it was the case in the event that I mentioned in Brazil.

But here, some discussions have led us to a point in which we may say that they are mature enough for us to start thinking what the next steps might be. Because if we, the next time, start from scratch discussing the same issues that have been discussed during the past two IGFs and this one, it may not take us further.

There are, of course, some criteria or some preconditions for that to happen.

The first one would be a broad consensus.

Second would be the involvement of relevant stakeholders.

Third, as I said, discussion would have to be mature enough to shift towards practical measures.

But I think that our greatest challenge, and the future of the IGF is related to that challenge, is our ability to deliver according to the mandate that we have in its entirety.

We, as I said, from Brazil, government, civil society, and all sectors of society, are fully committed to that goal. You may count on us continuously.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: There was a lady out there, and then Michael, a gentleman in front here.

>> Thank you very much, Margaret Moran, M.P. from the U.K., one of the U.K. IGF participants. And I, too, want to congratulate the organizers of this conference against all adversity. I think we have proven that we will not let those that threaten our democracy and our freedoms which are embedded in the notion of the technology in the Web, we will not allow them to stand in our path to progress. And I think that the presence of everybody here and the superb efforts of our Indian host give justice to that and I thank them very sincerely.
 I wanted to raise one point. We have talked a lot about multistakeholder approach, and I think we have succeeded, to a very large extent, in that. But I raise the point that I raised last year. And I think you echoed it back to me, Chair, at the final session last year, which is I do think that many of the discussions that we are having, we need to reach out further to our citizens to engage them in those discussions as well.
 And I do congratulate our colleague here on the work that has been done remotely. However, I do think that we need to do this in a more structured way and using the technology, by which I mean we need wider citizen e-participation in this conference, and perhaps posing some of the difficult questions.
 I would specifically say within that that we need to engage with young people. We all know that they know more about technology than we will ever know, and they will always find different ways of using the technology.
 And I would just like to make a proposal that we have been discussing within -- in relation to the U.K. IGF that we would be willing to pilot some kind of online participation, possibly linking up with our colleagues, young people in Egypt and in other countries to get their online engagement in preparation for the Cairo conference. And certainly hopefully their active participation in that.
 Looking around the room, we are not all as young as we might wish we were, and I do think we need to have much more involvement of young people.
 The second thing is I was extremely pleased to hear that there is likely to be more of a focus on developing countries in next year's IGF in Cairo.
 This certainly came up very loud and clear in our debates about online child protection where it's clear that some developing countries are going to jump over us in terms of technology but don't have the protections and policies necessarily in place, which could leave their children extremely vulnerable.
 So as well as in previous sessions offering any help that we can give, I think it would be an excellent idea to have that firmly on the agenda for the Cairo conference.
 [Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I have the mic for the gentleman.

>> Well, thank you very much.
 I first would like to state my -- to start by pointing out that I think IGF is better today than ever -- in fact, it improved along this same week, to reach a very special level in this morning emerging issues session.
 The IGF I think should maintain its approach of an evolving model of interaction, a continuously learning venture.
 I think this forum is unique as providing a conscience to the Internet community, like the network of neurons in the human brain provides a conscience to a human being,

each of us as individuals.
 I believe this role is not fulfilled by any existing organization, and that it cannot be contained in more traditional organizations of hierarchical nature.
 This conscience and intelligence is essential for the economy and for societal improvement in all the areas of the globe.
 The reason for this is that we need an organization that matches the network structure of the Internet itself. Openness to participation and interaction, evolving boundaries with time, fractality in the sense that when we look at the small part of network, the pattern we see is equal to the whole network itself, and therefore it's not the kind of networks which somehow have structures which are more organized and hierarchical.
 It is the robustness of the interaction of diverse and independent actors that allows the sustainability of widely shared values, convictions, and principles.
 The issues of the Internet are not exhaustive in technicalities. Actually, technicalities are only a minor part of the issues that have to be brought to consideration in the whole picture.
 As a matter of fact, we need social organizations with the flexibility and interactivity which are characteristic of human beings.
 New kind of organizations, and IGF is actually pursuing from this point of view organizational innovation of a very special kind.
 In terms of the future I think that certainly we need to work better on a point that was already mentioned by another person regarding reach out to wider audiences in a more efficient manner. To bring whatever has been constructed here and is part of our conscience as individuals who in this network have participated to create this sense and feeling so that it can be communicated outside. And actually to reach with other forms of participation to improve better on remote participation, for instance, to actually involve younger cohorts in this discussion, which I think you are eager to do, if we provide the right channels and the right local support for this to happen.

 In terms of themes, I cannot do better than what the session of emerging issues did.
 I commend the adoption of the proposals that we heard during the morning and its exploitation for the future steps of this organization.
 In terms of themes, I cannot do better than what the session on emerging issues did. I commend the adoption of the proposals that we heard during the morning, and its exploitation for the future steps of this organization.
 By the way, I did not introduce myself. LUIS (saying name) from Portugal.
 [Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: (saying names).

>>STEPHEN LAU: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 I'm not going to dwell upon some of the more strategic and macro views with regarding intervention, with regard to issues being brought up, strategic issues, important issues being brought up.
 I like to look at the more micro kind of issues, like granularity.
 If I took an example, I think the issue is data privacy on the Web. It's an important issue. We brought it up. It should be discussed.
 But any issue we bring up, I like to suggest at least that there is some kind of action, activity that goes along with it, for example, when we talk about data privacy on the Web. And the suggestion was that, hey there have been and there are some notification statements now in a lot of Web sites. And there was a comment made

today, this morning, was saying, "Too legalistic. I cannot understand it." And then (inaudible) attack. "Something should be done."
 I would like the proposer to be able to say something to those interventions, to say, "Okay. It should be no longer than 100 words. It should be in simple English." Or you can say, "Okay. They should be vetted, that Web site, by somebody called Privacy Seal Organization," recognized well-intentioned.
 So to say, for example, that organizations and governments should take notice, really, to stop there, it does not have much effect. But you can come up with suggestions, actions, timelines, that could get the debate going. And I really would like to look at the granularity and the action item path for future to illustrate that point.
 I also want to make a second comment, is we had some very, very good discussion on -- and brought up the issue of, for example, child pornography. I just want to take a count here.
 How many of you -- just a raise of hands -- how many of you would like to have child pornography on the Net to be discussed next year?
 Next year. Next year.
 Child pornography on the Net next year.
 Whatever, some show of hands. I was just trying to be provocative. In a sense, I will set up a scenario and say, "I don't want to discuss next year." And the reason is because that is what is the progress made in IGF. We have discussed this issue. It's a mature issue, common framework, commonality across countries. Brazil is doing a lot of work on it. ITU is now moving. And it's the first, first action item, is protection of children.
 Effectively, get it off the agenda. There's already progress made. And I'd like to see more of that nondiscussion.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you.
 Alice.

>>ALICE MUNYUA: I just want to announce that there was a workshop yesterday organized by France and U.K. Nominet bringing together the various countries and regions that have so far conducted initiatives at the national and regional level in IGFs.
 The following countries participated: Senegal, Kuwait, Italy, U.K., Germany, France, the Council of Europe, Brazil, and Kenya, which was representing the East African region, which is Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda.
 Now, the workshop focused on exchanging experiences, the various diversity of processes and content, as well as the challenges, and, to a certain degree, best practice.
 Now, the outcome of this workshop was a proposal to have a dynamic coalition on national and regional IGFs.
 We intend to make a summary of the proceedings yesterday on the main IGF Web site and would like to take this opportunity to invite other countries and regions to join the coalition as well as other networks from the private sector, civil society, as well as development partners.
 Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: (No audio).

>>:We can't hear you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Hello. Yes.

Okay.

>>:I'm (saying name) Patel from Indian customs, government of India.
 I want to -- going through this, I really -- an element of multistakeholder, everyone is clear what is the vision. Every stakeholder is clear about the vision he wants the way to go. What is lacking is the bridges. The tunnel is there. Each stakeholder has tunnel vision. But what is lacking is the bridges across the tunnel.
 So I would like some kind of structural buildup where we can have bridges across the tunnel within the multiple stakeholders. That is one thing.
 Secondly, I want to specifically mention again at the cost of repetition -- this morning I mentioned it -- now we are not able to see ten years in the future. The Internet is a heritage. We had need to handle it safely in the next transition. By the time they become the children are -- boys are infants, they become mature and talking in a forum like this thing, we will be in our graves. Therefore, we have more responsibility on us to hand over this heritage in the most safe and responsible manner to the next generation. That is one thing.
 Secondly, the possibility -- how to hand it over in the most responsible and sensitive manner, the answer possibly lies in -- again, going back to the (saying name), who, nearly 100 years before, he visualized and conceptualized that (inaudible) will come in future. And he could not find the term like a mobile or desktop or laptop, things like that. So he designed a term like complex micro- -- complex numerical microsymbiorganisms.
 So possibly I would suggest there is a strong case to revisit the work of the Neil Barissili, Italian numerical biologist, to approach the problem of what kind of solutions we can find to this next IGF. Thank you very much, sir.

>>NITIN DESAI: You would wish to rename the IGF "Complex Numerical Micronisms Forum"? Sorry. I'm just pulling your leg.

>>:Definitely, sir. I will take the responsibility.

>>NITIN DESAI: The gentleman at this end. And then right here.

>>:Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
 First, thank you for the excellent arrangements and the delegates, from whom I have learned a lot.
 Just a small suggestion for the next IGF. When you talk of the next billion or the last billion or the last million or the last man, the ultimate objective is to make the whole process more inclusive for his or her social and economic evolution and betterment. And in that context, the suggestion was that if we tried to make it -- this process a little, you know -- a little more descriptive and more substantive and put more meat, then maybe for the next IGF, if we could have something on the contribution of the Internet or the IGF process to the achievement of the millennium goals, which you are well aware of, which talk of certain standards and certain indicators being achieved by the whole world, that would probably, you know, then give us a complexion from the topmost macro level issues two micro issues which directly affect human beings.
 Thank you very much.
 [Applause]

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Thank you very much. My name is Wolfgang Kleinwächter. I'm from the University of Aarhus.

We all know that the mandate of the IGF belongs to discussing of emerging issues. And one of the emerging issues is the Internet of things.
 If we go back to Tunis, nobody talked in the WSIS about the Internet of things. It was raised for the first time in the last IGF. This year, we had two workshops on the Internet of things. And at the end of the two workshops, we created a dynamic coalition. We are still in the process of the formation of the dynamic coalition on the Internet of things.
 And I think this is a very good example of how you can measure success of the IGF, because, you know, without this platform, probably all of the various partners would still be sitting in their silos. The business sector would go forward with the RFID and all this, you know, civil society would express concerns about privacy with the Internet of things, governments would have their own conferences and discussing this issue which probably they do not really fully understand at the moment, because it still was awake and nobody knows what is really behind this concept.
 This forum here has stimulated a debate among the various stakeholders and has created a space where the stakeholders have met, and in this dynamic coalition we have now ten members, two from the technical community, two from the business sectors, two from governments, two from civil society, and two from the academic community.
 And I think if you look for an outcome, probably this dynamic coalition can produce in the years ahead, in one, two, or three years, a practical outcome, probably a recommendation.
 But this is then among the people who are really involved. And I think this is the beauty of the IGF, is the IGF enables such processes, in particular, with regard to emerging issues.
 Thank you very much.
 [Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I -- there's a gentleman there at the back, right at the corner and the gentleman right there at the back.

>>ANJAN BOSE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Anjan Bose, and I represent ECPAT International, an NGO based in Bangkok.
 We just heard some time ago that there has been a mention of not including any discussions regarding child pornography in the next IGF, or minimizing such discussions.
 Absolutely fine. We would be happy if there is no discussion, which means all the solutions, all the recommendations that has been put forward has worked perfectly, and in the next IGF, we would come up with all the solutions hand in hand.
 So I would really love to see that happening. And if anybody has any other proposals of not including discussions, as far as I remember, according to the action points detail on the WSIS, under the ethical dimension of the Internet Society, protecting children was one of the key components. And we cannot deny the fact that Internet plays a big role, and we do need to take action on it.
 Thank you very much.

>>NITIN DESAI: I think -- If I may reply, Mr. Lau never meant that we shouldn't take action on it. What he meant to illustrate was that there is always some progression, that we always move a little ahead, and we should recognize that.
 Mr. Lau, would you like to just quickly clarify?

>>STEPHEN LAU: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You have put it very succinctly, but I could also add.
 I used the word children or child pornography. I did not use the word "protection of children on the Web." It's a whole variety of issues out there about protection of children on the Web. I did not say that.
 So please understand me.
 I was just -- as was saying, I'm trying to illustrate a point about this platform of IGF as I know it, being a newcomer, is, we are not -- we do not have negotiated outcome. We bring multistakeholders together, discuss issue, generate interest, generate the kind of -- and hope through this process governments and all stakeholders will take action, and effective and positive action. I use that as an example to say that now Brazil, U.K., many countries and international bodies are already effectively moving into action framework, and so we can actually satisfy the original mechanism and the framework upon which IGF should be structured and should be action upon.
 So, therefore, to me, that reflects progress and actually what I call -- even though we don't have a negotiated outcome, the effective outcome is to bring to the attention and to influence and to synergize actions from relevant quarters.
 Thank you, Chair.

>>NITIN DESAI: There was a gentleman right there in the back. And then I'll come back to the front. The gentleman right there in the back. And then the lady.
 Can somebody get the mike to him, please. Can you just raise your hand.
 Have you got the mike?

>>:I'm a lady, actually.

>>NITIN DESAI: Oh, sorry. I thought there was somebody behind you trying to --
 [Laughter]

>>NITIN DESAI: My apologies.

>>JAC SM KEE: It's quite all right. My name is Jac. I'm from the Association of Progressive Communications. I'd like to echo the earlier comment that the IGF represents a really unique, seminal space to discuss about complex and difficult issues with a variety of stakeholders and that the problems are in its granularity and not in rhetoric.
 So while we acknowledge maturity in some discussions -- I'm not going to name it -- we must also hold our maturity to acknowledge oversimplification, conflation, and polemical positionings of complex issues, like safety, protection, privacy, content regulation, and harm, and that the diversity of all stakeholders must be taken into account and that no shortcuts in analysis or knee-jerk reactions are taken, that learnings do not become wholesale importing of models and policies, because the implications can be very damaging, sustained, and long-standing for those whom we have missed out, ignored, or misheard, such as the (inaudible) of women, women living with HIV-AIDS, trafficked women, sex workers, young women, as well as the (inaudible).
 So I urge that for the next IGF, that we actually broaden this space to enable deeper discussions and bring in the participation of people that we don't usually see through things like e-participation, for example, and that there will be more colors amongst us.
 Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: I had a couple of people out in front. There was a lady in red from

Brazil, and then the -- nick.
 Two ladies. One and then the second one.

>>LIESYL FRANZ: Another lady in red, but not from Brazil. My name is Liesyl Franz.
I'm from the Information Technology Association of America.
 And I'd just like to make a comment perhaps a little more on the logistic side of
looking forward to IGF in Egypt that I hope reflects some of the positive comments that
have been made about aspects that we've picked up here.
 And one is that -- and this session is a great example of a dynamic and cohesive
discussion even amongst a group that's this large.
 Mr. Brueggeman spoke earlier about one of the positive things that has happened in
some of the workshops is that the discussion has been very interactive. And those have
been productive, because they include discussions amongst the various stakeholders.

 So what -- And this session is probably robust because I don't know if there's any
conflict with workshops.
I know that scheduling and the logistics of what workshops take place when and which
sessions take place when is extremely difficult. But I would urge the organizing
committee and the chair and the secretariat, with the stakeholders, to think about ways
to have less conflict with main sessions and workshops throughout the schedule of the
IGF.
I don't have a particular solution for that right now. But I'd be happy to help work on
that to try to find ways to bring as many people into the room for conversations just
like this, not only about logistics, such as my comment, but also about the substance,
because there is really rich, robust substance. And I think even from IGF to IGF, the
discussion in a room like this has become very mature, very rich, and civil.
So thank you. And I look forward to working with you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Did you want the floor, the lady from Brazil who spoke about remote
participation? Did you want the floor? No.
Can I have -- can you pass the mike to the gentleman there, please. Then it will come
to you in a moment.

>>ANDREW MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Desai.
I'm Andrew Miller, member of the British parliament. Although I've been involved in
technology issues and the way they impact upon people ever since I've been a member
of parliament, for 16 years, this is my first IGF.
And I echo the observation by the gentleman who spoke earlier from the University of
Aarhus in Denmark. One of the richnesses of this forum is the way it brings together
people who would normally operate in silos.
I think that's incredibly valuable. And one of the things I've got out of this event is
being able to mix with people from different parts of the stakeholder community
seamlessly. And I think that is incredibly valuable. And that's something that the IGF
should continue to develop.
I share the view that was just expressed. It was a very crowded space. It was like
going into a restaurant with too many choices on the menu almost. I found myself torn
between one workshop and another. And at one stage, I even noticed that one of the
presenters was speaking simultaneously in two separate events.
So I think the space is crowded and we do need a little bit of work done on how to
time-table some of the events to get the best out of the expertise that's gathered
together here today.

Just a couple of points, just to reinforce the point that my colleague Margaret made about engaging with young people. I was privileged to run an event like that, not to do with the Internet, but using the Internet, bringing together a school in Budapest and a school in London, using an expert moderator. It was actually on the subject of the 50th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising. And it was a very emotional event. And those children got a huge amount out of listening to the expert speeches and then contributing in a dialogue afterwards.

We can learn lessons from that sort of thing. It has been used in the Internet space many times before. And perhaps the IGF in Egypt can consider that kind of vehicle.

Now, the first panelist this afternoon used one word that nobody's commented on. That was the media.

The media is changing in this seamless, mobile world that we live in. And it is changing quite fundamentally. We see news broadcasts going live that are pieces of film that have come out of somebody's mobile telephone and impacting upon our lives instantly without any interpretation from professional journalists. We see new forms of media emerging every day almost. It's a rapidly changing space and is fundamentally changing the world of the media. And, therefore, I think it may be of benefit to consider having a stream that examines that part of the work, not just journalists themselves, but the journalists mixing with technologists, with civil society, to look at this changing world of the media in the mobile age we live in.

Ms. Desai, I, too, share the views of many other speakers that this, I think, has been a superb conference. And congratulations to the organizers, and particularly to our hosts here in India.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: Gentleman there, and then there is another gentleman out there in the back.

Can we get the mike to him, please.

>>:As an Indian, I would like to thank the people who have come here from all over the world to participate in this IGF, and by participating, you express your solidarity and friendship with the people in India in contrast to the tragic incidents that happened in Mumbai just before the IGF.

I think the feeling across the whole IGF has been quite strong that the IGF is a unique experiment in multistakeholder governance and that three years is too short a period of time to come to a conclusion about whether that's the way to go or not.

And, therefore, the exercise next year more in terms of assessing to figure out what we can do to make it more effective, whether it should be an evaluation or something is a question that I have for myself.

But, obviously, there are things that we can do to make it even more effective. And I have a specific suggestion to make in that regard. The suggestion is also discussed in quite a few workshops and the main sessions here as well.

Which is that the IGF is a once in a year kind of forum. People meet here for four days. There's enough time to listen to one another but not enough time to come to some kind of reasonable consensus on the issues we face. One gentleman mentioned you have data sharing happening one place and data privacy in another and there isn't enough time to put it together.

And I think that perhaps we need to move from an institution-based focus which we have been seeming to have in the IGFs, for example, we discuss is ICANN the right body, is ITU a better body? But maybe we need to move from that to issue-based

focus, where we pick up an issue like data privacy and data sharing. And then you have a group of people spending considerable amount of time discussing pros and cons. And this, of course, would be a multistakeholder group that will go into it. We have a very excellent example of this that happened as a part of the WSIS process, which is the working group on Internet governance that was chaired by yourself. And I think the document that this group came out with was considered (inaudible) diverse opinions of various people at the same time, because it gave some kind of direction to Tunis. And I think between now and Cairo and Cairo and the last IGF, if we can set up specific working groups on identified issues, I think we will be able to make significant progress.

One issue I would like to suggest, and that is, again, coming from discussions that have happened in various workshops, we just look at a rights-based framework for Internet governance. And people have said that if inclusion is what we should focus on, if inclusive information society is what the declaration of principles called for, the next billion is maybe not the right term. We're looking at the last billion, we're looking at everybody. And I think this allows us to address some concerns that people have raised. Why are we seeing more people here, more people from the civil society here. When we start talking in terms of making sure that the last woman and I'm sure the last person will be a woman and not the man, so maybe we should change the term -- the last person who will get connected is the person we should be focusing on. I'm sure you will find more from Africa, Latin America, and various countries and Asia. I was very surprised that in India, the civil society movement is extremely strong. It's very thriving and vibrant. We hardly see any here, including, you know, Hyderabad is a place where there are so many organizations. So I think by changing the emphasis, by bringing issues that are of concern to various people in humanity into the discussions here and giving people sufficient time to start listening and start trying to work out issues like (inaudible), it will make the IGF far more effective than we have it today. Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: The gentleman there at the back, and then front again.
The person there, the back.
Once again lady. My eyesight is not what it is thought to be.
Please.

>>:Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.
Several people here have been drawing attention to the importance of having a wider stakeholder involvement in the IGF. The lady who was an M.P. from the U.K. said we should think more of the concerns of citizens. The intervention that was just made did the same.
I would like to briefly draw your attention to an open letter that has been circulated here in Hyderabad and which has been signed by 109 organizations from civil society from all over the world and also by a number of individuals. Many of these organizations are from the global south. Many of these are grass-roots organizations. Very few of them are actually present here. And all of them ask the IGF to pay attention to a particular issue. I don't want to read the complete letter. But I would like to read the paragraph that has the key demands.
And the paragraph says:
We strongly urge the IGF to directly address the following key global public interest and policy issues: The increasing corporatization of the Internet, increasing proprietization of standards and code that go into building the Internet, increasing points of control being embedded into the Internet in the name of security and intellectual property

violations, and a huge democratic deficit in global Internet governance.
Some of this letter is written in a language that is very different from the language that is spoken here. And I mean in terms of vocabulary. I know that makes it sometimes difficult for people to relate to. But I think if we are serious about being a multistakeholder venue that wants to be inclusive, then we have to go beyond those kind of restrictions and we have to try and be open and address these concerns as well. I feel that the considerable attention for human rights in this IGF, and hopefully even more in the next IGF, some of that has been hit there. But I do hope we will continue to build on this and take the considerations expressed in this letter as well.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: I thought there was somebody up -- somebody up here in front.

>>:I have a mike.

>>NITIN DESAI: Okay. I can't see.
Can I have Mr. Muguet. And then Ayesha. Then the lady here.

>>FRANCIS MUGUET: I would like to compliment the intervention by Mr. Wolfgang Kleinwächter. The address of the dynamic coalition of the Internet of things is simply Internet, dash, or without dash, things.org.
Now I would like to suggest maybe a way to get out of the lack of, I will say, purpose that some stakeholders are now feeling.
One thing is to have an open assembly is very good so that stakeholders meet one another. Now, for that they continue to meet, you need to bring forward, in fact, some more tangible issues some tangible ways. And as you know, from the very start, I suggested to fully implement the mandate of the IGF and to have the possibility to make recommendation on emerging issues.
One last year, the Dynamic Coalition on Linguistic Diversity, was only coalition so far who made recommendation. Now I suggest that all the dynamic coalitions can make recommendation, and this recommendation shall not be recommendation of the IGF, but listed as a document of the IGF as recommendation at the IGF. So at least we'll make some little step-by-step progress.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Ayesha, and Peter.
Sorry, can -- since the mike is -- would you pass the mike to her.
And then Ayesha and Peter.

>>VIOLA KREBS: Viola Krebs from MAAYA and ICVolunteers. It's been very stimulating and it's been very, I think, encouraging. I would like to emphasize on what some of the others have said as far as this IGF has been concerned. Of course, challenges do remain. And in terms of the Dynamic Coalition for Linguistic Diversity, I think what has been very encouraging precisely is to see that languages have gained in importance in this space. And maybe one of the objectives for the future would be to see how, instead of having 350 languages, we could have 3,500 languages in cyberspace.
And doing so, also how we could maybe include more some of the communities on -- who have not been included enough in this space and dialogue, which are the linguists, bring together linguists and technicians, and also maybe build on some of the examples of very good participation that have been included here, for example, in the session by UNESCO where questions were taken on a distance basis, where more

dialogue was given rather than just presentations and monologues.
Maybe even more build on that remote participation in order to further include those 106 organizations that were, to a great extent, not here and signed the open letter, to broaden the inclusion of who can participate in IGF.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Ayesha Hassan.

>>AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you, Chair.
On behalf of the International Chamber of Commerce and the members of the BASIS initiative, I am pleased to express that we would like to welcome the dynamic coalition on multistakeholder national and regional initiatives and express our support for this dynamic coalition as it evolves.
As we have stated before, the national and regional level multistakeholder dialogue on these issues will enrich the experience of the IGF at the global level, and we look forward to helping to motivate business from around the world to participate in those initiatives.
Thank you.

>>PETER HELLMONDS: Okay, thank you, Chair. My name is Peter Hellmonds from Nokia Siemens Networks.
I would like to join the others who have applauded the Indian government for organizing this, the third IGF.
The facility and all the technical features worked well, with perhaps the usual glitches on the first day. We all feel welcomed by our Indian hosts, and I would like to thank the host for their hospitality.
We especially appreciate this hospitality in the wake of the terrible events in Mumbai, and we all feel like family with our Indian hosts and sincerely condemn these attacks. Our hearts are with the victims and their families.
Coming to the evaluation of the IGF, I have been very active both as a member of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group in the first two years and as a MAG alumnus and volunteer during this year in shaping and supporting the IGF in both developing its processes and its contents.
Allow me to highlight where I think we made progress in this grand experiment and where we can still do better as we go ahead.
When we started to embark towards Athens, we didn't know what would happen. In fact, some of my business colleagues were quite concerned when confronted by some civil society advocates on the issues of human rights.
Well, I think we made a lot of progress here. Instead of confrontation, we see collaboration.
I participated yesterday in a workshop on human rights and Internet governance, and engaging, I can tell you, is much more fruitful in the long run than blaming and shaming.
I particularly enjoyed yesterday afternoon's session, and this also showed (inaudible) amongst former combatants, witness Patrik who agreed with Milton or witness support for the statements of our colleague from China.
So we are making progress here.
We are all seeking no longer to make statements for publicity sake but the success of the IGF is to allow for this frank exchange of ideas, where we see commonly accepted solutions for the challenges ahead.
We have also made progress on the level of discourse, from 14 panelists in Athens

staying still on the podium there for three hours, we now have interactive dialogue and even debates between the participants from the floor, showing the high level of understanding that exists in many participants.

So clearly, on all those accounts, the IGF has worked remarkably well. And the multistakeholder nature of the IGF, the nature of not having to come to negotiated outcomes and the equal footing on which participants discuss with each other has surely contributed in large part to this.

However, we can do better still in some areas.

We still have too many workshops. That's clear.

We should encourage more workshop organizers to work together and to merge their workshops.

Early announcement and encouragement, early deadlines would help to bring proposals in time and allow the MAG to encourage that. But clearly we need to provide for more focused interaction and less events competing with each other, although I am on record for promoting competition, but this is no contradiction here.

Also, I think we had the expectation that we would be able to go deeper in the issues, and we did succeed, but only partly.

We could do better for the IGF in order for the IGF to be and to remain relevant.

We need to recognize that there are different levels of understanding among the participants, and we may need to have some entry-level workshops and some graduate degree workshops, if you may like to use the academic comparison.

Entry level is to take those along who may be new to the process, and graduate level would be for the experts who expect more than just the general discourse that we have had in the previous years.

So that is in order for everyone to seek to go to the level of depth in the discourse that they feel appropriate for themselves.

The main session workshops were, by and large, successful, and this experiment has worked in allowing workshop organizers to organize the main session workshops.

There was a difference in the main session dialogue server. Some were excellent. Especially yesterday afternoon.

I encourage whether we further study whether this could be a model for open debates in future dialogues.

However, other open dialogues didn't work as he will, especially when the moderator didn't take the time to prepare adequately.

On content, I think the issues of access and openness, of diversity, multilingualism, of security, safety, human rights and privacy, critical Internet resources and human capacity building are still important and relevant. And the next two IGFs should again seek to go deeper in the issue of relevance within these broad baskets.

These effect our business, especially of course the access business where we are developing concrete solutions to bring Internet to the next billions of people.

As we go forward, we should seek to encourage similar engagement of multistakeholder dialogue on the national and regional level such as those we have heard about from the Latin American, African and European regional dialogues.

Allow me to thank the Indian hosts, also yourself, Mr. Desai, Mr. Kummer and the interpreters and the scribes in order to to make this IGF an extraordinary success.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: That last phrase is a reference to my thesis that in the United Nations we only have two categories: success and outstanding success.

[Laughter]

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I -- I thought I had somebody at this end.
Good, we seem to have -- I'm glad. I think we have a lot of things, but -- sorry,
Bertrand.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my name is Peter (saying name) and I am from injury
mane and I would like to give you one observation which I hope is true.
If I look back to the origin of these series of Internet governance fora, it was a very big
crush of interests at the World Summit on the Information Society. And if I remember
correctly, it was something like a dirty word in Rio to talk about enhanced cooperation.
So we were just talking about critical Internet resources.
What I understand from here is we are talking in a much more open way about the
divergent interests, calling them enhanced cooperation.
And this is what I observed, my personal opinion, and it gives me some hope for the
future.
If we can achieve, during the next Internet Governance Forum, to speak even more
precise and more articulate on our real interests, I hope we will be able to pave the way
to talk, really, also in a more formal way about possible solutions in the future.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Bertrand.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I'm Bertrand De La Chapelle from France.
A few points, rapidly.
First of all, to express that in all the discussions we had among the European Union
members, we all agreed that we wanted to express very, very strong support, not only
for the IGF and the Secretariat but for the process that has been going on for the last
three years.
Because fundamentally, it is the unique global multistakeholder space to discuss
Internet governance.
There are many other entities that discuss those issues, but this is the main watering
hole where, every year, we have the opportunity to share among ourselves.
A few concrete suggestions regarding what happened this week. The first thing is that
the new format that was decided for this year, for the main sessions had basically two
benefits. The first thing that the three tracks, the three themes were really helping to
get together issues that were previously treated separately and broad dynamism. And
particularly in the second day, where the different issues were responding one to the
other and bringing security, privacy, openness, and all this together in the afternoon.
The second element is that the format of the main room and the panels was clearly
bringing more benefit to the people as we can judge for the attendance. So much so
that this year, for the next year, might have a problem of articulating the spaces where
last year we were afraid that the main sessions would be empty.
So it's a progress.
The second point I wanted to make is that in choosing the three tracks, we have
actually done something that is very hard to accomplish in traditional international
organizations, which is reclustering of the issue and making it an evolving agenda.
If you look at the structure of the themes between Athens, Rio, and this year, it has
evolved. We have regrouped some subjects, we have organized it in a different way.
For those who participated in September to the discussion on how to organize the
follow-up to the WSIS, we are rigidly bound to the action lines. And these action lines

are negotiated text that we cannot touch without re-opening the whole box.
It is a major distinction. This capacity to have an evolving agenda should be used as much as possible based on the emerging issues session as well.
Second point about the maturity of issues. The IGF should allow issues to move from the mapping stage, where we explore the different dimensions, to basically the setting the goal or developing consensus on a goal, towards -- and I take Stephen Lau's expression -- synergizing action. I think what he meant, and correct me if I am wrong, by talking about the child pornography is that we have actually moved now to a sufficient consensus that this must be addressed that we can get, next year, into a more active format. And I would like here to make a suggestion of format.
Some of the rooms here large square tables which can host about 15 people. Could we explore a format that would be a group discussion, a public group discussion, on this issue, for instance, picking 15 actors who have been active in the last three years in one category or the other and make them exchange on how to cooperate better later on, operationally. One suggestion.
The third point is, yes, let's not fear the multiplication of dynamic coalitions. I can imagine that people are saying, wow, another dynamic coalition.
I want to mention that, this week, a certain number of dynamic coalitions that have been created separately have skied decided that actually they can merge or cooperate or restructure themselves. This is another illustration of the capacity of organically evolving the groups in a much more flexible manner, that any setting up of working group, task force, study group that we can have in other systems. And this is another benefit of this organic network.
On dynamic coalitions, a last point. It apparently works best when the actors are not only sharing an issue, but when they have a common goal with problems of implementation, or a common issue but opposing approaches.
If you have a common issue that you are interested in but nothing you want to do or no problem to solve, the dynamic coalition is not dynamic enough.
And finally, in terms of formats of panels, we have almost unvoluntarily this morning explored a sort of hybrid where you have panelists who could make an introduction and then a discussion back and forth, which was sort of intermediary between the panels and the afternoon session.
We could envisage next year to have this kind of format where we had a three-hour session but with a small panel introduction and a discussion afterwards.
And finally, I thank -- I am very personally pleased with the interaction that took place on the national and regional IGFs. I'm very happy that it is gaining some traction. And I hope the IGF network will develop nicely in the next year.
Thank you.
[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: The gentleman from Germany there.

>>MAX SENGES: Hello my name is Max Senges. I'm with the dynamic coalition on an Internet bill of rights.
As Bertrand just mentioned we are thinking of merging with another dynamic coalition on frameworks and principles, and in that context we are thinking to rename ourselves to be the dynamic coalition on Internet rights and principals.
That is just as an introduction so when you see a new name, that this is the background.
I want to make some comments on the procedure and then one important point on substance.

What we heard in our session where we were sort of trying to do a needs analysis, asking all the different dynamic coalitions how they can mainstream human rights in their work, we heard some interesting points, in fact, from Peter Hellmonds who expressed -- am I speaking in my own capacity or am I speaking as a representative of Siemens. I think this is ongoing problem we have with the multistakeholder approach in the dynamic coalitions.

We found the solution to say we have government representatives as full active participants, so they can speak for themselves, but obviously we have this connection to the governments. This is how we want to move forward.

But I think it would be very helpful if the Secretariat could find ways to standardize, quote-unquote, the way that the private sector representatives and governments participate in the dynamic coalitions.

I want to second Bertrand's suggestion that I think is great to have roundtables that are, again, output focused so there are results coming out of the dynamic coalitions, there are results coming out of these expert groups sitting together and working. And also in that regard, it would be very helpful if the dynamic coalitions could work with the Secretariat to look at what kind of formats and documents are reasonable in this regard.

And lastly, a point on substance.

The Italian government has kindly offered to host a midterm meeting in between the years where we can discuss rights and principles in the context of the Internet. And I think that will be good to produce some input for the next year's IGF. And in that context, I would like to ask MAG and the organizers to consider how we can give rights and principles and adequate format in the form of a main session or naming it as a key theme of next year's IGF.

Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Did somebody here want the floor?
Thomas.

>>DAVID APPASAMY: David Appasamy from Sify technologies.

At the outset I would like to reiterate what everyone has said about the level of progress we have seen at this IGF and the maturity of the exchange that's been taking place in the workshops. But I submit to you that we seem to have reached an inflection point for the IGF process itself.

We have been through three IGFs, and for us all to meet physically like this there are limitations and that means a whole host of multistakeholders out there who are not included. Therefore, it was wonderful to see to see what was happening in Europe and LAC and Africa in terms of regional IGFs. But that really is the way forward so that it becomes a ground swell of movement across the world which feeds into the IGF here. That's one point I wanted to make.

The second is governance of the Internet is dynamic by its very nature. So the IGF forum as a platform for exchange is very, very valuable. It is not a forum where we take finite decisions, but where we exchange and carry back to wherever we are and implement or execute.

The Internet by its nature as it evolves is going to lead to many more demands in terms of how it is governed. And this forum and the moment that it unleashes across the world will be the dynamic response to those demands. At least this is what I believe. So really the journey is the destination and not any kind of a resolution that we take at any point of time, but in the learning, the exchange and the implementation.

The last point I would like to make is that given the nature of this, it's time that we use

the IGF Web site itself as a platform for exchange. So that as this moves as a movement across the world at national and regional levels, they can feed into that site as a platform, can discuss, can post success stories and so on and so forth. So when we come back here together, it's that much richer.
Thank you.
[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: On your point about the journey being more important, Robert Lewis Stevenson said somewhat pessimistically once: To travel hopefully is better than to arrive.
[Laughter]

>>NITIN DESAI: Thomas.

>>THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. My name is Thomas Schneider from Switzerland. And normally Switzerland supports and does about 95% what the European Union does and says.
At this time I want to join to 100% to what has been said by the E.U. presidency.
I think they are good proposals and good judgments made by Bertrand.
I also would like to support others who think that the IGF should remain a discussion platform, an open discussion platform, but that the outreach should be strengthened and we should try to get action around -- more action and more tangible things around the IGF, more influence on institutions, more actions, which is probably more important, more actions from dynamic coalitions and spontaneous bottom-up initiatives that try to go for solutions on the issues we discussed.
And as we have been -- Another issue is that my personal view was that there were too many simultaneous events. I was, by far, not able to follow at least a part of what I wanted to follow.
So maybe we could think of having less events, continue to merge even more strongly the workshops together so that we would be more able to follow the discussions.
And as we have been very happy to help out the Council of Europe that could not be here for the reasons that you know, I am also very happy to help out the presidency of the European Union to bring up an idea that the representative forgot in his speech, which I think is a very good one. So that maybe for the next IGF we could not call for workshops, but you could call for issues and then see what the issues are that come up. And that would help you to force people to merge their workshops on the issues. And maybe you define the number of workshops according to the issues and then try to bring it to the people.
And lastly, I would thank to Wolfgang Kleinwächter and all the others who were working on the book that has been distributed a few days ago. I think this is a very valuable thing, and we would encourage you to find the resources.
And so whatever you need to come up with a new book on the highlights of the IGF even earlier than this book.
Thank you very much.
[Applause]

>>NITIN DESAI: I'm happy to see there's hundred percent support of Switzerland to the European Union a week before you join the (saying name). A week from now you will be a part of the (saying name), but you are a week ahead of that.
I think I covered -- yes, there is a gentleman there.

>> Good evening, Chairman and members. I'm very happy to participate in this event. This is my first international meeting.
We have discussed things like what to do and what not to do, and contents, how should be the contents in the Internet. But I'm more worried about the infrastructure. You know, the -- particularly network switches, which you are going to replace in future because they are very exorbitant to maintain in a country like India. And also the service. For a small space, a user has to pay a very high price. And in fact, it is not at all encouraging for a country like India to afford Internet.
He has to spend at least a minimum of one (inaudible) investment, which is very difficult for a common man to have this facility, and enjoy the contents.
So the infrastructure supporting people have to come forward to some space, maintain the equipment at a cheaper rate so that countries like India will get the benefit compared to developed countries.
This is my request.
And the Internet governing forum should focus on this aspect also.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you, thank you.
Yes, the lady here.

>>VIOLA KREBS: Viola Krebs from IC volunteers again.
Listening to the discussion, I think those who have played a leading role in give can really be proud of what has been achieved in terms of multistakeholder approach. And since this is the third IGF and there are going to be five, maybe there's going to next step after that, I would suggest that maybe one thing that was discussed a lot throughout the WSIS process, but we have gone way farther now in terms of multistakeholder approaches and processes, how IGF could serve as a model for other U.N. processes.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you.
I think we need to wind up.
Sorry, one more. Ambassador Subrenat. And then that's the last and I turn to the Panel.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you.
I think we need to wind up -- sorry, one more, ambassador Subrenat.

>>JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: -- briefly take two words from your title "Internet Governance Forum." I'd like it take governance and forum. Let's address governance first.
I'm, my name is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'm a member of the board of directors of ICANN.
Governance is one of the themes that I retain as I walk away from this meeting. We've had different approaches and interpretations to this concept. But what I found is that there is a greater maturity in the analysis and also in the proposals put forth. This is compared to Athens or Rio. When I compare to Athens and Rio, I think that the approach is less one of confrontation and one that is much more about seeking solutions.
The second term that I wanted to talk about was the word "forum." I think some have regretted that this forum doesn't lead to recommendations or resolutions. But, all in

all, I think that it's exactly the fact that that specific characteristic that there is no point, no resolution at the end of the road, that's allowed everyone to speak frankly and openly. And I'd just like to say that, in my view, the success in Hyderabad is due to a number of factors: First, the quality of the hosting of the Indian government, which I'd like to applaud. Secondly, the efforts of all of you who have been responsible for organizing this. And, finally, I think that the success is -- stems from the fact that the various communities here, represented here, are talking much more to each other rather than one at each other, one at another.
So I think those are the reasons which explain the success. Thank you very much.

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I just quickly turn -- the panelists have some quick comments to offer, a couple of minutes each.
George.

>>GEORGE PAPADATOS: Thank you. Let me pick up briefly on a point that Thomas Schneider made. And I've been thinking all along about expanding on this. He said we should maintain the multistakeholder, no results, nothing written, free-wheeling notion, and then at the same time, we should try to reach out.
This reaching out is something that I'm not very clear how it's going to take place. I could go back to Athens, to Taverna, talk to my friends about what happened here. I could write some letters to blogs. But is that enough?
So the other trend of thought that emerged was to bring governments together, parliamentarians, so forth. What about the media?
Everton pointed out toward a written outcome, and I presume was to get the point across to a global audience.
What about a way of getting the three most novel ideas across and have CNN, have the "New York Times," "The Irish Times," "The Guardian," whoever, BBC, make a little reference.
And so if there are any journalists in here, please come forward and tell us, what is the best way to get some of the messages across to a wider audience?
I think press conferences have not been very successful so far. They work locally, nationally, but not worldwide. I think that that's important. It's not only important to get additional members to join us; it is important to get the messages across. And the strongest I've heard was about the child protection. So what is the novelty about the child protection in the discussion here? How can we get this point across? I think that will help the IGF a lot. Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I move this way, please.

>>KATITZA RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, sir.
I would like to highlight the privacy debate, that is the open, security, and privacy.
I agree with many of the comments that was raised today, like, we need to discuss the thing in a format that needs to be short, simple and by cases as well as to try to enter into the details of the tension to show exactly which are those tensions that are in place and which are all those positions of different stakeholders on the issue.
Sometimes there will be conflicts, but those tensions or conflicts should not be seen as something negative. But those confrontations are good in order to improve ourselves and maybe be able to arrive at a solution.
So I would like to highlight that the granularity and showing the tensions in the main session in specific topics, in general, it's something very good in this process in the IGF.

Basically, that's all.
Thank you.

>>N. RAVI SHANKER: Thank you, sir.
The IGF, really, is a tale of three cities, from Athens, to Rio, to Hyderabad. I am sure that this continuity and change will keep going, continuity in the sense that some of the issues that were discussed in Athens, the four principles of access, diversity, openness, and security, have continued through the next two IGFs. We then had at Rio critical Internet resources. And if I may add, at Hyderabad, the term that seems to have enveloped all is "enhanced cooperation." This really is an interesting tale in that sense. And I'm sure that onward towards Cairo, the continuity will be there, but there will also be change ahead in Cairo.
I would like to look at this aspect of the Internet for all where the last man standing is looked at as the person who ought to get onto the Internet bandwagon, if one may call so.
I did notice that the delegate here mentioned, it may not be the last man standing. But I hope that we would be very gender sensitive to see that it will be the last man who is standing and not the last lady who is standing.
Thank you.

>>NITIN DESAI: I think one of the questions -- there is a longer process of review which is underway. And I'm sure many of you would have reflections that you would like to pass on and include in that. And there is time for that.
And I was just going to request Markus to give us a sense of the timeline for that review.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Thank you, Nitin.
The mandate is, shall we say, relatively clear. It has to be -- it has to take place within five years of its creation. And this generally assumed that the creation dates back to Tunis 2005. So the Secretary-General will have to make a recommendation to member states, as it is stated in the Tunis agenda, and make recommendations so that a decision can be taken within these five years.
This brings us to the General Assembly of 2009 -- 2010. Sorry. That is two years from now.
And in order to get there, we will have to get started soon. In order for the General Assembly to take a decision, the report from the Secretary-General needs to be ready in early 2010. It will then go to the CSTD in May 2010, from there to ECOSOC in July 2010, and from ECOSOC to the General Assembly, which then has the last word on whether or not to continue the forum in December 2010.
In other words, we will have to get started early next year, and we will prepare that with a day set aside at the meetings in February. We have the dates already for the open consultations. That is 23rd and 24th of February. And one day of these two days will be set aside for the discussion on how to prepare this review process.
And, of course, we invite all stakeholders to post their ideas and comments. And we'll post it on our Web site. And we will, as usual, prepare a paper as an input into the discussions.
The process will then be conducted on the basis of these discussions in February and brought to fruition at the meeting in Egypt sometime in late fall. And I am given to understand that our Egyptian hosts may be able to announce us the dates later today. But it is also, I think, understood and also not the desire of our Egyptian hosts to turn the meeting in Egypt into an inward-looking meeting where we discuss the future of

the IGF. This will be one item on the agenda of the meeting, like we have today, the taking stock and the way forward. We would then discuss the review.

But the actual review will have to take place at the meeting itself. The mandate says the Secretary-General will have to consult -- informal consultations with forum participants. And that can only be the annual meeting of the IGF.

So we will have to come to consensus in this area. We do say the IGF is not a decision-making body. But we will have to find some way of reaching a consensus on what will then go into the report of the Secretary-General. But the final decision will be with the member states in the various instances, CSTD, ECOSOC, and, finally, General Assembly.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you very much.

I think this has been a valuable exercise, and particularly in guiding our work on shaping the next meeting and the meeting after that. There's also the review process which Markus talked about.

I don't think I can summarize the rich discussion, but just some of the reflections which arise from that.

The first thing that -- when I talk about Internet governance to people who are not involved in it, in Delhi or elsewhere, their eyes glaze over, because they don't know what I'm talking about. They don't know what the issue is. And I think we have recognized this. And we have not defined our agenda in terms of the logical or technical infrastructure, the technical dimensions of the Net, if you like.

It is as if, with printing, you would say that the most important issue you need to discuss is the chemical composition of the ink and the nature of the led type and the weight of the platen that you use, when we know that the real issues with the development of printing are not those, but the impact it has on society, on politics, on economy.

And similarly, in this case, we have moved from a definition in terms of the logical or physical infrastructure to some terms like "access," "diversity," "security," "openness," even "critical Internet resources," terms which are more in the province of social analysis, political analysis, economic analysis, not terms which are purely technical.

You cannot talk of access purely as a technical issue. You have to address basic issues of society, of politics, of economy. Similarly with diversity, with security and openness.

So we have moved from the technical -- the technical, in a sense that we started with the engagement of the technical community. But by moving in this direction, we have engaged many others who are involved in the use of the Net.

I think we also need to start moving from the other end. There's a larger community of people out there whose primary interest is the use that you make of the Net.

If you go out there to the village, what you will see, let's say, in the India section, what you will see is people talking about, "Oh, I got my passport through the Net," or "I got my birth certificate through the Net," or "I get my pension through the Net." "I can access my land records through the Net."

This is what your ordinary citizen is interested in, was referred to by several people, that last billion are interested in those things. This is what the use of the Net.

What we have to do is connect that with our agenda. To say that, yes, you are accessing land records on the Net, therefore, issues of access matter to you. It does matter to you, is this available in your language, the language that you understand, which is where diversity comes in.

Is it security? Can somebody steal that data about your land records when you're getting it done? And issues about openness, but also figure, do you have a right to access this land record which is held in this government department up there.

So we have to also move from that end to this middle ground that we are occupying in

the Internet Governance Forum to fully engage those whose primary interest is the use of the Net and to say that these issues that we are discussing are relevant and salient for your interests and your concerns.

I think then we will be able to reach out and attract a much larger community into this whole process of Internet governance. And this, incidentally, is how Internet governance was interpreted even in the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance.

We started with this. And it is for this reason that we have this forum.

Please also recognize that once you put it in these terms, there isn't an obvious place somewhere else where these issues are being discussed.

Yes, the technical mention of diversity may be discussed in the groups which are talking about Internationalized Domain Names or multilingualism. But is that all there is to diversity? Where are issues of access being discussed? Yes, issues of costs of access will be discussed in the context of ITU. But is that all there is to access? There's much more to it. Where is the totality of the issues which affect access being discussed?

What of security, cybercrime? Yes, there are places where this is being discussed. But what about the balance between security and privacy, which was the focus here? I accept the point which was raised that privacy is not just an issue in the context of the contrast with security. It also is an issue which is independently of importance. But where is that being discussed together?

So please remember that this forum is important because many of the things we have been talking about here are not being discussed anywhere else. And that's the importance of this forum.

What we need to do is to connect what we are talking with what people otherwise are interested in. This means we have to address the connection between our work and the uses that people make of the Net, whether it's e-governance, e-health, whether it is commerce, whether it is media or whatever. And reference was made earlier to the convergence, where -- between media, electronic media, and Internet.

My second point that I want to make is how we operate here. And many suggestions have been made. One class of suggestions is on participation, which I think we should take on board. Part of the challenge of participation is to explain our agenda in terms of what are other people's primary concerns. If we explain our agenda not just as something which is a translation of the sorts of things which get discussed in Internet technical forums, but also has a translation of what gets discussed in forums with ICT for development, we are not going to talk about ICT for development here. But what we say is, what we are talking about is relevant for your capacity to deliver e-education, e-health, e-governance. And therefore you should be concerned and take an interest in this area.

So we have to come from both ends, the technical end and the users of the Internet end, to this middle space that we occupy. And if that is the case, we will reach out. But we do have specific challenges of engaging governments. We have a specific challenge of engaging parliamentarians. A lot has been said about young people. They are the primary users of the net. They are far more adept at using it than most of us here are. And certainly we have to find ways of engaging them in something which is not just formalistic. Not a young person as a professional young person, but, really, something which is really, here is what they do with the Net, what their concerns are, and let us see whether we have a way of engaging with them to convince them a these issues that we are talking about are important from their perspective also.

I also think it's important to understand how we talk here.

One of the things we have to accept, that when you have a multistakeholder forum,

stakeholders don't give up their culture that easily, the culture of formal statements by governments, the culture of protest by nongovernmental organizations. Why should you protest when you are a full member of the organization? If you think there's something wrong, well, you're a member. Do something about it.

And we -- but, nevertheless, you will get polemics. What we have to understand is that we have to go beyond that into a dialogue of good faith, a dialogue you enter into where you are willing to be converted. You don't enter to proselytize, but you're also willing to listen and be converted, which is why I pose the question, is there somebody here who's going to go away with some particular view on Internet governance a little different from what it was when that person came here at the beginning of the week? So this willingness to be changed is what is important.

I believe some of it is happening. What we have succeeded in doing so far is reducing people's apprehensions, reducing people's concerns, "Oh, my God, they're going to talk about this. This is going to mean unnecessary interference, et cetera, et cetera, unnecessary interference by governments or unnecessary interference by NGOs, or unnecessary corporatization," whatever. I think we have managed to get a little bit beyond that, and there is much greater sense of trust, if you like, cautious trust, but trust, nevertheless.

I think the most important message I get from listening to all of you is a sense, to use David's phrase, that we have reached a point of inflection, where taking -- defending what we do and the value of what we do only in terms of process innovations is not enough, that people say now, "What's coming out of this?" Which is why the question, what are you going to take away from this? Do we have a process where people can take something away which is of value in the way in which they use the Net, the way in which they supply Net services, or the way in which they manage the Net.

And I think this is an important question.

There was a reference to the focus -- that we should consciously focus on searching for consensus, on trying to narrow differences through our processes of discussion and dialogue, not with the intention that we are going to become a decision-making forum, but that this process of dialogue and discussion helps in reaching decisions elsewhere. It's what, in diplomacy we would call track two diplomacy, if you like, which now every diplomate knows is of great value in almost any process. Many people have referred to something which I think most people accept as valuable, the fact that this process has spawned mirror images at the national level, at the regional level. And I think -- I get the sense that many people think this to be a very valuable exercise and a very valuable product, the dynamic coalitions which have developed.

And in some ways, as the last speaker said, this is acting as an exemplar of a multistakeholder process. And that's a very valuable outcome. That, in many ways, seeing this process, people feel, why can't we have something similar at a national, regional level. And in some ways this whole philosophy of multistakeholder engagement is finding expression at a level at which it can actually have a very direct contribution to decision-making.

I'm not surprised that we have a very large delegation from Brazil. Brazil is one country which already has a multistakeholder system for the management of the Net. And it's an example of why having a multistakeholder system at the national level increases the engagement with the process of this nature. So I'm not at all surprised that you have such a wide and diverse delegation from Brazil participating in this process.

Can we find a role for this in our process at the global level? Can we see the global IGF down the line as something which is a combination of what happens at the national and the regional level?

There's been reference to products. Mr. Muguet referred to the possibility of dynamic

coalitions giving recommendations as their recommendations. Everton Lucero referred to the example of the child pornography agreement which was reached in Rio. Can we design something where, at least in a few limited, well-defined areas where a process has succeeded in narrowing differences, finding consensus, we can come up with something which carries a certain legitimacy because it has come from a broader multistakeholder process in which the people who have ownership are not just governments, but governments, service providers, industry, NGOs, and many others? Yes, it doesn't have to be done for everything. It may be done only in a few areas, like the example that he gave of child pornography.

Should we be thinking in these terms?

And I get the sense that people feel that, look, it's time we started thinking about what do we get out of this process.

We don't have to be a legislative process. All valuable products are not necessarily legislative products.

In fact, sometimes the legislative products are of extremely limited value.

The important thing is it must be a product which the people who have responsibility for decision take seriously.

And those people may well be Internet Service Providers rather than governments.

They may have to take that seriously in implementing it.

So I don't think we have to think in terms of legislation in the usual sense of the term.

But reflecting something which is a genuine consensus, how do we do that.

People talked in terms of net-based, net groups coming together, developing things.

And I think what all this is leading to is trying to look towards a richer contributory process to the global IGF, the regional, the national IGFs, net-based coalitions developing this work, the dynamic coalitions coming up with products. And creating a space where these things will be talked about, will be discussed.

And I would stress once again there are very few fora where these issues are actually being discussed in the breadth and depths that we are doing here.

Segments are being discussed out of access, diversity, security, openness, et cetera.

Even critical Internet resources. In it's totality, it's not discussed anywhere.

It's segments which get discussed here, there and in places.

So we must exploit that advantage that we have of being able to bring these different things together.

There are many other things that I could have said. I will say them perhaps after more reflection when we meet in February in Geneva.

But the broad message that I get is, forgive me for getting back to my boy and girl analogy, but the broad message is what we need to tell the boy and girl now is, you have talked enough. Get a move on now and do something.

So this is the basis on which we shall -- so thank you very much.

[Applause]

Now we end this session and we shall move into the closing session straight away.

Please stay seated.