EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

PART II: Transcripts of the Proceedings

The 10th Internet Governance Forum (IGF)
10-13 November 2015
João Pessoa, Brazil

IGF Internet Governance Forum

The 10th Internet Governance Forum (IGF): 'Evolution of Internet Governance: Empowering Sustainable Development'

10-13 November 2015
João Pessoa, Brazil

Part II: Transcripts of the Proceedings

DESA Mission Statement

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat is a vital interface between global policies in the economic, social and environmental spheres and national action. The Department works in three main interlinked areas: 1) It compiles, generates and analyses a wide range of economic, social and environmental data and information on which States Members of the United Nations draw to review common problems and to take stock of policy options; 2) It facilitates the negotiations of Member States in many intergovernmental bodies on joint course of action to address ongoing or emerging global challenges; and 3) it advises interested Governments on the ways and means of translating policy frameworks developed in United Nations conferences and summits into programmes at the country level and, through technical assistance, helps build national capacities.

Note by UNDESA

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The term 'country' as used in the text of this publication also refers, as appropriate, to territories and areas. Since there is no established convention for the designation of "developed" and "developing" countries or areas in the United Nations system, this distinction is made for statistical and analytical purposes only and does not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or region in the development process. Mention of the name of any company, organization, product or website does not imply endorsement on the part of the United Nations. The views expressed in this publication are those of the individual authors (see acknowledgements) and do not imply any expression of opinion on the part of the United Nations.

The IGF 2015 Report - Part II: Transcripts of the Proceedings

Table of Contents

Message from Under-Secretary-General Mr. Wu Hongbo

The 10th annual Internet Governance Forum in 2015 once again demonstrated the key role of the IGF and its growing community of stakeholders in facilitating discussion on crucial themes and issues related to Internet governance. Indeed, the success and utility of the IGF was re-affirmed when its mandate was extended for another 10 years as part of the UN General Assembly's WSIS+10

.
The annual global multistakeholder Internet Governance gathering took place from the 10th to the 13th of November 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil. It was hosted for the 2nd time by the government of Brazil, who have been an active player in the IGF and the multistakeholder Internet Governance model since its inception in 2006. More than 2,400 registered participants from over 116 countries attended the meeting, with thousands more actively participating online. The overarching theme for IGF 2015 was: 'Evolution of Internet Governance: Empowering Sustainable Development'. This theme was timely, as the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015, and reviewed the implementation of the WSIS outcomes at its 70th Session soon after the IGF. Output-oriented debates and discussions during the four-day meeting addressed both opportunities and challenges under the following sub-themes: Cybersecurity and Trust; Internet Economy; Inclusiveness and Diversity; Openness; Enhancing Multistakeholder Cooperation; Internet and Human Rights; Critical Internet Resources; and Emerging Issues.

Through preparatory activities and during the 4-day meeting the IGF once again demonstrated its capacity to produce tangible outcomes within a multistakeholder collaborative framework. Mobilizing the inherent benefits of solving problems through a diversity of perspectives, and building on a busy and compelling agenda, the IGF community was united in its willingness to address complex issues and work towards concrete solutions. The IGF 2015 was also successful in facilitating greater participation among stakeholders from developing countries and enhancing linkages between the growing number of national and regional IGF initiatives, the global IGF and the rest of the Internet governance ecosystem.

The entire IGF 2015 was webcast and interactive online participation enriched sessions throughout the week, allowing many additional participants from all over the world to engage with those present in João Pessoa. Real-time transcription was also available to enhance the overall participatory experience for delegates both there in the meeting rooms and those following around the globe. 50 remote hubs connected participants from countries such as Mexico, Argentina, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Egypt, Iran, Cuba and New Zealand, to name a few. Thousands of interested individuals followed the proceedings on Twitter (#IGF2015), so that virtual discussions took off even before the meeting started, continued throughout the week, and lasted long after delegates left Brazil to return home. This two-part publication contains a summary and the proceedings of the 2015 IGF.

UNDESA has helped foster the growth of the IGF in the past ten years and we look forward to continuing to do so, together with you, in the next decade.
Thank You.

WU Hongbo
Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs
United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Editor's Introduction: The 2015 IGF Report

This is the 10th edition of the annual Internet Governance Forum (IGF) proceedings produced by the IGF Secretariat since the first meeting in Athens in 2006. By collecting and organizing the outputs, reports, transcripts, webcasts and other proceedings here in this 2-part report, the IGF Secretariat hopes that this content helps capture the historically important institutional memory of the discussions and debates during the now thousands of sessions that have taken place within the IGF in its first ten years.

The 2015 proceedings are presented in two parts. **Part I: Summary of IGF 2015 – Reports and Outputs of the 11th IGF** intends to provide a comprehensive overall summary of the annual meeting and includes all of the main session, workshop, open forum and other reports (together with links to their transcripts and webcasts if available) produced from the meeting as well as the Chair's Summary, tangible outputs from the 2015 IGF Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion work and reflections on the meeting including the stock-taking synthesis report, the gender report card and attendance statistics.

Part II: Transcripts of the Proceedings contains edited transcripts from all of the high-level main sessions that took place during the 4-day meeting, as have been traditionally presented by the Secretariat since the first edition of the IGF proceedings. Transcripts of the High-Level Opening Ceremony, Opening Session and Closing Ceremony are also included. Transcripts contain both verbatim records of participants who spoke in English as well as English translations of those who spoke in one of the other UN official languages and Portuguese. Therefore, just as in the previous publications, some statements may be easier to understand and more clearly written than others. But we hope what is captured most significantly are the constructive debates and exchanges of opinions and ideas that make the IGF deliberations so unique. Links to the IGF website which contain full un-edited transcripts produced immediately after the meeting are also included in the Part II Table of Contents.

Ten-Year Review of the World Summit on the Information Society: Developing Messages from the IGF Community

The following are the outputs of the real-time captioning taken during the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in João Pessoa, Brazil, from 10 to 13 November 2015. 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 event, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

***

ANDRE FIGUEIREDO: Good morning to everyone present.

I would like to welcome all of you again at the 10th IGF meeting. Particularly I would like to mention with affection the presence of the WSIS Co-facilitators, Lana Zaki Nusseibeh from the United Arab Emirates and His Excellency Janic Majeiks from Latvia, and the work of the debate of the 10 years of the Information Society work in New York and their meeting on the 15th of December.

The participation of the Ambassadors, this will provide a unique opportunity for the results of the session to be immediately transmitted to the main responsible people of the drafting of the final document of the December meeting. In Brazil we are NETmundial, here we are represented by its multistakeholder Committee with the CGI. It is very pleased to have this debate, people, where we can experience a participative debate of building consensus.

It is worth mentioning that Brazil is enthusiastic of the multistakeholder model. It is the second time we host IGF: The first was in 2007 in Rio, and then in 2013 we had a WorldNet which was a pioneer example to have the concrete sessions for the development of the Internet ecosystem by a multistakeholder process. Brazil is a pioneer in the Marco da Civil drafting with a collaborative contribution at WorldNet. We base ourselves on the definition of global principles for the governance of the Internet and on the definition of a root for a future evolution of Internet Governance. Today in 2015 this debate has become more important and urgent as we approach the conclusion of the process of revision of the 10 years of the WSIS World Summit.

This morning we'll have the opportunity of listening to the different players on the successes and failures of the World Summit and maintaining the accomplishments and now we'll have the chance of identifying the challenges we have ahead that should be addressed from the decision to be taken at the meeting that's a high-level meeting of the UN to be held in New York on the 15th and 16th of December. Thus, we should recognize and greet the international efforts of WSIS+10 with the priorities and challenges related to this and the advance of the new needs in social demands in our viewpoint, the important discussions to be held regarding Internet Governance, I mention the need to redebate the current governance arrangements and the importance of evolving in a debate on the definition and implementation of enhanced communication in Tunis.

In this context, Brazil has defined the importance of the mandate of IGF following the governance structure and working methods. On the other hand, especially under the viewpoint of developing countries, we believe it is necessary for the process to advance the concrete mentions for the overcoming of the digital gap considering the technological development and the challenges faced by society. This morning we have the possibility of exchanging impressions and visions on this process. That certainly will contribute to the enriching of the final version of the document to be appreciated in December.

Thus, I conclude this brief intervention with my expectation that via this collective exercise we can gather visions and reach consensus that may be formally incorporated to the process of revision of the 10 years of the WSIS World Summit.

I'm sure with consultation meetings with governmental sectors in New York in July and October the debate we'll have this morning will contribute greatly so that the Ambassadors can receive suggestions and assess the areas of greater concern of Civil Society, private sector and academic and technical communities in the world regarding the themes being discussed and the process WSIS+10.

In this, I would like to thank everyone for your time, and I would like to give the floor to the co-moderators of the session, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho and Lynn St. Amour to proceed with the words.

>> H.E. AMB. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHA: As indicated by the administrator, we have the privilege of counting the presence of the Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives from Latvia, Ambassador Janis Mazeiks and from the United Arab Emirates Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, that represent their countries in the UN in New York and are Co-Chairing the preparatory works for the high-level meeting in December in New York. It is a great privilege for us to have their presence here.

As you know, the General Assembly is having a session from September to December, the General Assembly has its annual session and they're considering the fact that they're heading their missions in New York, they have several attributions, topics that deserve their attention. I would like to mention that it is a great privilege for us to have their presence here.

>> ANDRE FIGUEIREDO: I'm grateful for your participation.

We know at this time at the General Assembly it is a very intense, demanding time for the Permanent Representatives. We're grateful for you for coming here to discuss this with us.

With these words of introduction, I would just like to give the floor to Ambassadors so that they can make a presentation and update the situation in New York so that they can comment on the process and that should result in the meeting -- the high-level meeting of December.

>> H.E. JANIS MAZIEKS: Thank you.

Dear participants, it is my privilege to participate in this IGF meeting and address you as a Co-facilitator of the overall review of the WSIS, the process of which the IGF itself has started.

I would like to begin by thanking the Host Country Brazil for the tremendous efforts in making this meeting a success.

To me, the number and diversity of participants present at this year's meeting is a good reminder that the idea behind the IGF is very relevant and there is a high demand to have such discussion platform.

My intention here today is to give you a brief account of ongoing preparations for the high-level meeting that will take place on 15th through 16th of December, UN General Assembly and then, I hope, that we'll engage in rich exchanging of views especially given that present set of participants is different from the New York meetings.

As you may well know, it was decided during the second phase of WSIS to request the United Nations General Assembly to conduct its overall review of the implementation of WSIS outcomes in 2015. After the intensive and extensive negotiations in 2014 the UN General Assembly in the so-called resolution agreed to organize a 2-day high-level meeting in December of 2015 marking the end of the 2015 review process. This resolution prescribes the roles of governments and other stakeholders in the review process.

December meeting is expecting to produce a negotiated outcome document which will take stock of the progress made in the implementation of the outcomes of WSIS, addressing existing challenges and indicating areas of continued focus, including the focus of taking in consideration the contribution of all of the relevant stakeholders.

It is an honor to serve as one of the Co-facilitators along with my colleague Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates to UN, Lana Nusseibeh.

In the first informal meeting of the plenary, as part of this intergovernmental preparatory process for the WSIS+10 review took place on 1st of July, 2015 following an initial stocktaking meeting on the 10th and 11th of June of 2015. The aim of the first meeting was to provide an opportunity for Member and Observer States and Observers to share inputs on the expectations of the elements to be captured in the December outcome document.

In the first informal meetings we received many written contributions which prepared the non-paper to discuss the objectives and later develop a Zero draft of the document to be developed in December.

The Zero draft document was discussed in another meeting providing detailed content to the structure and overall review and reaffirming the WSIS vision established.

In parallel preparatory meetings, two rounds of consultations with stakeholders were held by the President of The General Assembly on 2nd of July and 19th of October respectively. These consultations provided an interaction with the multistakeholder during the process.

We're carefully studying all contributions and keeping closely involved with all in the process. We made an effort to create a balanced basis for further negotiations, and a few days ago we circulated draft outcome document.

Currently we're just days away from starting intensive textual negotiation on the document. We would appreciate to hear your views in general and on specific aspects and themes of the WSIS review.

Before that, I would like to pass the floor to my colleague Lana Zaki Nusseibeh who will provide a more detailed explanation on the ongoing debate including Internet Governance within the WSIS review.

Let me conclude that written contributions make one part of the review process and there is nothing more valuable than face-to-face meetings with all interested parties. I'm very much looking forward to fruitful exchange during our stay here in Joao Pessoa.

Thank you.

>> H.E. LANA ZAKI NUSSEIBEH: Thank you, Andre Figueiredo.

We're delighted, we're honored to be here. We would like to thank the Government of Brazil for their generous arrangements for us to be here today and for their careful stewardship of the IGF this year. It is a phenomenal experience so far.

It is our first IGF. We're excited to be here, and we're listening to your views on the process so far and what you would like to see happen next. We have been grateful for the opportunity to meet with many of you on the sidelines of the formal meetings and take that input forward.

Throughout the UN's review of the WSIS outcomes we heard about the IGF from all corners of the government, private, certain, academic communities as the world's foremost platform for governance and multisectorial multistakeholder to carry out the vision of a people centered, inclusive development-oriented society.

It is exciting and instructive to participate. We have encountered firsthand the frank, incredibly diverse, well-informed discussions proving the reality of how valuable this forum is. The ideas debated and refined here are precisely the inputs that we and all stakeholders need to take back to New York, especially now entering the critical stages of negotiations. This process is too important to get wrong.

As Ambassador Janis Mazeiks explained, this is a timely opportunity to look back over the last 10 years of Internet development, evaluate progress made and the challenges that remain and identify the priorities for the future. Frankly, ten years in ICT time is like five decades in another sector. If there is one point that the UN review has made clear, it is that the value of the Internet has increased beyond almost any expectation in 2005. ICT is so firmly embedded in our lives and the economy that any conversation about its future is in fact also a conversation about development, about values, culture, about security.

I think it is worth repeating statistics to underscore the scale of change, and these statistics we as Co-facilitators take in every negotiation so that people remember the substance of what we're discussing as they enter negotiations on text.

From 2005 to 2015 the number of mobile phone subscriptions went from 2.2 to 7.1 billion. 2.5 billion are expected to be online by the end of 2015, over 40% of the world's population by the end of 2015. Of these 2 billion are in developing countries.

Additionally, mobile Broadband is the fastest growing market segment in the world. 2014, 32% global penetration, four times higher than in 2009.

It is accordingly not surprising that the governance of the Internet assumed such a large place in WSIS discussions, and that these are equal parts optimism and trepidation over how negotiations around the governance play out. It is telling that 2.5 thousand people came to Joao Pessoa with many more participating remotely to hear and to be heard about this topic.

I would like to try to contextualize the governance debate within the WSIS review, starting with the frame of ICTs for development, and then going into the New York-based conversation on Internet Governance.

So a taste of that discussion in New York:

Many think of the UN as largely focused on security, an important pillar of the work is on Sustainable Development. This is, moreover, an intensifying focus, as both moral outrage and understanding of the security connection grow in response to the fact that 836 million people still live in extreme poverty. Environmental health continues to be threatened. Let alone the fact that today there are more refugees globally than at any time since World War II with a number that's almost at 60 million. This problem is only intensifying as conflicts in all parts of the world fail to find solutions.

To address this amongst other issue, all 193 Member States and thousands of non-government delegates gathered and agreed to mobilize partnerships to eradicate poverty, protect the planet, achieve peace, and you will recall the Millennium Development Goals adopted which largely focused on less developed countries, we have come a long way since then. The Sustainable Development Goals demonstrate a significant shift and approach of the international community as they apply to every country of the world recognizing we can all benefit from the global commitment to social, environmental and economic betterment.

Of greatest relevance to our gathering today, the 2030 Agenda explicitly recognizes that ICTs are both a driver and an indicator for development and economic growth. Having a mobile phone, for instance, is now common aspiration. At the same time, we're moving past correlation to cause with connectivity, income, education, health, many other underpinning aspects of development.

In the context of development, ICTs brought life-changing impacts. Mobile banking has transformed financial access for the poor, especially for rural populations. Being able to receive realtime weather forecasts or market price data helped farmers to raise yields and grow incomes. Social media platforms revolutionized everything from disaster response to citizen-government interaction.

We no longer talk about whether ICT should be a part of development, but rather how they should be leveraged to their maximum potential for everybody.

Harnessing the potential of ICTs for social and economic progress is at the core of the WSIS, the mandate of the UN more broadly.

The many success stories of the last ten years as well as the impressive data regarding increased global connectivity lead many to ask the question why fix the system if it isn't broken? The answer lies in the other side of these statistics, the digital divide. Today 80% of online content is only available in one language. 60% of the world lacks Internet access, and only 37% of the world's women have Internet access, which is a statistic that I think is unacceptable to many.

So while there are enormous leaps in advancement and impact of ICT in parts of the world and for some groups of people, the gaps between those with Internet access and those without is still too large.

Looking at the reasons behind the digital divide and how to tap into the potential of ICTs has been a priority of the WSIS since its inception in Geneva. Globally, narrowing the divide requires capacity-building initiatives and technology transfers, and creation of an enabling environment, better public-private partnerships and more investment.

Within countries, advancing the discussions around enhancing women's education and participation in ICTs as users and entrepreneurs and leaders are important. Ensuring the Internet is accessible for people with disabilities, particularly the vision impaired, is key and may require explicit policy action.

Another trend we're seeing over the last 10 years is the focus on the need for equitable access. Just having access to ICTs and the Internet is no longer enough. The quality of access, relevance of content is also critical. Moreover, technologies and services must be affordable, and information must be available in different languages.

Finally, for true access to be achieved, everyone around the world needs to have the ability to create and develop their own content and to contribute to the richness of the Information Society. How then do we get greater penetration of ICTs, raise the quality and affordability of access and ensure the relevance of content, enabling ICTs to drive achievements of the SDGs?

On Internet Governance, this is a question that's perhaps one of the more contentious ones in the WSIS review at the UN. While nobody disputes the role of education and good domestic policy, there are groups of countries that see reform of Internet Governance as being central to harnessing the ICT for development and groups of countries that adamantly disagree with this view.

The growing use of ICT for crime, terrorism, other illicit purposes has further exacerbated the tension, further mixing concerns on security and Human Rights with concerns of governance. For instance, if terrorism undermines the development, many countries and stakeholders say that the use is in the interest of development. On the other hand, many others see such intervention as a slippery slope to strangling the creative spirit that made the Internet so successful in the first place.

In a similar vein, there are many divergent views on who has the decision-making on the governance issues and what the impacts on the development would be. We have seen calls from many different configurations of governments and non-government actors each with their own understanding of the contribution to further the deployment and innovation, and therefore development.

In fact, there may not be a one-size-fits-all approach. There are many different layers to Internet Governance and not all of the decisions involved in the operation of the Internet will need all stakeholders at all times.

There is deeply political and technical aspects that are under consideration. We should be aware of all this and how they affect one another.

I would emphasize a strongest point of consensus in the UN WSIS review is that governments and non-government stakeholders should both have a voice and input into the process. This is by no means a

common view in intergovernmental processes, and this is a direct result of the IGF in many ways. While there is a call for greater participation, the reason it is working, everybody is richer from the inclusiveness.

Ultimately, ensuring the achievement of a people-centered inclusive, development-oriented Information Society requires the broadest sense of ownership, and the best ideas from every part of the world and there is resounding acknowledgment that the IGF enables both elements.

Before I close, we would like to take advantage of this feature of the IGF and put three questions to the room that could inform our ongoing negotiations back in New York:

One, what concrete measures and policy and financing can accelerate achievement of affordable, relevant, high-quality access in order to bridge the digital divide?

Two, what are the specific measures that can address the gender dimension of the divide, and how do we make sure that our global Internet Governance system reflects the global nature of the Internet?

Again, I would like to thank you for having us here, for the opportunity to work together for an outcome in December that we can all rally behind and, we're really here this week in listening mode to hear your views. Thank you for the opportunity to do so.

[Applause].

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: I thank you both for your comments. Your valuable insights as Co-Facilitators of the process provides us with a good basis for the discussions.

I would say no better introduction could be made, and thank you for posing the questions that should also guide and be a parameter for interventions that will follow.

I would like to turn now to my co-moderator, Lynn St. Amour.

Lynn St. Amour is the President and CEO of Internet Matters, and she will explain and guide the rules for our discussions that will follow.

You have the floor, please.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you, Ambassador.

I'm pleased to be back in Brazil again and very pleased and fortunate to have the two UNGA WSIS+10 Co-Facilitators with us.

We were the co-moderators for the session or perhaps put another way, the timekeepers. As the two Co-Facilitators indicates, they're here in an active listening mode. It is to say that this is not a typical panel session you may find at the IGF. They're here to hear from all of you. It is not a debate -- though they may have some clarifying questions and if so, they should indicate to Benedicto Fonseca Filho and I and we'll give you the floor.

Now to the more specific administrative details, we just completed part 1, which was setting the scene and we're moving to a fairly lengthy session, a little over two hours in total, which is going to be dedicated to developing messages from the IGF community and ending with a summary of key messages. The consultation is based on the updated Zero draft, it is called the draft outcome document and was published November 4th. That should be scrolling here in the background as well in order to aid the process here.

We did pass out some sheets, the URL is there for the document if you need it. In this case, the search engines are also your friends.

We have over two hours for this session, and we'll walk through the major sections in turn. We would like to ask you to place your comments in the appropriate sections. We have four identified: One is ICT for

development covering the preamble and sections 1 through 3 of the document; section two, Internet Governance and enhanced cooperation and that will cover section 4; the third section is implementation and follow-up, section 5, and then we have another section at the very end which is called other or additional messages or an open mike and some other forums.

Following the process used in the WSIS+10 preparatory process in New York we suggested some guiding questions. Those are on the reverse side of the sheets that you were handed as you walked in. You're free to comment on any of the sections of the draft you wish, but those were meant to just help direct the discussion a bit and we have the three excellent questions put to the floor as well.

There are four separate microphones here in the room and a fifth one for online participation. We indicated when people were coming in the room, we hope successfully, that the mikes were organized with business, private sector on this side, my left, Civil Society is in the middle on the left and government is over here on the right and then technical government and IGO and then technical and academia is there on my far right. We're going to rotate across those five groups. Participants will be allocated a maximum of 2-minute statements to make their time slots, to make their statements. We may reduce the time for participants at the end if, in fact, the size of the queue demands that.

It is not a debate. We really want to hear from you. Please make your comment as clearly and as much to the point as possible. This will enable as many voices to be heard and you can take the microphone in multiple sessions. Think of this as enabling a neighbor's voice to be heard through your own judicious use of air time.

For those that aren't able to keep their comments to 2 minutes we have a timekeeper, it is a thankless job for any of us, but she will be indicating when people have hit the 1 minute, the 30-minute mark as long as we're in a 2-minute discussion section.

With that, I want to open the floor up. I think it makes sense to start left to right. We'll ask people to start queuing at the mikes. If you're familiar with Netmundial, you are familiar with it.

This is a session, ICT4D, we'll spend 40 minutes there. I will moderate that section and then Benedicto Fonseca Filho will moderate the second. I will give you a moment to get to the mikes and I can read out the questions that we had indicated.

The first is how can ICTs be harnessed for Sustainable Development?

What insights and experiences from the last 10 years should be highlighted by the review?

What concrete measures can help bridge the digital divide, including between and within countries, and between women and men?

How can the IGF community contribute to the implementation of the SDGs in achieving ICT4D for all?

What could be the role of the IGF in these efforts?

And finally, Human Rights issue, we have included two other section: How should Human Rights issues related to ICTs be addressed in the outcome document and finally how should the outcome document handle present and emerging concerns about cybersecurity?

Please go to the mike. This is not a panel. This is an opportunity to share your thoughts, question, opinions to everybody here.

I will go left to right and if one of the mikes is open, obviously we'll move to the next.

Please, introduce yourself and your affiliation.

And we'll need active mike control here from the audiovisual team.

>> JOE ALHADEFF: Thank you. I'm Joe Alhadeff with Oracle and ICC.

We think that the current draft has struck a very good balance related to the ICT for development. We would highlight some of the comments made by the could facilitator, related to the breadth of technologies that are helpful here from the idea of whether rainfall historical data, big data analytics to move these things together, this is available to be done in development countries as well, the technology is transferable and applicable and we also think the breadth of the technological applications goes across all of the development goals, not just the few that call them out. This is a useful tool to formulate a very integrated and approach. In particular, we suggest the SDG target 16.10 which ensures the public access to information and fundamental freedoms could be precisely cited in this chapter on ICT for development.

And my two point is related to the Human Rights section. We would like to complement the improvement in this version. In the Zero version we have suggested to have a stand-alone, more prominent section on the Human Rights. At that time it was just a subsector and the Internet Governance, now we have it. It is sufficiently elaborated.

We would like to reconfirm the Geneva Declaration and the Tunis complement and as UNESCO, and also the universality concept, we reaffirm the commitment to the universality to the interdependence and the relation of all Human Rights including rights to free expression, right to privacy, right to education, right to culture participation and the security of person and also to the development and the gender equality. That's the second point.

Number three, we have noticed vocabulary inconsistency in the text. For example, the multilateral, it is used to describe the multistakeholder approach. We think there are two concepts which should be more consistent in using multistakeholder approach.

And another vocabulary is about the management of Internet and the Governance of Internet. They're two different things. We would like the vocabulary to be fixed in the new text.

That's it. Thank you very much. If you need, I can provide our inputs in writing by UNESCO.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you. That would be helpful.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Good morning. I'm Raul Echeberria, the Vice President for Global Engagement of the Internet Society.

First of all, I would like to thank the organizers of the session, that's really, really important, and I would like to thank especially the Co-Facilitators for the process for coming to the IGF. It is not a minor thing. It is a strong sign of the importance of the multistakeholder process on the Internet Governance.

Limiting my comments to the part of ICT and development and Human Rights, I would like to say that we're very glad to see that the focus on the development on this document. This is a big change. It is not a coincidence that this focus is coming up at the same time that we have on the table the new Sustainable Development Goals. We like very much the idea of seeing the ICTs, not just one more chapter of goals in development but a cross-cutting thing, this is ICTs should be seen as an instrument for achieving all of the development goals and I see that this focus on the document.

Besides that, I was very, very glad to see in the discussions, in the last WSIS review meeting in New York that many governments are embracing this view so I think that's -- we think this is the document that's very balanced in that sense.

In terms of Human Rights, we're very pleased to see the importance of Human Rights in the document. We're sensitive of Human Rights being in the center of the discussion. We say and we have -- we say many times during this process it is impossible to think in a people-centered Information Society if Human Rights are not one of the foundations of that society. So it is closing the two issues. We think that the Human Rights and

development is the central issues on the post-2015 Agenda on WSIS and should be reflected well in the document. WSIS can continue to discuss many things, high-level things, and after this year, after the December meeting, but we think that it is really Human Rights and development, it should be the center of all discussions after 2015.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Do we have a comment from the remote or online participation?

>> REMOTE MODERATOR: Not currently. Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Business, private sector.

Hello.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you. Your Excellency, distinguished ladies and gentlemen. I'm Jimson Olufuye, the Chair of the Africa ICT Alliance.

First of all, I would like to underscore what you are speaking about earlier. ICT has been critical to business in developing and least-developed countries, it is the greatest beneficiaries in a way. With regard to take away, yes, it needs to be sustained, we need to sustain the process of embedding ICT in the various development processes and for us, what we need to do, we need to focus more on policy development processes in the developing countries. We believe that it will have another openness in governance. More transparency and more accountability which is key for businesses and for peoples in developing and least-developed nations.

Talking about concrete measures, universal service phones, we would like to see that this phone is more transparently used in developing countries and to provide access to many more people, reduce cost, make it more affordable, this is quite key for us and we believe that getting to understanding more the multistakeholder approach as well.

Talking about the role of IGF, more IGF needs to be established in country because we need to get more people to understand the subject matter and recently in Nigeria we started to have IGF, we need to encourage IGF not even national but also intersector in the country so more people have an understanding on the issue.

On Human Rights, we believe everybody has a right to be informed. Every one of us has a right to be informed and we think that ICT can make that happen in the outcome document.

The last point I would like to address at this time is regard to cybersecurity. Cybersecurities are collective security, it is a concern to all of us and all stakeholders need to play an important role in all of this.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Civil Society.

>> DONNY B.U.: Thank you for giving me the opportunity. I'm from ICT in Indonesia. I have two suggestions regarding the section of the development and the second, it is for another section.

The number one, I propose to include the technology approach at the end of paragraph number 15 of ICT sections so at the end of the paragraph more or less it will say now understood to be foundational country to enable the development with recognizing the principle and importance of technology and neutrality. Be sure that technology neutrality is different than net neutrality, the one means the same regulatory rules apply regardless of the technology used. The regulations should not be drafted in the technology in silos. It very much is relevant to the SDG number 10.3 that to ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities including

discriminatory law, policy and practices and promoting appropriate legislations, policies and action in this regard.

I believe technology, net neutrality can ensure any alternative communication technology, may and will have appropriate opportunities to be acknowledged and developed, as to those that are developed by global, that's number two.

And another, getting to the next section: With the number of proper deliberations, of course, I strongly suggest to prioritize, at the beginning of paragraph 50 in the intergovernance section. At the beginning of the paragraph, more or less we'll say we affirm that the governance of the Internet should be multistakeholder transparent, so on. I believe that development of future Internets should be a process reflected from the rights, obligations and the people, not from any particular states or global player. I also recall that the WSIS+10 review should reaffirm the principle agreed in the World Summit including continuously promote and encourage more holistic approach. Due to this approach on a national level, it has began conducted by a number of democratic countries such as Indonesia, and therefore the comprehension and implementation of the multistakeholder should be upheld strongly and reflected in the regional and global effort.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

I just would like to remind everybody that we would like to concentrate on the ICT4D, the preamble in sections 1 through 3, and we'll come to the Internet Governance and enhanced collaboration in the next session.

The timing went beyond 2 minutes because the queues at the mike, they were sparse. As they fill, we'll be on that more.

We'll go to the government mike.

>> Thank you.

I'm from Minister of Communication and telecommunication in Indonesia.

I think my inputs will be straightaway to number 14 on the screen.

We have to -- the number 9, number 10, reduce within and among countries, so the complete sentence will be we commit to have lessen the potential of ICTs to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other internationally agreed development goals noting that ICTs can accelerate progress across all sustainable goals in addition to the specific reference in SDGs 4b in brackets, education and scholarships, 5b, women's empowerment, 9c, infrastructure and access, and 10, produce equality within countries and then we have the technology bank and capacity building will call on all governments and all other stakeholders to integrate ICTs in their implementation approaches to the SDGs and for UN entities facilitating the WSIS action lines to contextualize their reporting and work within the 2030 Agenda.

That's all.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

I think that technical and academic queue is empty.

Again, online participation?

>> REMOTE MODERATOR: We still have no comments.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Business.

>> Thank you.

I am from Egypt. I'm a board member in the Africa ICT Alliance.

I just want to echo my colleagues on the same that it is very important and we appreciate very much the availability of the wording regarding ICT across all Sustainable Development Goals. At the same time, it is very important to emphasize the role of SMEs from development countries and to highlight some examples of ICT for development like localized solution for eHealth in Africa or eLearning, serving remote, underdeveloped areas that would certainly bring richness to this and would certainly serve the rest of the developing world.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Civil Society.

>> PETER MASAK: Thank you.

I'm Peter Masak from Access Now.

I would like to draw attention to the positive language on privacy and mass surveillance and other forms of surveillance and paragraph 42. We support this language asthmas surveillance violates Human Rights turning all citizens and users into suspects. We feel that privacy must be protected online as it is off line and this section draws attention to the important role that Human Rights law plays in ensuring that all interception of communications and other types of surveillance is with other international laws and norms. In addition, mass surveillance threatens trust in the use of ICTs and must be considered as an obstacle to development.

In this way, we also suggest language ensuring that encryption tools are protected online as they're enablers to the freedom of expression and privacy in the digital age. The encryption tools access is the best way many vulnerable ICT users have to protect themselves from malicious attacks on the Internet. The Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression David Kay recently found that blanket prohibitions on encryption violated international Human Rights. In addition, encryption is essential to banking systems, eHealth, any technical system where security, authentication, integrity of communications is paramount.

In this way protecting encryption both enables access to Human Rights online but also ensures the benefits of the development of society, and how it is spread.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Government queue.

>> MICHAEL WALMA: Thank you. Good morning.

I'm Michael Walma, I'm the Cyber Coordinator for the Department of Foreign Affairs in Canada. I would like to start by thanking the Co-Facilitators for being here and for the Chair in Brazil for making this session possible. I think that this is a critically important initiative if we're to maintain the multistakeholder approach and the involvement of all stakeholders in the process. I very much welcome this initiative here today.

In keeping with that sentiment, I would like to note that it would be our approach that we're taking careful note of this conversation as I know the Co-facilitators are and we would hope to be able to reflect enough of what we hear today in the discussions in New York to ensure that all voices are heard.

For Canada, the section that we're talking about here is, of course, of key relevance, the ICT for development is central to the vision of the world's Information Society and we believe this is very properly the focus of the report and we find the language here much improved over previous drafts. The linkages to Agenda 2030 are critical because, of course, that's the overall approach to development issues and these must be mutually reinforcing and compatible.

With respect to some of the other elements that you're asking for comments on here, I can be relatively brief because as a government we'll have other opportunities to make our views known, but with respect to the Human Rights language, we find that the language here to be very forward looking, very balanced, important for thaws we recognize that Human Rights obligations apply online just as they do offline and that this is recognized by this group.

With respect to the final point on security, the language there is I think -- it needs some work frankly. It tends to focus pretty much, as do other sections of the report, in some places on governmental rules and I think doesn't adequately talk about some of the other activities that are being -- that are undertaken, some by Civil Society, some by private industry, but I think it also is a bit of a UN focus, not necessarily recognizing some of the other efforts that are being -- that are taking place talking about the recent conference hosted by the Dutch in the Hague where there was a global cyber expertise set up which has as its goal sharing of information on cybersecurity practices and a clearinghouse for capacity building efforts. Other regional organizations, the OHS for example, where Canada is particularly active, they do a great deal on cybersecurity. I think we need to look more broadly at the question of cybersecurity and not see this as strictly a UN and strictly a state to state issue.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Technical and academic queue, still empty? There was somebody up there earlier? Not normally known for being shy.

Back to Civil Society. I think we owe you a thanks.

>> MATTHER SHEERS: Thank you.

I would like to highlight the unique opportunity we have before us with regards to ICTs in development. We see in the text and thank you to the Co-Facilitators for producing an excellent text. We see in there a number of references to the SDGs and the importance of those links, we see it in paragraph 14 and then we see it dotted around elsewhere, what's missing in this document is the importance of this commitment to the SDGs in the follow-up and final section of the document.

We really do have an opportunity back in 2003 we talked about the millennium development goals, but we seem to have missed that boat, the ICTs harnessing ICTs for development and the MDGs from knotting sufficiently linked up and it is a crying shame if we don't have that -- a greater sense of linkages between the SDGs and the WSIS going forward. The only way to make substantive progress on the SDGs if we realize that this is a fundamental enabler, it is wonderful to list them but it is more important to come up with an Agenda, plan, for ensuring that the ICTs are harnessed for the SDGs.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Going to the government mike.

>> My name is Muhammad and I'm Chairman of the Telecom Regulatory Authority of Afghanistan.

I understand one of the major messages is in the document is that not a single player can handle the situation and the multistakeholder approach is of immense importance for us. We do understand that the alignment of the international ICT policy and SDGs, they're of critical importance and that's why we very much endorse the suggestion that the ICT policies and the Sustainable Development Goals should be aligned together.

However important it is also to make sure that through the IGF and all other stakeholders, how we could ensure the development of infrastructure, in particular in the countries where the ICT sector is not very much developed.

Likewise, governmental levels it is very important that we move the barriers that are challenging the investment by the private sector. There is further need and elaboration is required to make it clear of how we can encourage the private sector so that they could have their initiatives and how the governments could grow towards more liberalization of the policies. It is important that the IGF involves governments at different levels to make sure that the technology awareness, it is raised on one hand and then on the other hand, it is important to encourage the government officials at the highest levels so that they could include all these recommendations while they're developing the initial policies.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Technical mike.

>> BYRON HOLLAND: Hi. I'm Byron Holland. I'm the president and CEO of CIRA, the Canadian operator of the dotca country code. I'm also Chair of the CCNSO at ICANN which represents all country code operators in the world. We have 153 members currently. I would like to speak in my capacity as CEO of CIRA.

I would like to draw attention to how well -- how much I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this event, and how well organized it appears to have been. My colleagues and friends at CGI.br, a key participant there, I would like to call them out, recognize them and say thank you for a job well done.

I would echo many of the comments we have heard thus far this morning, there is much to recommend in the document thus far.

However, I'm going to speak to some of the things that concern me and in particular one theme that runs throughout the document. It starts in the preamble. It is set up in the preamble in Article 12 and then weaves its way throughout the entire document. That's the role of the multistakeholder model and how it is diminished throughout the document. In favor of wording around multilateralism. I would suggest that the multistakeholder model has successfully brought almost 3 billion people online in little more than 15 years and it is poised to connect the rest of the world's citizens in short order.

Throughout the current draft, the term multistakeholder is only used in the past tense. Typically referring to events that happened in the past. Multilateralism is used for all forward looking activities and is presented in a manner that assumes it has always been thus. It simply does not reflect the practical reality.

The multistakeholder model has been in place to govern the Internet's technical resources from the very beginning of the modern Internet. The evidence proves that it has been tremendously successful.

I would say going forward, you know, for example, the multistakeholder Internet community has been engaged in the stewardship transition process in the past 18 months, this is one of the most important undertakings of the global multistakeholder community, it is a process that's taken some time but it is critical we get it right. Internationalizing the technical Internet functions involves balancing a wide variety of interests from governance, private sector, non-governments, certainly from the technical community who make the whole thing work.

I believe we will do this. We will be delivering a proposal on enhancing ICANN accountability in a couple of months paired with the already completed transition proposal, the package that will result in a truly international regime for the management of the core technical functions. Once completed, it will be another excellent example of how the multistakeholder model works in the context of magic Internet resources.

Yet, I believe its role is certainly not adequately represented in the outcome document today. The text of this document I believe should be modified to recognize this practical reality.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

I'm going to start moving to a push signal from online participation rather than -- if there is a comment, maybe you can signal me directly.

I move to the private sector and, again, would ask everybody to keep comments to 2 minutes. We're getting to the end of this first session and we want to make sure we can get to everybody currently in the queue which is probably a signal that the queues are just about full in terms of the time remaining to us.

>> ELIZABETH THOMAS RENO: Thank you.

I'm Elizabeth Thomas Reno, and I represent the ICIS basis initiative and the global business that participates in that.

I am not going to repeat the remarks of my colleagues relating to the ICT for development Sustainable Development Goals but we certainly support them and will issue remarks to the current draft that will elaborate our concerns and questions and support for the text in that regard.

I would like to pick up on the point made by our colleague from the Government of Canada about cybersecurity, about the cybersecurity section, in that I would like to support the call to include greater references of other activities that are going on in Civil Society, private sector, other non--- other intergovernmental organizations beyond the UN, for example there is some work going on at the OACD in this regard, ICIC has done work and was able to launch it this year at the global conference on cyberspace held and hosted by the Dutch in the Hague. We would welcome and support the invitation to add more information on those activities.

We would also like to support the inclusion of the Budapest Convention in the document.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Civil Society.

The queues are now closed with the folks standing in line.

We'll move to the next section shortly.

>> STUART HAMILTON: Thank you.

I'm Stuart Hamilton representing IFLA.

We like a lot in the new version of the text, I would like to draw out a few things. We like the references to the multifaceted approach to the digital divide in paragraph 22, the nuance and awareness there. Perhaps there could be a couple more tweaks to reference the importance of community-led solutions and we'll be submitting written comments on that.

Libraries are not just about helping people access information, it is about helping people understand, share, create information so that we like the references to supporting the media and information, literacy skills in paragraph 23.

In the enabling environment section we're absolutely convinced that Connecting the Next Billion is not just happening through mobile or private connections alone. Public access will play a big role, millions of people already rely on this so the reference to public access in paragraph 27 is welcomed. If we had a preference it would be that there was more language on supporting the public access rather than just acknowledging it.

We were extremely pleased to see reference to culture in the new draft, it was completely missing from earlier drafts, a bit worrying seeing that there is an entire action line devoted to culture but we're happy that people have been listening and it is good to see that in the text and the language must be retained.

Finally echoing the comments of Matthew sheer's earlier on regarding the opportunity here to really link WSIS with the SDG, nice to see some a bit more concrete in the text.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Government.

>> Good morning.

I'm from Brazilian Minister of Planning. I recognize the emphasis that the document brings on bridging the digital divide. That's important.

I would suggest to add stronger recommendation for governments to increase the delivery of public services online, adopting as long as possible the digital first approach.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Technical, academic queue.

>> AHMAD SHAHEED: Hello. I'm from the Center of Communication Governance in International University of Essex, and I would like to specifically thank the organizers and the Co-Facilitators for this opportunity and it is heartening to see that at each draft there's been received -- I mean, improvements that reflect the inputs and voice from the various stakeholders specifically under the section for ICT for development, the languages -- the language on the digital divide can be for the strengthened in a sense that there is a specific need to articulate the fact that sometimes digital divide is amplified by manifestations of existing socioeconomic and inequalities and it is reflected in certain parts of the text on cultural and economic, social difficulties, there is a specific reference needed for this. We would be submitting specific text inputs, written text inputs for this. Also, importance of new financial mechanisms is very important and we completely support the idea that there should be a further mechanism that's separate from usual development assistance and we also appreciate the section on Human Rights and we appreciate the inclusion in this draft.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Civil Society.

>> BENOIT THIEULIN: I'm the President of The Digital National from France, I'll speak in French to be more precise.

(No English translation).

>> I would like to really talk about the basic ideas.

First of all, we really insist on this in terms of not only to go and see Internet as a right, but that's been discussed, and through many debates, but to actually take on the whole idea of Internet as a common good and information, you need a link part 21 in -- that you'll have that in a few months, we're in a digital and ecological transition, both articulate together and together with this, we have common goods, natural ones, informational ones, and behind that, you have the whole idea of open source movement, the idea that you have basic information that are free. That's the first idea.

The second idea, it is actually that we talk about the digital divide in terms of infrastructure. We talked many times about this idea in terms of what we call the numerical literacy, talking about the divide, we're talking about the divide of the control of the uses. It is important this is written in all public policies, the fact that we're just not talking about access to Internet but actually to educate citizens in this plan, to actually use the Internet and that is digital literacy. The third point, innovation, behind the neutrality which is written on the European, French, legal term, we're talking about here the whole idea of innovation. We're talking about being able to bring on innovation and to emphasize innovation over and over again. Not only from a point of view that we're just seeing the technology, but in terms of use, services, business models and also in terms of not necessarily business and neutrality, a principle for the lower tiers of infrastructure, we have to think as researchers and think as what is actually the high-tier principles and that way we can take on the whole idea of loyalty to the platforms. It is very important because we need to have the principles there in the lower tier and then neutrality. We need to take that into consideration so that we have that. This is an essential topic here, and behind the loyalty to the platforms there are challenges like the interoperability, portability of data, of platforms and that seems to me very important.

And to conclude, I would say that I believe that all of these statements here have to take into consideration that we must show that there are many digital worlds, it is a huge leverage for transformation in the world and we can't have just one thinking there, there is leverages, but we need to make this digital revolution guided and to sum up I'll say there are many digital worlds possible out there. Thank you.

>> This is a very important opportunity to listen to non-government voices and we hope that the views expressed here today can be taken into account as the conversation moves back to New York. We think much of the draft document is already consensus text and we thank you for the work that was done, there was clear consensus on the development, and we have seen the specific goals mentioned in the text in paragraph 14. We would like to see references to Sustainable Development Goals on economic growth, on climate change, as UNESCO said, goal 16, protecting fundamental freedoms and access to information.

There is one area of the text which does need further development as others have said, that's section 3 on building competence in security. We have to reflect the roles of all stakeholders and reflect the role of the technical community in building security, the contribution of Civil Society for example in raising awareness, the responsibilities of the private sector in looking after the data of its customers. Section 3 currently neglects these critical roles. WSIS should be about development. Instead of emphasizing repeated references to national security we need to reflect other developmental issues around education, around skills, around awareness raising, around capacity building and building confidence in security in our view it is not enough only to emphasize the roles of governments, we need to fully reflect the contribution of all stakeholders if we're to build confidence in security in the use of ICTs.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Technical and academic.

And really, I need to encourage everybody to stay at 2 minutes so we don't have to short the folks that are standing at the mike.

>> Thank you very much.

I'm with the Human Rights Center. Thank you for allowing me to comment.

We are happy that the draft is a lot stronger on Human Rights elements of the targets in it now but it should go beyond issues of privacy to include issues of discrimination. For example, analytics, the high-risk individuals in particularly, the high-cost individuals, therefore they find it difficult to access certain basic services, healthcare for example, insurance may be too strict for them. There are aspects that are beyond privacy that impacts Human Rights and there is anti-discrimination as well, you could have that because policies could identify certain social backgrounds which may change the look of it proportionately. There is a case of looking at importing practices such as language on mainstreaming Human Rights and the Human Rights approach to ICTs which could link up with the broader impact of Human Rights -- on Human Rights on ICTs. I would be happy to submit language to that effect.

Thank you.

>> ANYA POVISH: I work with the Internet Democracy Project in India. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

We are pleased to see the direction in which the current draft is developing. We have been very happy to see that many of the comments we have made earlier were included. We think that there is still space for improvement, including on Human Rights, and I support many of the comments that my colleague made from academia.

We're very happy with the strong recognition of the need to protect Civil Society space in paragraph 38, and also with the language on free speech and privacy and surveillance in separate paragraphs and strongly hope that this will stand. There is space for improvement though. I support comments my colleague from Access made earlier on including anonymity and the encryption in the texts.

In 18, there is an emphasis on the importance of knowledge. We think there could be a more explicit reference to accessing information in this paragraph which is crucial to make sure that the benefits of ICTs reach everybody.

Perhaps more importantly though, at a higher level, we think that -- we continue to think it is important to include reference to Human Rights governance in the text specifically in paragraph 5 and paragraph 47. We find this is not balanced since they reference the charter including specific paragraphs of the UN charter, and when it comes to Human Rights I do not refer any instruments at all or refer to instruments that are not binding. We think to strengthen the balance between different roles and rights and responsibilities that this should be corrected. Similarly on paragraph 43 there was language on the duty -- duties of Human Rights and the importance of all restrictions to be legitimate which we fully support. It also says these rights may in all case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, seeing that there is reference to legitimate restrictions we don't think it is necessary to include this reference.

Finally, briefly, on the SDGs, we think that there needs to be stronger recognition of the fact that not having access to the means -- digital exclusion leads to harm. It is not just a maintenance of the state or school. This is really important to recognize in the context of the SDGs because it is the importance of bridging the digital divide and the fact that if we do not bridge the digital divide putting ICTs at a service -- the SDGs, it means that for those people that do not have access to ICTs, things will be worse and not better.

Thank you.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: Chris Painter. I'm with Cyber Issue in the U.S. State Department.

I thank you for the hard work that you have done thus far.

I want to raise one issue in paragraph 49 which currently states that we acknowledge the call for a convention on international cybercrime suggesting that this is a consensus when indeed having done this for many years myself there is no consensus on this issue. In fact, this is interesting doing this in this Netmundial setting, this is one of the many issues that was debated. That text reflected not a call for a global convention but the need for greater cooperation between countries and other stakeholders in addressing the problem which this draft also talks about.

There is a good reason that that wasn't reflected there and in fact in the UN bodies that looked at this and the UNDOC for many years, debated many years, the only consensus that emerged was an important consensus is one around capacity building and the need to bring countries up to speed. As we have more and more countries that are indeed modernizing laws to call for a global convention which would take many years and would not really help those countries who need to modernize their laws, even in the short-term or long-term, we think that that should not be reflected in the document as a scone sector specific initiatives item and we should emphasize as the document does in other places the need and importance of capacity building.

I also want to agree with my colleagues about the importance of reflecting in the cybersecurity area some of the other work that's being done even outside of the UN system.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Civil Society.

>> STEVE ZELTZER: Yes. I'm Steve Zeltzer with LaborNet APC and LaborTech.net.

And I want to address a serious issue that is yet to be addressed in this, that's a question of dislocation and the effect of deregulation through companies like Uber and others that are displacing workers. In San Francisco, them and other companies have led to marginalization of workers in the taxi -- marginalization of the field, and we're threatened by the new technology.

Technology, not saying it doesn't have a positive role, but it is playing a negative role in terms of the worker lives and that's going to continue and grow in the future. I think when we talk about the sustainability we have to look at the effect of this technology on workers' stability. We're in an international global market and workers in the United States are competing against workers in China and other countries in the world, that means it can benefit society and also can be harmful to the living conditions of workers in many countries. That, I think, is a question of sustainability and has to be addressed.

This idea of disruption, which is the ideology of many of the people who are developing the countries I think has to be looked at seriously. What effect is this disruption having on the economy and the real economy and for working people and labor internationally in every country in the world, that's got to be addressed in the future and has not yet been addressed in this document.

Thank you very much.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

To the last speaker, government.

>> GARY FOWLIE: Thank you very much.

I'm Gary Fowlie head of ITU Liaison Office to the UN.

I would like to call attention apparently for the last time to paragraph 14, the commitment to harnessing the potential of ICTs to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals which is a very clear, incredible, concise paragraph in terms of its expression of the reality of the document.

I would like to call attention to the preamble of the Sustainable Development Goal Agenda noting paragraph 15, how global connectivity in ICTs have great potential for human progress. I think that's a good reflection of the reality but measuring that progress is not going to be an easy task for the SDGs Agenda but not possible unless we harness the ICTs as a cross-cutting means of implementation which fortunately it is recognized in goal 17 as a cross-cutting means of implementation. I think that provides us with the starting point for the action that I have heard many people want to have. In terms of achieving ICT for SDGs and in anticipation of that, ITU with the WSIS coordinators created the WSIS matrix, it connects them, it is a work in progress, it is worth taking a look at this, the idea is to continue to strengthen the impact of ICTs for Sustainable Development. Each action line coordinator was asked to look at their line of action, look at where -- at which goals they may or may not relate to, provide case study examples, it is a work in progress, more input would be much appreciated. I would encourage you to read the complete document which is at WSIS.org/SDG.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you. That would be useful.

That concludes the first section. I particularly thank those that made the effort to stay in the 2-minute speaking slot.

I'm going to turn over to Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho for the second session.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

I'll assist you and try to moderate the discussion on the second session on Internet Governance and enhanced cooperation. Which is a section relatively short in regard to what we have been discussing until now.

The first portion of the text that was handled included 49 paragraphs, this section on Internet Governance has 7 paragraphs. That's why I would like to beg your indulgence not to read out the paragraphs but to walk through -- if we can turn to paragraph 50 here, the Co-Facilitators have proposed to resort to agreed language from the Tunis Agenda with reference to the definition of Internet Governance and including the working definition of the Internet Governance that's contained in paragraph 34.

Paragraph 51, again, there is a reference to principles that were agreed at the Geneva Declaration, we're resorting to the agreed language coming from the outcome document from WSIS and making particular reference to paragraph 35. In 52 there is the issue of participation, especially from developing countries, they need to increase participation in the Internet Governance processes and also a call that this would be coupled with Voluntary Funding mechanisms to assist in the increased participation.

Paragraph 53 refers to net neutrality. There is recognition and reaffirmation of the importance of net neutrality.

Paragraph 54, particular importance for us here at IGF since it addresses specifically the role of IGF reasserting the unique role of IGF as a multistakeholder platform and makes reference to the report that was prepared by the Working Group on improvements to the IGF and make as call for its implementation to be accelerated.

It proposes -- I think this is going to be one of the main topics to be addressed by you, I think that's the mandate for the 10 years under and within the current mandate as set out in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda.

Paragraph 55, here we have section 4.1, enhanced cooperation, that's a subset of the discussion on Internet Governance, of course, but there was an emphasis on that discussion I assume in light of the discussions that were held in the preparatory meetings. Here there are two paragraphs, the first, there is acknowledgment of the initiatives and actions that have been done to -- towards implementing the concept of enhanced cooperation and we are invited to take note of the notes on that matter and the work that's been undertaken by

the Working Group on enhanced cooperation under the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. I'm happy to see the room, the Chair of the Working Group, Mr. Peter major, we acknowledge his presence here, the benefits from his presence with us. The second paragraph, there is a recognition that on the other hand there have been a call for this process of implementation to be accelerated and to be deepened and, therefore, there's suggestion to request from the Secretariat, the Secretary-General a report to be submitted to the 73rd Session on Implementation and to that end, to also -- it is also suggest that had a Working Group, intergovernmental Working Group with participation and input from all stakeholders should be establishes to that end. I think this covers the main topics I think of what's been proposed by the Co-Facilitators.

On that basis, we have developed a few questions that could maybe also assist you in addressing those issues so we are proposing that in your intervention, you could, few wish, touch upon the following topics, what should be the main goals of Internet Governance now and in the future?

How long should the IGF mandated be?

How should improvements be implemented and what's the role of the UN? The third question, what are the respective roles of governments and non-governmental stakeholders?

How do you view their fulfillment over the last 10 years and how should they develop in the future?

Finally, how can enhanced cooperation across and within the Internet Governance ecosystem be strengthened through the WSIS framework.

Those topics are proposed to you on the basis of the text provided by the Co-Facilitators and you may also ask the questions that we have and benefited from the information from the could Facilitators, I invite the comments on the part of the plenary on any of the topics related to that section.

I turn to the representative of Civil Society. Please.

>> Thank you. I'm a professor from Denmark and I was a member of the Working Group on Internet Governance and I'm very pleased to see that this section starts with the reference to the definition of Internet Governance, which was produced by us. This was a very carefully drafted text, and this text has introduced the concept of multistakeholderism and introduced the concept of sharing principles, programs, decision making, and it has introduced the distinction between the governance of the Internet and the governance on the Internet by using the language, the evolution and the use of the Internet. I think this was really the outcome of long discussion and we were very pleased and this is not just the UN, but the heads of State adopted the text word by word in the Tunis Agenda and so far, you know, I wanted only to express my satisfaction and invite everybody to a section on Thursday because this is the 10th anniversary and we'll have a full 2-hour session to go more into the details of what we have achieved 10 years ago in WCIT and what's important today and tomorrow.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for the comments. Very helpful.

Private sector, you have the floor, sir.

>> JAMES OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Ambassador.

I'm from Africa City Alliance.

Just have a very brief comment on the goal of Internet Governance now and in the future. I want to emphasize that it needs to be more inclusive, it needs to be more inclusive and have broad participation, need to encourage more broader participation in reference to what I said earlier. We need to take it in country, encourage more divisional participation in the country to get more people informed about IG.

I quite agree with the fact that the ten years, the proposal, quite good, we have seen the outreach of IG has been over the years and the value it has added to a society.

On the role of government and non-governmental stakeholders, well, I think the approach so far has been quite good through the multistakeholder approach, the exchanging of ideas and having understanding. I think we can never come to the end of an ideas which is very important. I think we should keep that in view.

On enhanced cooperation in the WSIS framework, I want to use this opportunity to commend the Working Group and the Chair of the Working Group on enhanced cooperation. I think the framework within this, it is to foster implementation of the enhanced cooperation spirit with regard to the WSIS paragraphs.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your comments.

I turn now to United States. You have the floor.

>> DANIEL SEULVEDA: Thank you.

I will try to be brief.

Paragraph 50, I think a number of comments were made during the last session and I think will be reiterated again here about the emphasis throughout this document on the word multilateral and the application going forward.

I think in paragraph 50 being the first paragraph on Internet Governance it should be multistakeholder and multilateral in the language. I understand that you are resorting to the language used in the original WSIS but we have learned a lot since then. This event and everybody stated commitment to adhere would be undermined by not including the wording multistakeholder and before the word multilateral.

Paragraph 51, we claim to be resorting to establish language again. Paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda outlines important rules for stakeholder PSW but does not restrict them nor in most cases as responsibilities. We should refrain from inserting such texts as a result we would recommend striking within the respective roles and responsibilities from paragraph 51. It is not resorting to established language. If we're reaffirming text we must insist on accurate, concise quotations.

On extension of IGF, I note yet at the high-level meeting there were people calling for a five-year extension rather than a 10-year extension. We believe we should be extending the IGF for a much longer term than 10 years even to give donors, participants, everybody that's bothered to take three, four flights to get here, to participate in this event has exposed how much it matters to them. To not call for an extension, a firm extension of 10 to 15 years at a minimum, is a problem, and I hope we won't debate that in New York. At this point the consensus opinion of the multistakeholder community is at least 10 years. On enhanced cooperation, this is going to be a challenging paragraph.

We believe and we cannot concur with the changes made to the Zero-Draft as repeatedly noted enhanced cooperation involves more than just enabling governments to exercise or enhance their power. As written, this language states that the concept of enhanced cooperation is to enable governments to carry out their responsibilities and that's the full purpose. We're engaged in enhanced cooperation right now in this meeting between governments and between governments and every other stakeholder in the room. Enhanced cooperation has been a success. It is the opinion of some that it has not been fully implemented, as directed in the WSIS document, enhanced cooperation is a process, it is not an end. You will never fully implement it. It is not something to be fully implemented, it is a process we engage in every day out of respect for each other and out of respect for all other stakeholders.

Now, I think I have a number of other comments to make throughout this document. In respect to the time, I will stop there. Ultimately I think our biggest responsibility will be to ensure that we do not come here and celebrate the multistakeholder process and then go to New York and among governments without the participation or the microphones for other stakeholders agree on language that these stakeholders would not support.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your statement.

I will turn to Raul.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm Vice President for the Internet Society. I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this section of the document.

I agree with other speakers, especially with the speaker from .CA, from Canada, saying that the use of the expression multilateral is not reality. It is not a matter of preference, it doesn't represent what we have built.

We know that we recognize that there are different views on different governments. This is not an easy point to solve. Using -- we recognize the importance of using the agreed language in this cases and the international environment, but this language was agreed 10 years ago.

This was an expression to decide -- we were discussing about what we wanted it to be. In those ten years we have built something that's not only important from the point of view of Internet Governance but also from the point of view of international governance in general. We have built a very new process that's been very successful. This should be recognized in this text.

It is time to be corrective with the language. To use something that doesn't contradict the agreed language from 2005. I encourage you to review the language that was agreed based on inputs and comments from multiple participants, including several governments, organizations from Civil Society, private sector, academic community. We agreed on a language that doesn't contradict the agreed language from Tunis Agenda but represents much better the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders and the process that's the basis for the Internet Governance.

One more comment related to this one, paragraph 45, the security, it is related to this, this is a call for a leading role on governments on dealing with cybersecurity. We think that it is not -- we have to build, we have to reinforce the need for a collaboration among all stakeholders. In some cases the governments would have a role, in other cases they'll be other stakeholders that will lead -- that will lead the things that have been done. It is happening right now. There are many other stakeholders creating capacities, making movements in a national level, other cases with the governments that are leading the discussions and implementation of policies.

This should be recognized. If we're recognizing in the paragraph 50 the different roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in the governance of the Internet there is no need to be specific on paragraph 45 saying that somebody should have a leading role in the process of building better conditions in cybersecurity.

My last comment is on paragraph 56, enhanced cooperation. There is a call for having new intergovernmental Working Group with participation of different stakeholders. This is redundant. This is exactly what had been done under CTSD, and it has been an intergovernmental Working Group with participation of all stakeholders and informally this Working Group is still open. There is no need to create opportunities for opening new working groups that will take energy from other stakeholders participating and following up on the developments and so I think that's -- it should be removed I think.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your statement.

I will go back now to representative of the private sector. You have the floor, sir.

>> MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Chair.

My name is Martin Boyle, I'm with Nominet, the domain name registry from the U.K. We as an organization fit neatly in the business sector and in the technical sector.

I think I would like to echo the thoughts that have come from the previous two speakers without repeating that.

I would actually say that we have gone a very long way since Tunis and the Tunis Agenda.

We have seen the development of the IGF as a forum for involvement and exchanges between the different partners of the multistakeholder environment. We have seen the development of the stewardship transition proposal, which again got the mobilization, which got all partners across the different groups. We have seen the national cooperation and partnership, Brazil is a very, very good example of that. We have been doing similar cooperation and engagement within the U.K. and we have certainly seen the development on the international for that sort of exchange.

So as a net result I think that a loss of the wording in the Tunis Agenda was very much wording from 2005. I recognize the need to requote that wording but I also think we -- here we are ten years later, we should look at how we should be developing that wording to recognize the massive developments that have taken place that we start looking at the blurring of the roles because of the Internet understanding and the shared responsibility that's been taken by the different communities that's standing up here today. I would like to see that reflected in the draft that's going to the United Nations.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

Civil Society.

>> DEBRA BROWN: Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment.

I'm Debra Brown with the Association of Progressive Communications.

We're very happy to see that many of the comments we submitted earlier in the process made it to the current draft including the reference to net neutrality.

We also welcome the recognition that the Internet is a global resource that should be managed in the public interest and would suggest adding to paragraph 50 the principles of open and inclusive manner to make it more consistent with paragraph 12 in the preamble and because these are key Internet Governance principles. Regarding enhanced cooperation, we support what was said regarding the intergovernmental Working Group and the need for participation from other stakeholders. We would suggest text to welcome governments the opportunity to discuss Internet related public policy issues in collaboration and link ups of the Internet Governance forum.

Regarding the IGF we welcome the renewal of the IGF and would like to see the recognition of the IGF's evolution tore outcome oriented, capacity building, identifying emerging issues and facilitating institutional dialogue.

Also to identify solutions for Internet related public policy regulations and problems.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for that statement.

I will turn to governments.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN Thank you, Chair.

Rahul Gosain, Government of India.

It should be also recognized that in the next decade a large number of Internet users will come from developing countries. The Tunis Agenda, 2005 has been reasonably successful in increasing access to developing countries, however at the same time it should be noted that there has been a lack of participation from developing countries in the policy development processes related to the Internet.

India would like to highlight the need to enable developing countries to have a say in the policies which have a direct impact on the social and economic development. The role of developing countries cannot be limited to receiving support for development and they should have an active role in Internet Governance. In working towards such inclusion it is crucial to ensure that the objective is substantive inclusion and not merely formal inclusion.

Keeping in mind the barriers making the participation and processes that are normally open to all, the outcome should invite all developing countries to actively engage and participate in various forum related to Internet Governance and for them to explore means to facilitate such substantive engagement and participation. We would be happy to provide text which could be included.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your statement.

I will revert to the representative of the technical community, please.

>> Thank you.

I'm Pablo. I work for The Regional Internet Registry for Asia-Pacific.

First thing, to thank the Co-Facilitators for the great work.

In spite of very restrictive times for the review of very important process you have made a great effort to listen to the voices of different stakeholders and it must be very hard to make decisions on how to include very different views and to develop from the non-paper to the current draft. Thank you enormously. One of the key features of the World Summit on the Information Society indeed was the process. The novelty of it, the way that it evolved and how it finished in Tunis and how it started in Athens with the first IGF. I mean process in the sense of the level of inclusiveness and the beauty of being key for bridging a gap. The gap between technical expertises, what is the Internet, how it actually works, and policy making, how to support its growth, how governments cannot do it on their own. For policymakers to make better decisions that would not hurt the technology but actually help to foster it.

WSIS has been great process for this gap to close in information and information to flow particularly through the IGF back and forth between governments, technical experts, private sector, Civil Society, I think that's a story of success and I hope we can preserve that spirit.

I would like to support comments made by my friend from Indonesia Donny in the previous section regarding paragraph 50 and an importance on preserving the multistakeholder spirit of WSIS in the sense of meaningful participation not only involvement but meaningful participation of different stakeholder groups whip is a key feature of the WSIS process.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

I will refer to the private sector again. Please.

>> DOMINIQUE LAZANSKI: Thank you.

My name is Dominique Lasanski. We represent all mobile operators worldwide, over 800 of them are members and we will be key obviously to Connecting the Next Billion and several billion with all of you. I just wanted to make two points.

One, that we really support the renewal of the IGF mandate, the ten-year renewal and we were pleased with that and thank you for that. That's fantastic.

Just on the point of net neutrality, we feel it is a bit too constrained in terms of the words that are being used and the open Internet would actually be more inclusive to include not just the specific topic area but, you know, all topics around this, around the secure, safe, interoperable Internet. To that point, I want to just read a statement that was adopted in the Council of Europe last year in November, unanimously, that's a great way to phrase the open Internet, it says take necessary steps to preserve the open and neutral character of the Internet and support end user rights to access, disseminate and use Internet content or services of their choice.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your statement.

I want to acknowledge the presence of Lennie Montiel, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, we're honored with his presence

And I'll now go to the Civil Society representative. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho. We're delighted to have want representative on the Internet Governance from the United Nations and I want to give a special shout out to the permanent member to the UN for her inspiring speech and the co-facilitator of of the WSIS process yesterday.

I come from India. I teach and this has been truly an inspiring journey. We have been able to engage with the process of the IGF which is truly inclusive, transparent bottom up allowing people to participate. Meetings, however, take place in places which are expensive and they're difficult to engage with in terms of the process. As far as the current draft is concerned, speaking particularly to paragraph 50 and 54 on the issues of Internet Governance and enhanced cooperation, paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda especially is the spirit where Internet Governance capacity building and speaking to the unconnected, the billions, 3.4 we're looking at and women and youth remain underserved. We believe that 10 years hence, it is time though we made a great journey, there were representation when the draft was put in place, when the Tunis Agenda actualized, we have made a long journey since, I speak for those that remain unconnected especially from developing countries and emerging economies. My colleague from India just mentioned that we do not just want outreach and empathy, we would like to have a place at the table where decisions are taking place. This is more than multistakeholder participation, it is also about equitable participation and outreach. It is about capacity building, not just with funding which is essential to bring young people, but not just end users and also lead users. I would like to see stronger language when it comes to enhancing cooperation between countries and also recognizing the text that cybersecurity and privacy are concerns that intervene and have more space for different stakeholders while existing mechanisms which are multilateral, they can be strengthened but spaces like the IGF, they need to be reinforced and also need permanent support in recognition in terms of the UN is concerned. Thank you for taking that onboard and strong support we would like to articulate for the renewal of the IGF mandate for another 10 years.

Thank you for listening.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your statement.

I will now turn to the distinguished representative of the U.K.

>> Thank you.

The U.K. government supports a multistakeholder model of Internet Governance, open, inclusive, transparent, accountable. The IGF is an indispensable pillar of that model and we very much welcome the proposal for a 10-year extension to the mandate. We have concerns, however, about the section on enhanced cooperation. The U.K. government believes that real enhanced cooperation is happening now and it needs to continue and continue to develop. Stakeholders are cooperating in new ways to address key issues. That process needs to be flexible in order to address the different kinds of issues that come up and in order to keep pace with innovation. We don't need a new intergovernmental Committee where issues are negotiated between governments behind closed doors without the expertise, the experience and most importantly perhaps without the commitment of other stakeholders. The successes and achievements we have seen over the last ten years have depended on open and collaborative approaches involving all stakeholders. We recognize, however, that there are differences of view on what enhanced cooperation means. What is vital is that we don't consider this concept in the abstract. It won't take us forward if we only talk about commissions and panels and reports and special sessions.

A conversation on enhanced cooperation must be issues-based. What's enhanced cooperation mean for child online protection? What does enhanced cooperation mean in terms of investment in infrastructure? What does it mean for climate protection?

The answers will be different in teach case. It is only by following this issue-based approach involving all stakeholders that we will be able to develop a meaningful conversation that can actually make a difference.

We hope the WSIS review will not focus its attention on long discussions about enhanced cooperation as an abstract process but instead, focus on the issues and focus on the Sustainable Development priorities that we urgently need to address.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you. Thank you for your statement.

Technical community.

>> I'm Gangesh. I'm from the Center of Communication from the University of New Delhi.

On this section, we need to reflect the need -- the comments made already, this can be reflective of the current scenario and there is an urgent need to update the understanding of Internet Governance from ten years ago.

I also recommend that in paragraph 50 the word open and inclusive are part of the open lines and these are terms that need to be mentioned wherever we talk about any kind of multistakeholder engagement.

Also the fact that the enhanced cooperation is the subject of debate since its inception and there is the ambiguity developed between 69 and 71 of the Tunis Agenda, here we have an opportunity to clear that up, that ambiguity and probably to define enhanced cooperation in a clearer fashion and that we can operate better.

Yeah. That's it.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

I give the floor to you, please.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff from Oracle, on behalf of ICC basis, and we would support the comments of others related to the renewal of the IGF mandate.

To that topic we would add perhaps that thinking about why it is important for the renewal of the mandate over that period of time because it helps the IGF in fundraising and in planning. The 5-year renewal was a limitation on the abilities to do that. We should remember there is a reason it is not just 10 years as a nicer figure than five, it helps the IGF do what it is supposed to do.

In terms of people spoke about improvements to the IGF, we believe improvements should be made and trying to figure out how to better take the lessons learned from the IGF and make them available to national governments, to developing countries, all of the stakeholders participating, both through the regional IGFs and other mechanisms, but we don't want to lose site of the value of the IGF as a dialogue.

Sometimes when we look at improvements we forget about what we have done that's beneficial and useful. After 10 years we should be celebrating some accomplishments and that dialogue is one of the substantial accomplishments we should not under sell.

Finally, when we think about governments in some way some of the text makes it sound like there is government and there is other stakeholders, government is a stakeholder. The text needs to unify that government is one of the stakeholders with all of the others. We have to make sure that in the language we don't create a nuance that they're separate, we play different roles but government is a stakeholder and participates as a stakeholder. Finally, in reference to the question that was raised with the language from ten years ago, we have to remember that there will be new people coming to this document. Perhaps as we quote the older language we can create an introduction to talk about the importance of the multistakeholder process, the role of multistakeholderism and what it does today and then highlight the fact that it was first established in this language and then we can quote that language directly.

Then it places the language in context so that we're not bound by the status quo of where we were but we remember where we were and how we got to where we are.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for the statement.

I give the floor to you.

>> Thank you. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

In the IG section I want to stress again we're very pleased with the language on net neutrality and the strong goal to not just recognize its importance but also to protect it.

We also welcome the proposal to renew the IGF for 10 years and including the emphasis on the improvements that need to be made.

Where we have more concern is similar to what many others have already said here. Paragraph 12, 15 we find that the emphasis is far too strongly on the multilateral aspects. We think that it is very important to recognize the contributions of the multistakeholder community in those paragraphs as well and that one stakeholder group should not be privileged over another here. In paragraph 52, we are very happy with the inclusion of the recognition to have greater participation of the developing countries in the Internet Governance. We fully support the comments that were made earlier here by the Government of India to argue that this should be substantive inclusion, not just inclusion informed.

For this reason, we're very happy to see the reference to the funding mechanisms that are needed to make this a reality.

We would like to see the word expanded and added to the text so now it says mechanism should be strengthened, we think they should also be expanded.

In addition, we would welcome a reference to any additional measures to make sure that is greater inclusion happening, including references to checks and balances in the multistakeholder process and a greater need for transparency in many pros. Enhanced cooperation, we share the concern about proposal for an Internet intergovernmental Working Group in paragraph 56, we realize it says there will be contributions from other stakeholders but as long as it is not clear beforehand how this process will be organized a reference like this does not induce the kind of trust that's really necessary to move forward in Internet Governance.

In a way it is similar to what we have seen with the current WSIS review process, the Co-Facilitators are doing their best to maximize the space for stakeholder input in the modality but there are parts that are only government only and that's a concern for other stakeholder and we should not deny that. It is worrying to see a call to put such an important aspect of the Internet Governance debate and such contention aspect into possible closed door meetings.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

Please, I give the floor to the representative of government.

>> LJUPCO JIVAN GJORGJINSKI: Thank you very much.

I'm head of communications in the Macedonia Foreign Ministry and Multistakeholder Advisory Group.

In different times in the last 15 years or so I had an opportunity to speak at different microphones and these settings, never had an opportunity to speak in front of the technical microphone, I don't have the mind for that, I'm very respectful for those that created the Internet and the tools we use today.

At the same time, I understand why there is concern sometimes in using such words as multilateral and there should be definitely multistakeholder in front of that, multilateral is not a bad word. We have to remember at this time that this as we renew the mandate, that it is the UN that's given the mandate that it is the renewing of the mandate, that the IGF is a UN product and we should celebrate it as such. Nevertheless, we should celebrate multistakeholder which is the basis of what made this beautiful thing, the Internet, what it is. Having said that, we are in support both the government that I represent of fully multistakeholder approach to Internet Governance, same time we should not shy away from anything that involves multilateralism as well. Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for your statement.

I give the floor to the representative from the technical community.

>> Thank you. I'm actually from the Secretary of The Commission on Science and Technology for Development as there was no mike for international organizations I just decided to stand behind this line.

>> (Laughter).

>> I wanted to comment, the reference, it is that -- the references made on the work of the CSTD in terms of the working groups in improvements to the IGF and enhanced cooperation, paragraph 54 says that we call on the CSTD within its current reporting to give due consideration to fulfillment of the Working Group report recommendations. This is being done annually in the context of the Secretary-General's report on WSIS implementation and follow-up. In that, we rely on the inputs of the members and other stakeholders and we are thankful for the inputs in regards to the fulfillment of the recommendations.

Paragraph 55 notes the Working Group work on the enhanced cooperation of the CSTD, as you know, they held four meetings between May, 2014 and 2015 and they were intense deliberations on what is enhanced cooperation, what are the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in it and how to pursue it.

It definitely increased understanding of the different points of view, but as the Chair concluded in its report the consensus emerged on some issues that were significant divergence of views concerning others, the complexity and the political sensitivity of the topic did not allow them to finalize a set of Recommendations for a fully operationalizing the enhanced cooperation.

Paragraph 56 of the outcome document suggests that the establishment of another Working Group. I'm not going to comment on whether such a group should be established but just to say if we decide for its establishment there has to be more clarity to it and also some creative thinking so that we don't just repeat the previous experience but that we can build on that. I would also like to make reference to the UNDESA work on the 10-year review report on WSIS, which concludes the Internet Governance for example, whatever the measures taken to solve the issues, what is essential is to ensure that the Internet remains a universal resource that's available for all.

We're going to discuss the main messages for the report on implementing the WSIS outcomes tomorrow afternoon at 2:00.

I would welcome you all to participate in that open forum regarding that and we're also going to link our work to the overall review in that session.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

As we are moving towards the end of that section, I will take the last three speakers and then we would make some remarks with my Co-Facilitators, co-moderator, not to confuse it with the Co-Facilitators for the next section of the document.

I will give the floor to the representative of the private sector. You have the floor.

>> CARYOLYN WINN: Thank you very much.

I'm Carolyn Winn from Microsoft.

I would like to make a few comments with regards to this section. With respect to paragraph 50, we agree with various previous comments with respect to also including the word multistakeholder, open, inclusive, transparent. At equal level with the words multilateralism. I would like to also reinforce a point with respect to paragraph 45 in terms of reflecting the same concepts of multistakeholder into the discussion of cybersecurity specifically, the paragraph states that for government which have responsibility for national security and personal safety to play a leading role, but in some issues to ensure cybersecurity as opposed to a broad stroke, putting in the document that there is tremendous ongoing work in public, private partnerships globally around the world as well as nationally to address cybersecurity issues.

If possible, we would like to see that reference made explicitly as well as in reference to other cybersecurity work that's not in the UN, for example, with the OECD. With respect to paragraph 52, we strongly support the paragraph in terms of the recognition that there is a need for greater participation and engagement of all stakeholders, particularly those from developing nations, middle income states, least, and land looked states, as a private sector we're strongly invested in the goals of the Sustainable Development in countries and support that paragraph. Enhanced cooperation, we noted support for comments from various other speakers in particular from the U.K. government regarding the cooperation that are already ongoing amongst all stakeholders. Just as there are -- there is not a tingle multistakeholder model, there are multiple multistakeholder approaches and different approaches to enhanced cooperation in an issue base.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for the statement.

I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

>> Thank you, Ambassador.

As many of the points that I wish to make have been made by others, I can be very brief.

You put out the questions for our consideration and many of them have been already covered from Canadian perspective, we would echo, you know, a key point with respect to Internet Governance would certainly be to ensure that we do no harm, we have a model that's been tremendously successful and we want to preserve all of the good that's come from it.

Like others, we want to recognize that this is very much a multistakeholder approach, it has to be multistakeholder in all dimensions, not just in a limited selection.

In that regard, we're particularly concerned about some of the language in paragraph 56 with respect to enhanced cooperation which seems to set the stage for a state to state discussion on enhanced cooperation when we know that obviously there is enhanced cooperation that takes place outside of a state to state relationship, we're doing it right here, right now today. It is happening in a variety of settings. A special session of the General Assembly will be by its nature state to state and we're very uncomfortable with this approach which is very state focused.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

Thank you for your statement.

I'll give the floor for the representative of ICANN which should be the last speaker, but I see two other participants that are requesting the floor. You will also be allowed to speak but it will be very short, the comments. Please.

>> NIGEL HICKSEN: Thank you very much.

Nigel Hicksen from ICANN.

First, I would like to congratulate this session in drawing out so many diverse opinions. That's what the WSIS process is all about. That's what we strive to do in various Internet Governance processes. I think that's got to be recognized. I would like to recognize the role of the Co-Facilitators, not just for turning up to this panel today but for the incredible work that they have done since being appointed on this particular brief. It is not at all easy I'm sure to be able to cope with diverse opinions, comments, the written, the oral, the tweeting, social media is terrible, isn't it?

All of the information that's come in to them, the many different viewpoints, the many serious viewpoints, the governments, other stakeholders have had on this issue. The history, the passion, the eloquent history, the cultural history of the Internet Governance as was mentioned this morning, it goes back a long way. The Tunis Agenda, the historical nature of it, the fact that it was a compromise between so many different interests has really, if you like, spurned what we have today in this draft. I want to make two points: I think on Internet Governance as others have said, the nature has changed considerably since 2003 and 2005 in 2003 we found it difficult in governments to get ministers to talk at Internet Governance conferences and it was difficult to get statements on the Internet Governance. Today the statements are plenty.

In 2003 and 2005 stakeholders didn't have the same access, ability to talk as they do today.

We need to reflect on this in this resolution and this historic resolution that's going to be held up against the Tunis Agenda as a work, if you like, on the Internet Governance treaties. We need to ensure that it truly

reflects this development. We need to try to move beyond the wording on enhanced cooperation. We all know what it means or what it doesn't mean.

Surely for all of us here, it means talking together. It means all of us having an input. It means governments being able to take their necessary part in public policy discussions and it means being able to take the part in those discussions, those decisions with other stakeholders as well.

We in ICANN strive to do that, other organizations strive to do that as well. We should be able to find language to reflect that.

Thank you very much. Thank you for your great efforts and we have truly looked forward to the discussions in New York.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

You have the floor, sir.

>> BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

Byron Holland, President and CEO of the Canadian CCTLD operator.

As per my earlier intervention with multilateral and multistakeholder, I would draw your attention to paragraph 50, another example that I think that others have commented on and I would like to further reinforce the importance of adding that there. Enhanced cooperation section, the concerns that I have about that is what my comments are around, by calling for a report on this, the section implies that there is some sort of an end state. How much, of course, the Internet is an ever-evolving ecosystem. Like Internet Governance itself, enhanced cooperation is a process. Almost by definition it has no end state as it must be as dynamic as the entity that it is meant to govern. Floor to the representative more, I'm disappointed to see the role of the multistakeholder model in the governance diminished in this section. It is essential to ensure the full and equal participation of all stakeholders in the review of the progress on enhanced cooperation in ensuring all voices are heard.

Only with their full and equal participation will we successfully bring the tremendously value of the Internet to all citizens of the globe. This is a government to government process in the text, for example, of course, Article 56 refers only to intergovernmental and UNGA processes to review enhanced cooperation with the participation of other stakeholders tacked on at the end as an afterthought seemingly. Multistakeholder is not a box to be ticked off on a list of news-dos, not a method of consultation, but a living governance model that is to manage these entities like the Internet. It is not enough to call for the participation of stakeholders in the processes, this should be woven in the fabric of the WSIS+10 process and any mechanisms developed for the ongoing development of the Internet.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Yes.

>> Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity in the last minute. I'm from the Japan networking information or JPNIC.

I would like to make a brief point on section 50 as previous speakers have made. It reads that we reaffirm that governments of the Internet as a global resource should be multilateral, transparent and democratic with full involvement of those stakeholders. I agree it should be sometimes multilateral, for example when the issue pertains to the public policy and at the same time it needs the coordination among the countries, but the other parts, such as the global coordination of the Internet or the setting the knowledge of the experts for the concerned issue, it is different and usually they need the multistakeholder approach rather than the other approach taken should be rephrased accordingly.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you very much, we have come to the end of the speakers.

We have one remote participation. I turn to our remote moderator.

>> REMOTE MODERATOR: Thank you very much, Chair.

We in fact have two comments.

The first from Nigeria. My name is Akin-Awokoya from Lagos, Nigeria, remote participation hub, a global member of the Internet Society. The Internet Society has its core mission to promote the open development, evolution and use of the Internet for the benefit of all people around the world.

We from the developing countries, we are pleased for the renewal IGF process and the multistakeholder model given another chance to show its advantage over other models. I would love to comment on the necessity for more capacity building especially in emerging technology that would increase access for the next billions.

Although the drone technology was mentioned in the comment from one of the contributors for the ICT4D section there is need for consideration for the TV whitespace and the digitalization of broadcasting, and there is a need for developing country experts to be at the table for the standards and technology. The percentage of participation of the developing countries in the development of emerging standards and protocols should be enhanced because the Internet rights, cybersecurity threat relies on these protocols and standards

I am happy about the paragraph 52. I would love to tie it to paragraph 18 as the ICT alters the way we live. The next billion should be able to transit into connectivity without losing its ways of doing things in its cultural ideal manner.

There is a second comment from Christine Arida in Egypt. Her affiliation is with the National Telecom Regulatory Authority of the Government of Egypt.

We appreciate the opportunity to intervene remotely and would like to offer the following comments in response to the questions posed to the floor.

We believe the main goal of Internet Governance should be facilitating coordination among the different stakeholders and all relevant players in a way that will preserve the functioning of the Internet as one stable global resource while enabling further innovation and extending its reach to all citizens of the world especially from development countries. We welcome the renewal of the IGF mandate for 10 more years and we believe this should be considered as a minimum. We stress the importance of the competing roles played by the different stakeholders and in this context believe Internet Governance should continue to be a multistakeholder process and suggest reflecting this in the language used.

Finally, we emphasize the need to further gage different stakeholders from developing countries in Internet Governance and would like to commend the intersessional work of the IGF this year in reaching out to regional and national IGF initiatives.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

Before I close this session, I would like to make some comments and I don't want to abuse my position as co-moderator.

I would like nonetheless, first of all, having participated in the preparatory Committee in New York in October I have the very strong perception that one of the basic parameters for us in New York is to consider that the outcome documents that come from the WSIS, that they provide still today a valid framework for the work to pursue beyond 2015. By doing that I think we are in a way -- we're not tied to the language there, but we're

guided by the language there. I think in regard to some delicate balance that's involved in the language that's crafted both in Geneva and Tunis, particularly in the Tunis phase I wouldn't say -- this is my -- maybe this is my personal, not my national position -- but -- I don't see energy needed, time to redraft I feel of the very important consensus that emerged from there.

I'm saying this for example in regard to the word multilateral that appears, it comes from the Tunis Agenda that reflects a very elaborate work that was done. I don't see how having been adopted at that summit level that we could in the review change things that are there. I think at the UN, I served in the UN a few years ago, it is difficult to get away from some agreed language unless you have a very important instance that would change that.

By doing that, we cannot be selective about important language coming from Tunis Agenda. Some parts you may like, so you want to preserve as it is, some parts you don't like, you want to change. I think that there is not that kind of scenario that could emerge there.

I think basically we'll be guided by the parameters and I repeat, those are considered the overall framework valid, it has been reaffirmed, something that we can live with and have assisted us in the last ten years.

In regard to the issue about multilateral, I would like to -- I thank the colleague from Macedonia, I wanted very much to say what he has said.

From the perspective of the Brazilian government, my minister has -- the Minister of Communication has stated this and I think my president will state that in a few hours at the opening ceremony. We don't see that there is necessarily a contradiction between multilateral and this is a principal in our constitution, we discuss the issues that affect the global interests, we should come together as countries, not have unilateral decisions, not have the decisions crafted by groups of countries, but come together as in multilateral ways to discuss. That doesn't mean to exclude other stakeholders. Being a democratic country, the constitution that was discussed, the meaning of multilateral is not to exclude the other sectors. I feel in the context of Internet Governance that those terms are seen as being mutually excluded and they're not.

We think that multilateral process can be reinforced by cooperative stakeholders and on the other handsome processes that are in itself multistakeholder that have -- that were born with the multistakeholder corrective, that they should allow the space for each stakeholder to express and to define roles and interests accordingly. We don't see necessarily that balance, that contradiction.

I want to thank some participants that referred to net neutrality. We had the honor to host Netmundial last year and we have been very proud to host that, it was a very valid experience, it provided us with very important ideas and proposed a way forward in the discussion on Internet Governance related issues.

I would caution it is not realistic to think that what we discussed at Netmundial, a meeting the Brazilian government convened outside that process, outside the existing process at the UN, that those results would be automatically transmitted to the UN context. I think that will require much more work with Delegations towards making that possible and this is our wish. You can certainly count on the Brazilian government to do that.

Finally, I'm sorry, because I said I would not abuse my position, but I think -- I don't see the flag raised but I think maybe I have already expired my time, from my own perspective, we think in regard to enhanced cooperation, one thing that's needed is more good information which we can make decisions.

We are very glad with the work that was done by the Working Group on enhanced cooperation by the CTSD. I think that's -- that enlightened us to show the issues, the processes, and we think that's kind -- that kind of exercise, it is not -- I'm not saying it on behalf of anyone, that's our position, we think we need some more clarity on what is meant by -- what will be the actual interventions that we could make in different processes.

Recognizing that the Internet Governance ecosystem has a variety, a multitude of processes for dialogues. How can we improve the overall infrastructure here? I think we need good information and we certainly could support that this kind of exercise could pursue.

We have an example, we were able to develop within the CSTD a format for doing this, in a way that was found legitimate, that was not only composed of governments but also included the other stakeholders, I think we could do the same and pursue this exercise in a way that would be seen as legitimate by all stakeholders.

I really trust that we can develop creative solutions even working in the context of the UN. We should not forget that the IGF itself was a creation by the UN.

We are optimistic on the prospect of working together with the countries, governments, stakeholders as well.

I apologize for the length, and I would like to go over to my co-moderator to continue the session.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you, Ambassador.

We started late this morning so we're combining the implementation and follow-up and then the general, the other category. Because of the time, I'm not going to try to do any high-level summary. We'll follow-up with the 7, 8 paragraphs here under the follow-up and review. Maybe the scroller can just go through them quickly here.

I'm going to read out the questions which we had suggested, again, just trying to get to the areas that we think would be the most informative.

So the first question was what financing mechanisms should be put in place to implement the WSIS outcomes? The second, the review of the implementation of the WSIS outcomes has taken place at 5-year intervals. How often should the reviews take place and what should their nature be?

What role can the IGF and various national and regional IGF initiatives play in WSIS implementation and follow-up?

Finally, what should be the objectives of the annual reviews, particularly the WSIS action line reviews at the WSIS forum and the annual WSIS reports by CTSD? I will note in those paragraphs you see that there was substantial support for continuing all of the various reviews and reporting structures and specifically called out for a continuation of the annual WSIS forum as well.

Finally, the last question, under section 4, how should stakeholders continue to be involved leading up to the UNGA high-level event in December?

We have 15 minutes for those sections. If you can keep your comments to a minute, a minute and a half, there is a lot of other times and opportunities to participate in the preparatory process. With that, the mikes are open.

I see the U.S. government, Daniel.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: Thank you very much.

This has been an incredibly useful conversation and I very much appreciate it. In terms of follow-up, looking forward, I want to reflect on the comments from our colleagues from India, from Civil Society who have called for I believe it was a substantive meaningful inclusion of all stakeholders from the developing world, we're happy and hoping for that language in whatever document that occurs. Relative to a number of times of conversation on whether or not multilateral, multistakeholder processes and conflict, we don't believe they have to be processes and conflicts but they can be. When we have concerns or express concerns about for example proposals to create a new intergovernment discussion on enhanced cooperation, to have that take place within the UN construct, that would exclude the stakeholder community from a decision making process

in that statement and could threaten the multistakeholder process. When we express concerns it is relative to that. I don't think that there is any longer this perception that they need to be in conflict and they can be added and supportive in the processes.

Lastly, on paragraph 62, because we had a WSIS in 2003 and 2005 and we're gathering ten years later for a high-level meeting to review the WSIS, I don't believe that means we have to gather every ten years to review the WSIS. We don't know what the next ten years will hold, whether or not the multiple processes we have for review including the CSTD annual gatherings. WSIS, the annual IGF and other conferences that we have, if those are not adequate to ensure that we are properly implementing the WSIS if we're not properly implementing the WSIS, at any time, the United Nations, multistakeholder community can have another high-level meeting and whether or not that high-level meeting should take place in the UN, maybe we should have a super IGF at some point in ten years or later to ensure the full participation of the multistakeholder community in this conversation and reviewing this process in review. Again, ultimately I think that there is an incredible amount of value in the process that our Co-Facilitators ran and the conversations that -- co-facilitator its ran and the conversations we have had, there is text with divergence and there is good will and a desire for consensus and we'll work with everybody toward that end. We want to make sure everything we're doing and celebrating here is properly reflected in the language, relative to the language in paragraph 50, whether we need to stay consistent with the language in the WSIS, I think if we're -- if the language in the text in many places reflects that there have been changes in concerns and considerations, some areas of language within the document up there, received much more time and consideration than they did in the original WSIS document, we're obviously looking at the WSIS documents in a different light today and this document reflects that. I think that generally there is consensus in this room, including the word multistakeholder, especially the first paragraph of any mention of Internet Governance, if we're going to revert to the WSIS language from 2003 and 2005 we have to cut and copy the entire text of 2003 and 2005 rather than selectively pull out one paragraph and make it the first paragraph of the Internet Governance section. With that, I again appreciate the consideration and I appreciate all of the comments of everyone in the room.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Let's go over to the business mike.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished moderator.

I'm Chair of Africa City Alliance.

I would like to really appreciate the spirit of the discussion, very lively, cordial.

In this way, our approach, I approach this other items, with regard to the financial mechanism I think we have -- we need to review the national economies and to strengthen them especially the developing economies we have as I said earlier the U.S., the universal service portion funds, these funds, they're supposed to provide some specific intervention through expansion of infrastructure for more broadband and general implementation of the WSIS, to get people to be more connected. We need to bring in more transparency in this regard.

Of course, it does not disabuse the fact that we can bring in new mechanism.

The second points, the review, I think we cannot put the review from project -- or from the program management perspectives from -- there is nothing wrong with review, we have the existing framework, the United Nations brings in reports, we have to find a way to get the nations to take this report more seriously, maybe working on their monitoring processes and evolution processes to get the statistics in. There are a lot of things happening in the grass root. We need to give the opportunity for this information to come in on a yearly basis.

Then, the role of IGF. As I said earlier, there is something unique that happens in Nigeria for the first time, I don't know if it happened elsewhere, we have intranational IGF, a regional zone in Nigeria, after the national IGF, I appreciate the coordinator, he's here, we have another IGF, so bring in the idea for enriching the discourse to the grassroots. So that's in the fostering of the understanding of the WSIS, the packet of inclusive, the nature of the goals of Information Society and then the objective of the annual review, of course, is to provide more clarity, progress to be made, I think that the report is great as mentioned earlier.

A stakeholder, involved in the UNGA, the high-level event in December, I want to congratulate the leaders in this regard. They have done an excellence job of getting everybody informed through media, through various venues, we need to sustain this momentum through December.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Another example of the evolution of enhanced cooperation we're suggesting another change to the Agenda. We were going to spend 20 minutes at the end with some summary comments.

I think in light of the people that are at the mike, and some of the comments that Benedicto Fonseca Filho made earlier, it is more beneficial to continue to hear from people in the room. There will be a session report that will capture the summary, we'll go to 25 past the hour and spend 5 minutes on a couple of things in one, two short announcements.

With that, I'll move to the Civil Society queue.

>> MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you.

Matthew Shears with the Center of Democracy and Technology. Appreciate the opportunity.

A quick point, and then a broader comment: A quick point is that on the review, going back to the comments earlier on about the WSIS with the SDGs in a substantive way, it is useful to foresee an annual review that does review that linkage and how effective that linkage is and highlights Best Practices and meeting those SDGs and innovative ways of looking at meeting those targets. A review focused on the linkages between the twos WSIS and the SDGs, and the progress made would be useful.

A general comment, there is no doubt that we have to look back as a part of the WSIS review to the documents of 2003 and 2005. I think that the Co-Facilitators did a nice job of trying to spur us to think about ways forward. If there is one thing that we have noted that we just really haven't quite captured in this WSIS review document, it is that everything is changing. Whether we like it or not, the roles and responsibilities are changing. The notion of multistakeholder and multilateralism are changing, I'm a steak holder, I'm in front of a Civil Society mike but I don't think of myself as Civil Society but I think of myself as a hybrid. It is going to be increasingly difficult to abide by the restrictions on what the stakeholders are, as we evolve, we'll see many more stakeholder groups evolve as well. This notion of change that's coming through a bit in the document actually is far more important and enhanced cooperation is changing, it is evolving.

We cannot just look at the static motion of the Tunis Agenda in 2015.

The importance of ICTs to development, it is changing. The role of innovation, it is increasing. These are elements of change that I think somehow needs to be captured more in a document and to encourage stakeholders to think more openly and creatively on how we take this Agenda going forward in the next 10 years or whatever the period may be.

Thank you.

>> JOE OLUFUYE: Joe Olufuye from Oracle.

Two quick points: One on the idea of the national regional IGF. They have demonstrated themselves to be important. We see innovative practices doing developed in places like Nigeria looking at the intranational IGFs. I think we have to think about how those regional and national IGFs and intraIGFs are becoming two-way vehicles or multipath vehicles where knowledge goes out to them, but needs come back and how they actually may share learning across the various national, regional, subnational IGFs because there may be examples of how ICT for development was used that could be shared across the regional and national IGFs because some of the examples between the developing countries may be tremendously useful to share.

Maybe we could find ways of panels within IGF to actually help some of that coordination take place.

On the last question of how multistakeholders can participate, I think there has been a call for comments to be provided in a somewhat more drafted form to be considered in advance of the meeting. I would also want to appreciate the role of the Co-Facilitators have played and continue to call on them to be creative in the way that you have operated within the modalities that are permitted to expand and continue to include the multistakeholder and participation and wanted to highlight how much we appreciate the efforts that have been taken to date.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Civil Society queue.

>> SUBI CHATURVEDI: Thank you, Chair.

I'm Subi Chaturvedi, and I'm from Indonesia, a member of the MAG.

Speaking to 57 and 58, thank you, Joe, for bringing up the question of national and regional IGFs and initiatives. There is a lot we have learned from national and regional initiatives and that language in terms of the reflection, we have stagnated at 36 to 14, there is in terms of support, there is requirements and a very clear message and mandate that you require only 3 stakeholders to put together a national, regional initiative, there is needs to further strengthen the similar initiatives. I link that to the point of the review process.

What I was trying to say earlier, it is difficult and extremely expensive for academia civil society and regional, national initiatives not just because of lack of funding but fairness to contribute to the process can substantively. What we would like to see in the language, decentralized review process, if this is consistent and calls for engagement, we're doing two things and we're also sending national, regional initiatives and looking at taking in commentary directly from the community that find it difficult.

The value is there are many, many challenges to jump through the hoops of fire. One, of course, is the clear mandates that you have to be an equal accredited civil society organization. That's a challenge. We hope these processes would be able to open up all conversations as well as inputs that can be sought from different spaces.

And I would like to speak to the point of paragraph 57 about the definition of stakeholders. Clearly the roles and responsibilities, they need to be redefined and examined and also a call for including media as well as youth to the stakeholder category because the Internet today is also one of the largest media. What we lack in terms of education awareness, also dissemination of information, engaging media, especially defining them as part of the stakeholders may be the way forward.

Thank you for listening. Thank you again, Co-Facilitator, you have done a brilliant job.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

Technical, academia

>> GANGESH VIARMA: Thank you.

I would just like to specifically on the aspect of reviews. I also echo a need for more regional and national level reviews that can happen. Also the fact that these can be cost intensive for developing countries and there is a need for creating a financial mechanism to aid in creating this kind of data collection that's talked about in paragraph 61 and it is also important that this data driven and the mode of policy making, it is important because it creates targeted policy that's more effective and so there needs to be that and it should be supported from a financial mechanism for developing countries.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

A move to Civil Society. You have the floor.

>> Thank you very much.

This is the Association for Progressive Communications, and thank you for the opportunity to comment.

We would like to refer specifically to the call, to the high-level meeting on the Information Society in 2025 and we're pleased to see the strong linkages with Sustainable Development Agenda and process. We support the suggestions made by Matthew sheer in relation to having annual reviews. We really think that would enrich the process very much. We would want to emphasize the need for the high-level meeting to be really inclusive and open in all aspects and all faces of it with the inclusion, the full inclusion and participation of the various stakeholders.

We're concerned that pairing a high-level meeting with intergovernmental Working Group is not conducing reinforce the Internet resource that must be managed in an open, inclusive manner with participation of diverse stakeholders, nor does it recognize the evolution of the Internet Governance in the past ten years and how it has been enriched by the contributions of the diverse stakeholders. We would like to see those recognitions made explicit in the document.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

We're going to close the queue after these two speakers from Civil Society. Then we'll have a few concluding remarks and a few announcements.

Civil Society, you have the floor.

>> Good afternoon. I'm not from Civil Society, but from the African IGF Secretariat at the UN Commission for Africa.

What I will say is the African IGF, output, it was said in December. When you look at the paragraph 102 of the Agenda, it is indicated that the commissions based on the request of Member States and approved budgetary resource, it may organize the follow-up activities in collaboration of the regional organizations and continues in paragraph 1, we consider a multistakeholder approach and the implementation activities by the private sector, Civil Society, UN and other international organizations to be essential.

So this is just to let you know that the African IGF, we have the review -- we have reviewed this, this outcome document and we came up that there is a need for regional reviews as we used to have in the WSIS process and we had sent our contribution, which is a bit reflected in paragraph 59, but which was not what we were asking for so what we want is the following, we call for annual regional review of WSIS+10 outcomes, involving all stakeholders who are Member States, international, regional organizations, a report on progress in achieving the outcomes within the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Thank you.

>> Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I'm from the Internet Democracy Project in India,

I support a lot of the statements that have been made here. I will try to be short.

I support everything that was said earlier by Matthew Shears from the Center of Democracy and Technology, including on the importance of being more dynamic in our looking forward efforts.

One point I wanted to specifically stress though is the value that is there in regional review processes and this comes back also to my earlier point about the importance of full development country inclusion, this is easier to achieve if there are actually regular processes looking at something like a review on a regular basis. Within the text, as the previous speaker mentioned, there is already in paragraph 59 the reference to the UN regional commissions and they could perhaps be mobilized to do this as was done around the earlier summits.

But it would perhaps be a great idea also to explore at the moment whether the regional IGFs may be a better venue to organize this. Good because they have built a very strong multistakeholder tradition and because they're effective and dynamic and they're already being organized. If we could combine these reviews with the IGF that would perhaps be a more cost effective way to organize regional reviews on a regular basis.

I would also strongly support suggestions to make the review more analytic, should not just be a reporting on achievements but also an analysis of trends, of gaps, of changes going forward. This regional analysis could then also be Fed into the review of the WSIS action lines at the WSIS forum as well as the WSIS forum more generally making that more dynamic and analytic as well.

Finally, I wanted to support a comment by my colleague from EPC, on the high-level meeting and particularly the need for any future review exercise to be fully open and inclusive of all stakeholders at all points of the process.

Many thanks.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

With apologies to the last two, if I could ask you to keep your remarks to one minute, we have to make sure we have time for the Co-Facilitators to say a few words before they need to leave.

>> Thank you for the opportunity of having this space.

My name is Sylvia. I'm Vice President of WTSA. I'm general director of ALITA, and deeply involved in the ELAT process, the process of Latin America and the region. I have been involved in WSIS process in the beginning as part of our government.

I would like to congratulate the organizers for the wonderful meeting. It is amazing. My first time in this kind of meeting. A lot of things I have to do and change, the mentality of private sector since this meeting.

I would like to stress the importance of finance mechanisms, that they should be reviewed, the instruments, they still need to be brought and we have to have the joint collaboration.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you. Well done on the time.

Academic, technical, you have the last floor spot.

>> Thank you very much. Thank you.

I will be quick,

I want to thank the organizers and the Co-Facilitators, and I would be glad to inform you that we will be giving specific text inputs that will help with the process as a written comment and also we request that the next stage,

if there is a possibility of one more consultation to be held before the meeting it would be very much appreciated and if the meetings may itself be open to more than just government stakeholders.

Thank you very much.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you.

I'll hand it over to Benedicto Fonseca Filho for concluding with the formalities and we have announcements at the end.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you for those that participated actively on my own behalf and on behalf of the organizations Committee of the Host Country and the MAG. I think we have completely fulfilled the purpose of the session to allow the Co-Facilitators of the preparatory process to have yet another opportunity to interrupt the representatives from governments but also from the stakeholders, especially from the non-governmental stakeholders, I think that was my view a success.

I would like to turn to the Co-Facilitators for their final remarks if they wish. Please.

>> H.E. LANA ZAKI ZUSSEIBEH: Thank you to all of you here for some of the most enlightening, enriching comments we have heard through the entire process.

I think we go away with a lot of fresh ideas, perspectives we wouldn't have had and it made our participation here in Brazil valuable. Thank you for giving us food for thought. I would like that thank and acknowledge in the presence of the Assistant Secretary-General, the role that UNDESA has played, we're one team back at the UN with all of your input. We would like to acknowledge that.

There is so much that was said that I don't think we can comment on each of the individual suggestions and proposals and questions. I would like to note that I think that submitting it in writing is a very good idea. Taking -- I think there was a suggestion from Joe to be creative within the restraints posed by the resolution, it occurred to us, if there is a high level summary of this meeting, it is useful to have that well before the negotiations start next week and what we will commit to do is to circulate that summary to all Member States so that as they're going into the negotiations they also have in front of them your contribution on paper side by side with the textual contributions from Member States, that's one way to ensure that what is said here doesn't simply stay in Joao Pessoa but comes to New York with us and we'll, of course, commit and pledge to represent the views that have been expressed here. That's one tangible way to take the views here into the negotiations in New York.

You know, lastly, I would like to thank those of you that have acknowledged that this is a difficult job. There are divergent views and there is something in the text that everyone finds to like and there is inevitably something in the text that everybody dislikes and we don't think that's a bad thing. We think that we have managed to compile a lot of very important views, important stakeholders, into this document.

It will not be easy. I don't want to say it will be easy in the room in New York on the 19th, 20, 24th, 25. We don't think it will. We hope not to lose the spirit of this document which has been forged out of a very strong consensus on a number of key areas that are important to taking this very important topic forward and we will pledge as Co-Facilitators to not let everyone in this room down to look at this document to be forward looking and help them achieve the next decade or two of development, that's essentially what this is about and we shouldn't let that go out of site as we're into text on the negotiations and we pledge not to let that happen.

Thank you again. It is a pleasure to be here and to meet so many of you over the last two days, and we take that experience back with us to New York.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you.

Let me say thank you for your statement and for the suggestion that these meetings, going forward for you, it is a summary for circulation, we think that this will increase the value of the session and we really thank you for this.

Would Janis Mazeiks also like to address us? You have the floor.

>> H.E. JANIS MAZIEKS: This is unscripted, and this is done for myself, but as mentioned by Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, which indicates that we're indeed -- first of all, I would like to recognize that this discussion has been as diverse as we had hoped and in fact, expected. Thank you very much for the organization of this, for this useful panel, and we will of course bring this back to the negotiation table. Both the new ideas that have been voiced today and also the reiteration of the elements that, of course, have been on the table for some time, but it is worthwhile hearing from the stakeholders how important they are to you.

We are looking forward to your written comments, and I think this idea of compiling one document of today's discussion also is very valuable.

Final points: We are gratified for the kind words we have heard from you for the work of the conferences and indeed our team who have been working hard for these months and we'll be working hard for another month.

I will be still here tomorrow so looking forward to further possibilities to interact in the meantime.

One more thanks to the organizers also from me.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you, Ambassador, for your statement. We will I'm sure that participants will take the opportunity to further interact with you today and tomorrow. I would like to join Ambassador Lana in thanking UNDESA for the support of the process throughout and I would also like to through this, I also want to thank the support that's been provided by the IGF Secretariat and by the MAG Chair who is here also with us and I would like to offer the floor to you. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Benedicto Fonseca Filho.

Dear friends, I'm particularly grateful to all those who intervened during this conversation and the comment on the draft outcome document of the session. This was actually the wish of the MAG to provide opportunity for a community to interact with the UN -- with the President of General Assembly or his representatives. Of course, when we planned this session, some nine months ago, we hoped that that would be a part of the formal process. Unfortunately it was not possible, nevertheless, as you heard from Ambassador Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, the report of this session will be circulated in New York as an input to the final negotiation, to the process, and since the President of General Assembly who was invited to attend IGF meeting nominated two ambassadors, Ambassador of United Arab Emirates and Janis Mazeiks to be the representatives here, you were basically talking to the President of The General Assembly. Thank you very much. Thank you Co-Facilitators for being with us and for engaging with the IGF community on the issues of such a crucial importance for all of us.

Thank you.

>> LYNN St. AMOUR: Thank you. We echo that thank you.

They have provided tremendous support to this, the UN Secretariat, to the transcribers, the translator, and also to the ones that organized this session. We had the support of Ginger, we have the online participation. It really does take that many people and certainly more to pull something like this together.

Just as importantly, echo the thanks to all of the participants here. This obviously would not have been a successful session without your engagement and your thoughtful exchanges. Appreciate very much those efforts.

I think the final thing I have to do is -- I want to announce that there is an exercise ongoing in the demonstration booth area, it is called Imagining the Internet with students. It is a journalism school. They have been to many of the IGFs in the past. They do a great job of capturing kind of the comments and the essence here. They're looking to do short interviews, 5 questions, 5 minutes. They'll be here over the course of the week. They're a non-profit think tank that actually researches questions of the Internet and perceptions. Really we would encourage you to stop by. You will see them. There are groups of two wondering around with a video camera.

I think I'm to point out that from 2:00 to 3:00 there is a setting the scene for the IGF, and of course then there is the main session as well which begins at 3:00.

With that, thank you all very much.

Thank you, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho, for joining me here.

10th IGF Opening Ceremony

CHENGETAI MASANGO: I would like to start on time. As you know, these sessions can go on. And can I kindly ask the rest of you to take your seats, please.

Ladies and gentlemen, can you kindly take your seats? Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Assistant Secretary-General and the Governor and Minister are about to approach. I kindly ask you to take your seats if you haven't done so, and also kindly ask the Opening Session speakers to come to the front row, and take their seats. If we have any more Opening Session speakers, can they please come up front?

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. The Assistant Secretary-General is entering with the Minister and the Governor. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Before we start the opening ceremony, we would just like to have a short presentation by a local artist, Miss Lucy Alves, some of you will know as the voice behind the song that introduced the IGF Joao Pessoa in last year's meeting in Turkey. We will start off with a video.

  (video playing).

  (no English translation).

  (applause).

  (performance by Lucy Alves).

  (applause).

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much. That is a very beautiful voice. I also hope that all of you will stay and wait until after the meeting to enjoy all that Paraiba has to offer. Thank you.

I would like to invite the Assistant Secretary-General for economic development, Mr. Lenni Montiel, the Minister of Communications of Brazil, Mr. Andre Figueiredo, and the Governor of Paraiba, Mr. Ricardo Coutinho, to proceed to the stage, please.

  (applause).

Thank you very much. Welcome to the tenth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum. It is my pleasure to give the floor to Mr. Lenni Montiel, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, to deliver a message on behalf of the United Nations Secretary-General.

(applause).

>> LENNI MONTIEL: Excellencies, distinguished participants, stakeholders, participating online around the world, I'm honoured to join you at the 10th session of the Internet Governance Forum, and to deliver a message on behalf of the United Nations Secretary-General. I quote: I am pleased to send greetings to all participants of the 10th session of the Internet Governance Forum, including those following online.

And I thank the Government of Brazil for once again acting as a host. Less than two months ago, world leaders adopted the visionary 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Our challenge now is to implement this blueprint for a better future. Information and communication technologies and the Internet can empower this global undertaking. The breadth and depth of the Sustainable Development Agenda will require that we tap into the potential of the data revolution through the use of new and nontraditional sources of data.

We must enhance the statistical capacities and ensure our efforts are based on sound science.

Many challenges exist including large digital divides, people living in poverty, women and girls, children, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, older persons, marginalized and vulnerable groups lack adequate access to and training in using ICTs and the Internet. Cyber attacks, Cybercrime, and issues related to privacy and surveillance are also issues that need to be addressed.

I call on all stakeholders to intensify efforts to promote accessibility, affordability, education and multilingualism by investing in critical infrastructure and capacity building and by building an open reliable, safe, secure, stable, and inclusive Internet, through multi-lateral and multistakeholder global partnership. Let us reaffirm the universality indivisibility, interdependence and interrelation of all human rights, and fundamental freedoms, both online and off-line.

Let us turn the digital divides into digital opportunities for all.

Let us leave no one behind. I wish you a productive Internet Governance Forum. End of quote.

Excellencies, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, also known as UN DESA, has been entrusted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to oversee the Secretariat support to the Internet Governance Forum.

We at UN DESA appreciate the opportunity to have serviced the IGF for more than, for ten years, a unique multistakeholder Forum on public policies relating to global Internet Governance. We remain committed to supporting the IGF, should member states decide to extend its mandate beyond 2015.

In echoing appeals from governments and other stakeholders we will further strengthen and improve the functions of the IGF. I wish you all a vibrant and outcome oriented meeting.

Now, in accordance with the customs on the Internet Governance Forum, I have the honor to invite Mr. Andre Figueiredo, Minister of Communications of Brazil, to assume the Chairpersonship of the 2015 IGF on behalf of the Government of Brazil.

(applause).

>> ANDRE FIGUEIREDO: Assistant Secretary General Montiel, thank you for your kind words. It is my pleasure to accept the Chairmanship of 2015 IGF.

Now, I would like to formally open the IGF 2015 in Joao Pessoa, and allow me to present a video message of Her Excellency Mrs. Dilma Rousseff, President of the Republic of Brazil.

(Video:)

>> DILMA ROUSSEFF: Ladies and gentlemen, participants of the 10th Forum of the Internet Governance, IGF, I want to express the welcome of the Brazilian people for all of Joao Pessoa to take part of this edition of

the IGF. I am sure that this meeting will allow the deepening of the great themes that concern governments and organizations of the Civil Society, businessmen, scientists, and researchers that work in the development of the global Internet. We want to help in the creation of an inclusive environment, and also sustainable, that allows the experience between differences and seeking consensus to evolve the Internet and its governance, ten years after the WSIS, and its main recommendations and conclusions remain current.

We should preserve the accomplishments made, and seek solutions for the new challenges, which is balancing security and full respect to human rights, specifically, right to privacy. Brazil has been endeavoring to build paths to evolve the current system of Internet Governance.

We have hosted in 2014 NETMundial, whose statement identified principles for Internet Governance, and a pathway for its future evolvement. The high level UN meeting late this year, once it reviews the ten years of implementation of the results of the World Summit, also should face these themes. Actually it is an important challenge that we have ahead of us, regards the conclusion of the reform process of the supervision or oversight system of the central parts of the Internet.

This exercise should result in the creation of a structure that is of global nature that should indeed respond to the demands and expectations of the community, and that renders accounts of its action. There is no opposition between multistakeholders and multilateralisms.

Some themes require deliberation on a multi-lateral level. In this case, all the countries should have the possibility of taking part on equal conditions, without having only one country or a small group of countries having priority over the others.

One Internet, submitted to intergovernmental arrangements that exclude the other stakeholders would not be Democratic, nor are acceptable, multistakeholder arrangements subject to the oversight of one or few states. Thus the complementarity between these two concepts, multistakeholder and multilateralism, derives from the recognition of the different roles and responsibilities that should be performed by the actors that take part of the ecosystem of the Internet. In Brazil the successful experience with the multistakeholder and pluri participative model implemented by CGI has inspired us to build and improve the Internet Marco Civil. It is only possible in a scenario of respect to human rights, freedom of expression, net neutrality, diversity, universality, security, and thus protection of privacy and the state of all our great challenge is to expand the access to the Internet for those that are still disconnected, especially those that live in developing countries.

We must have joint efforts of all participants present here, so that we can move forward in the development of the society of digital inclusion. This is the commitment of my administration that will be implemented via the program, broadband for all. Brazil has been from the beginning an advocate of the Internet use as a multistakeholder debate. We defend the extension of its mandate. The IGF, due to constant search for consensus amongst the various areas that are interested or stakeholders, is one of the most important Forums to continue the trajectory of building global Internet, enabling the Sustainable Development and also inclusive development.

Welcome to Joao Pessoa. Welcome to Brazil.

(End of Video.)

 (applause).

>> ANDRE FIGUEIREDO: If you don't mind, I would like to continue my speech in Portuguese.

Lenni Montiel, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ricardo Coutinho, Governor of the State of Paraiba, also our Vice Governor and her secretaries, ministers, authorities present, all the representatives of Civil Society, of the teleco corporate organizations, the academia and technical community, once again I would like to reiterate the welcoming of our President Dilma Rousseff and how we give the welcome to the IGF and

the City of Joao Pessoa. For us it's a great honor to have you all here, to have the opportunity for the next few days to share with you information, visions, experiences and propositions to enhance our ecosystems for Internet Governance.

I would like to start saying a bit about what aspects that really challenge us, that countries, developing countries, access to the Internet which are the ones that are still not included in the society of information. One of the core issues is the discussion on the options of public policies to connect the next one billion users.

In Brazil, there is full awareness of the importance of Internet access in people's lives. The Marco Civil that has as its essence respect to freedom of expression, the human right and development of person individualities, says that access to Internet is essential to exercising citizenship. That way, one of our big challenges is to really find the broadening of infrastructure in Telecom, that gives support to Internet and also really have a regulatory scenario that is stable that can bring on investment, innovation and respect to citizens' rights. In Brazil we have had great efforts to promote access to Internet to all.

Within our program of broadband, we have some tax waivers for Internet equipment and also for building broadband network. We have encouraged to have local providers. There are thousands around the country, and that today invest heavily in cutting edge network. We are about to launch a geostationary satellite to cover the remote areas of the country, and of a submarine cable to improve our connectivity internationally speaking.

As a benefit of this group of actions, we had notable impact. In December 2010 to August 2015, the number of subscriptions to Internet and broadband has increased 69 percent, going from 15 to 25 million for mobile broadband, we had a growth of 867 percent of subscription, which went from 34 to 138 million.

And today, there are 208 million subscriptions for Internet access through broadband in the country. The wide scale of the service shows a connected society in 2014, half of the households had access to the Internet, and 94.2 million people with at least 10 years old were Internet users.

So this significant numbers shows economic growth, increase of productivity, national integration and above all, digital and social inclusion of our population.

Beyond the challenges that each society sees in their own national state has a global impact and an impact individually. Our view as said by our President Dilma Rousseff is that multistakeholder approach and multi-lateral approach are complementary concepts respecting each theme and roles and responsibilities of each of the players that are part of the Internet. In the view of Brazil, when it comes to the global processes of Internet Governance, we can align with what we practice in-house.

I'd like to remind you that a bit over a year ago, we hosted the multistakeholder meeting for the future of Internet Governance, NETMundial, held in Sao Paulo through the call of Dilma Rousseff.

I believe that the draft from this meeting bringing on principles to be followed is the roadmap for the future evolution of the global ecosystem of Internet Governance. And it's an important benchmark for our discussions here at IGF. Based on these assumptions, we have now the task to debate and understand complex concepts as enhanced cooperation and the role of Government in a multistakeholders approach. We need to identify mechanisms of strengthening for this multistakeholder environment, so that all voices can be heard and can influence all the processes that impact them.

It's necessary to have a look into the specific demands of the developing countries, and less developed ones as well. Together with that, the dynamism and ability of change in Internet brings on concrete solid issues how to preserve the neutrality of the net, what business models can bring benefit or harm the Internet. What is the best policy of management for critical resources of the Internet? What are the barriers for the full development of the economic, digital economy, how can we protect the respect to the essential rights in the net, especially those that have to do with freedom of expression and privacy?

These are topics that will be debated throughout this week, and those which are not there, they are not ready answers to be used. That way, we must address based on the understanding the Internet has to be preserved within its openness, plurality and diversity, that can contribute to a society that it's inclusive, and fair. On behalf of the Brazilian Government, once again I'd like to wish you all a great time here, and really have an enriching time in the discussions. Welcome to Joao Pessoa. Welcome to Brazil.

(applause).

I would now like to give the floor to Ricardo Coutinho, Governor of State of Paraiba.

(applause).

>> RICARDO COUTINHO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My dear Lenni Montiel, Assistant to the Secretary-General of the United Nations here representing Secretary-General of the United Nations, our acknowledgment for the holding of the 10th edition of IGF in Brazil, my dear Andre Figueiredo, Minister of Communications of Brazil here representing the distinguished President of the Republic of Brazil, dear Dilma Rousseff, also a partner in the Ministry of Communications and various projects to support implementation of the infrastructure of digital inclusion in the State of Paraiba, that today has decided to celebrate yet another year of life, precisely at the opening of this event, which is IGF.

My dear Chengetai Masango, Secretary of IGF, partner of UN, responsible for the preparation of the schedule, our acknowledgment for hosting in this City of Joao Pessoa, the choosing of Joao Pessoa to be the seat in the center to hold the 10th edition. I'd like to thank the Ambassadors and coordinators and all the team for the partnership and trust in preparing and organizing IGF 2015, and we know it is an extremely important agenda for our country and for the world, in this beginning of the 21st century.

I would like furthermore to welcome everyone present, Government, representatives, private sectors, Civil Society, members of academic and technical communities, from the various regions of the world and Brazil.

And also, my welcome to the press professionals. We understand that this 10th edition of IGF in Joao Pessoa, that will have the central theme, the evolution of governance of Internet, empowering sustainable development, already gets it right on the starting point, by choosing the main theme. From the very first moment, we are aware of the articulation between the CGI in Brazil and the UN to bring another edition of the IGF to Brazil. It was our desire to support this important initiative, and to introduce the State of Paraiba, the City of Joao Pessoa, the facilities of our convention center with all the services and the facilities, all our tourism attractions, our hospitality, as a differential point for this 10th edition of IGF in Brazil.

Unlike some we are not used to say no between four walls, and are now seeing that we say yes to the public. A word is only one in any environment. This is why the holding of this IGF will be a landmark in history, and also in its next editions that will certainly take place.

This edition in Joao Pessoa outside major other centers signals to the importance of the open Internet, and the benefit of new development frontiers that are more sustainable and with special attention to better distribution of wealth throughout all regions and communities.

This is an immense challenge to all of us, particularly public servants. We know that IGF makes feasible a collective and participative space for the reflection of potentialities, risks and critical resources related to the advances of the Internet and the world. This return of IGF to Brazil after the 2007 edition in Rio de Janeiro represents a recognition on the part of the other world players to the protagonism of Brazil in the global debate on Internet Governance.

Here, I would like to make a special highlight to the partnership between cgi.br and the Brazilian Government in conducting the debate on the regulation of the Internet Marco Civil in Brazil. We are moving forward,

Minister Andre Figueiredo, but we need to advance even further with a certainty that we will retain in Brazil an Internet Governance ecosystem guided by good practices internationally settled, and in behalf of innovation.

I believe that this model should be taken as a reference in other parts of the world. The UN General Assembly in its resolution entitled, the Future We Want, drafted within Rio+20, reasserted the strong need to attain Sustainable Development.

We must act jointly in promoting sustainable economic growth, inclusive, equitable, generating more opportunities for all, reducing inequalities, heightening basic living standards, fostering social equitable development and inclusion, and promoting the integration and sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems.

This important resolution reinforces the importance of the involvement of all levels of Government, legislative agencies and segments of the society in the promotion of sustainable development.

We must have the engagement and efforts for other challenges, amongst them the continuity of the struggle for democratization of communications, opening up for a greater number of people, the opportunity of sharing a greater number of information contents that circulate in the world, giving equal conditions of individual and collective development, something that brings down another rationale that few people that are privileged can actually boast of holding exclusive information, be it as producers or broadcasters, as if information could still be an exclusively individual good, and transferable.

This is rather a pathway that needs strong step, and a moment in which society is increasingly more vulnerable to conservative, moving back, where only empowered population reduces risks of subtracting the most fundamental right, nothing most important than all being able to express their needs and dreams, access to information is a basic condition for each Democratic project over society.

(applause).

Now a question, regarding the access to the Internet, then I would like to share with you regards the growing numbers here. In Brazil, we estimate that over 97 million Brazilians have access to Internet at home. In Paraiba, ladies and gentlemen, children, very joyfully to host this meeting, has surfing indices that even higher than other Brazilian states, even economically stronger. According to research conducted by the federal government, 33 percent of Paraiba citizens access Internet 7 days a week, a higher percentage than states that are bigger, like Bayeux, which are our dear neighboring states.

Surveys points that Paraiba citizens spend on average six hours 26 minutes per day surfing, exceeding the national average, which is four hours 59 minutes, and still states like Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. Why am I saying this? I say this that for us, civil servants, this naturally imposes other challenge, expanding the way the governments relate with citizens.

We must, as I could see yesterday on Day Zero, we have been making efforts towards this, both in the need of democratizing the use, also in the expanding of instruments of Government for the improvement of public services. We are proportionately the Brazilian state that most acquired computers for students in the public school network, proportionally. We have implemented the teaching of robotics in public schools, middle schools. We are implementing to the end of 2016 in a partnership with MCTI about 3,000-kilometers of fiberoptics, integrating 55 cities in the state.

We have a process of making our budget all based in the popular participation that increasingly results to digital media to enhance the level of engagement of the population, as well as the transparency portal that allows simultaneous follow-up of Government spending.

So that in Paraiba, the population tells the state which are the priorities for investments and tries to see whether they are actually being made.

I would thus like to take the opportunity of this important edition of IGF in Joao Pessoa to highlight that it is imperative to rethink the scope and availability of solutions of electronic Government. We must listen from you at this Forum how we can move forward, and actually financially, in building agendas, guided to best deployment of new technologies, with direct impact in the goals of sustainable development in our state.

In regions like ours, Brazil northeast, whose adversities are permanent challenges, we have to make growth leaps at a shorter period of time. We know the importance of the role of the Governments, with greater articulation, with the private segments of Civil Society, members of academic and technical communities. We will be able to advance in the definition, implementation and assessment of public policies and foster instruments towards an open Internet that is Democratic, safe, and that enables social and productive inclusion of individuals.

I must admit that as a civil servant, I'd like to move forward in the offer of qualified services to citizens based on the Internet, with a certainty that technologies and the correct empowerment of knowledge to overcome our limitations may bring more favorable setting for sustainable growth, in a region like ours, where we are, our state is located, as well as other regions of the world naturally.

I am sure that safe, open, neutral Internet, neutral, well assisted by legislation, will be able to be an important resource for sustainable development, helping generating results and positive impact in education, healthcare, agriculture, public, security, perhaps one of the great challenges of a great part of the world start in many other areas. The State of Paraiba, with all its academic potential and also business potential, is open for partnerships that aim at the development, experimenting solutions of electronic Government, involving academic centers, young talents, the generation of solutions, the establishment of innovative businesses and connections with the market.

And lastly, I wish great success to all of you on these four days of IGF sharing with you the same feeling that Brazil and the world need to move forward in the strategic themes regarding Internet Governance, that is growing and becoming more inclusive.

I wish you all success. Enjoy the beauties of our state, of our capital, the easternmost point of the Americas, and enjoy the warmth of our people. We are very happy to welcome you, all of you, very welcome. Come back. Get to know better our culture and our people. Thank you.

  (applause).

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much, Governor Ricardo Coutinho. Please remain seated while Assistant Secretary General Montiel, Minister Andre Figueiredo, Governor Ricardo Coutinho leave the auditorium, please.

I call on Professor Almeida to continue chairing this meeting.

He is coordinator of the Brazilian Steering Committee, one of the main organizations behind bringing us to Joao Pessoa. I'd also like to call on Mr. Koulov to take the stage in place of the Assistant Secretary-General. Now that has put a close to our opening ceremony. We will now start the Opening Session of the IGF.

I will now hand it over to our next master of ceremony.

Opening Session

CHAIR: We will now begin the Opening Session of the 10th IGF meeting. We will now proceed with welcome remarks by representatives.

We are going to have now some words of Mr. Virgilio Almeida.

>> VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: Ladies and gentlemen, I will speak a few words. The IGF celebrates here in the sunny and free City of Joao Pessoa its 10th edition. The first IGF was held in 2006, in Athens, when the global Internet had one billion users. Today, ten years later, the overall number exceeds 3.2 billion users, of which two billions in the developing countries. Four billion people in developing countries are still off-line. In fact, the Internet user is an HackAc expression for, in the not distant future, we expect all citizens should have access to the Internet. I could present a short list of IGF achievements. However, I will point out a few whose impact was significant. Recognition of the multistakeholder nature of the Internet which followed the meeting of the WSIS in 2005 changed the nature of global Internet Governance processes. The expansion of the discussions of the IGF with the inclusion of social, economic and political issues was another achievement.

Various citizens in less central areas of the world held IGF meetings. This helped to quickly disseminate the concepts and innovative ideas of the Internet to the developing world. IGF 2015 has implemented one important innovation. CGI and ISOC launched the youth at IGF initiative, which seeked to strengthen the participation and leadership of young people during the 10th IGF.

Let me ask the 73 young students from Brazil and Latin America to stand up and give them an applause.

  (applause).

>> VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: However, I want to take this few minutes to put some basic questions that go beyond the traditional discussions of Internet Governance.

We need to answer a fundamental question. What should we do so that the evolution of the Internet make real difference in the lives of billions of the world's citizens in developing economies and least developed countries.

What must we do so that the Internet of the future effectively contributes to reduce discrimination and economic and social inequalities, which mainly plague the developing world.

We know that Internet access is essential, but not sufficient. We know that access to the current universe of information is essential, but not sufficient. We know that connecting people is important, but not sufficient.

We know a lot about new digital technologies, but we don't know yet how the future Internet can ensure contribution to achieving the 17 goals of sustainable development proposals by the United Nations for 2030.

The central question is, what do we need to do? I don't know the answers. But we do know some clues. We know that the Internet of the future has to make a difference in health, education, employment, security of populations, worldwide, particularly in the developing world. We know that the Internet of the future needs to effectively contribute to the preservation of the environment.

We also know that the concrete benefits of the Internet have not yet achieved a global scale, that the technology allows. The fruits of the evolution of Internet technologies are not fairly distributed. We need to discuss both an ambitious public and private partnership that make a real difference for the disadvantaged populations. The IGF with its multiple views, with its multistakeholder nature, and with its wide diversity and representativeness provides the ideal space to develop a response to the challenge that the evolution of the Internet presents.

On behalf of the Steering Committee of the Internet in Brazil, CGI, I want to welcome all participants and wish them fruitful work at the IGF 2015. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Virgilio Almeida. We will now proceed with welcome remarks by representatives of all stakeholder groups. We have 20 people who each will speak for a maximum of six minutes. I ask you to respect this time limit, so that we are able to finish in good time. I remind you from time to time the speaking order was selected by a lottery drawn yesterday. I would like to call Mr. Omer Fatih Sayan, Chairman of the Board, Information and Communication Technologies Authority of Turkey, host of the 2014 IGF meeting. Mr. Sayan, you have the floor.

(applause).

>> OMER FATIH SAYAN: On behalf of the Assistant Secretary-General, Excellencies, it's a great pleasure for me to be here for the opening of the 10th meeting of the Internet Governance Forum. Having this chance, I would like to express our gratitude to Brazil for the excellent hosting of this meeting. We have been enjoying and I'm sure that we will be enjoying our stay in this beautiful City of Joao Pessoa.

Last year we had the privilege of hosting 9th IGF in Istanbul, Turkey. Over 3500 participants came together on site, and online, to discuss many Internet related issues under the theme of connecting continents for enhanced stakeholder governance drawing inspiration from Istanbul's unique location where continents of Europe and Asia meet. In IGF 2014 human rights issues discussed in detail were IGF participants formulated an input to bring the Human Rights Council on the right to privacy in the digital age and agreed a key message. It was emphasized that there is a need for increased interaction between Government entities and all other interested stakeholders in ongoing and future deliberations on enhancing trust in cyberspace.

To facilitate the connection of currently not connected to Internet, a strong call was made for increased emphasis and inclusion of ICTs and Internet access in the post 2015.

Youth representatives emphasized the need to strengthen existing mechanism that empower youth in attending and engaging in the Internet Governance ecosystem. IGF Sport Association formally launched in Istanbul to achieve sustainable funding mechanism of IGF. IGF 2014 has also introduced numerous stakeholders to Internet Governance ecosystem and created a new global dynamism. We believe that the successful outcomes of Istanbul IGF 2014 will be a useful input for IGF 2015 here.

The Internet is an important contributor for sustainable growth, innovation and development. Based on discussions to accept the right to Internet access as a fundamental human right, to that extent, I am very proud to share Turkey's major set of goals within her strategic vision of 2030 regarding ICT.

These goals include expanding the economic among the global top ten transformation to knowledge-based society, building an international hub for ICTs, maintaining ICT base, economic growth and enhancing high-speed broadband access for all.

Among these goals as a G20 member Turkey is holding G20 this year and G20 leader summit will take place this weekend in Turkey. The Internet economy has always been a hot topic in meetings.

In line with that vision, Turkey takes strong steps in order to create a fully transformed country using ICT in eGovernment services, we recently successfully held IMT advanced auction by which operators will provide IMT services enhancing high-speed mobile Internet, and the further the value of added mobile services, and applications in Turkey.

We also aim to give one of the first 5G services by 2020. In today's world, data usage proliferates exponentially in both mobile and fixed networks thanks to the new applications, products and services, especially network neutrality discussions and over the top services revolutionize the way of delivering ICT services. OTT services created a value, but on the other hand, they affect the whole broadband ecosystem, in particular the network operators' revenues and ability to finance network deployment.

We like all stakeholders in particular countries which have no specific rules and approaches to net neutrality to discuss these issues to evaluate pros and cons. It is important to provide rules for guaranteeing the right of Internet access in order to express their opinions freely of the citizens.

It is also equally important to respect privacy and data protection in the Internet. We should protect the balance between such kind of personal rights, and data driven, innovation and economy. That approach will unlock the economic value of personal data on one side, and foster economic growth on the other side.

I hope IGF handles this issue in its meeting, further to overcome challenges. There is an increasing trend in the number of people online. Online safety is becoming a critical issue for everyone. Kids have specific needs and vulnerabilities with regard to online safety, enabling a safe online environment for kids has many aspects, close collaboration between governmental institutions, network operators, Internet service providers, private sector and NonGovernmental Organizations is inevitable.

We need to work together to prevent any illegal action, especially terrorism of all kinds where Internet is used as a means of communication. Terrorism has no religion or language. All multistakeholders should evaluate policies and have special rules for international cooperation in combating this. In this respect we expect utmost support from the representatives of social media companies, in order to prevent utilization of Internet as a tool of propaganda, by terrorist organizations such as Isis. We believe that protecting the rights of Internet users against illegal content would be a great contribution to the development of Internet economy. Intermediaries should also fulfill their responsibilities in the implementation of national laws to combat with illegal content of the Internet. Close cooperation with the international organizations, governments, NGOs and international Internet intermediary required to combat illegal use of Internet. I draw your attention to creating multistakeholder governments both on national and international level in order to give each stakeholder equal rights and responsibilities regarding to Internet related issues, because of the transition and ICANN accountability period we experienced most importance of having equal voice regarding the Internet Governance at global level.

IGF 2015 will be the perfect place for multistakeholder Internet Governance, deep dives. Taking this opportunity, I would like to underline that IGF meetings provide splendid environment for fruitful discussions, fleshing out ideas, sharing ideas and exchanging experiences in very established manner. Turkey strongly supports the continuation of IGF and encourages all stakeholders to join us in supporting extension of IGF's mandate under the UN.

I would like to conclude my words by wishing a successful meeting and look forward to joining the discussions in parallels throughout the week. Thank you very much for your attention.

 (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker on my list is His Excellency, Bambang Heru Tjahjono, Deputy Minister of ICT Applications, Ministry of Science, Information and Technology of Indonesia. Your Excellency, you have the floor.

>> BAMBANG HERU TJAHJONO: Excellencies, Under-Secretary general, Excellency, Mr. Virgilio Almeida, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished participants, it is really an honor for me to be invited and speak in front of this very distinguished audience of the Opening Session of the 10th IGF held in Joao Pessoa, Brazil today.

Ladies and gentlemen, to start with, allow me to congratulate the Government for hosting this event successfully.

I believe following the successful result of the NETMundial global conference last year in Sao Paulo where the Indonesian ICT Ministry attended, this IGF will be successful too.

Indonesia firmly believes that the finest ICT ecosystems should be based upon working principles, the global ICT community embraces the principles such as people centered inclusive transparent, equal, and benefit for all mankind. This is the essence of the development oriented information society.

Along with the effective and affordable ICT ecosystem, our works in WSIS and other venue will contribute positively to the achievement of Post-2015 Development Agenda that sets the ambitious target in empowering Sustainable Development Goals, the summit will certainly continue to serve that purpose.

Ladies and gentlemen, as part of our effort to enhance policies, Indonesia continues to strengthen its ICT policy and regulation. Indonesia has formulated a Indonesian plan, to create a better foundation for our ecosystem by 2019.

The plan seeks to harness the full potential through the creation of national logistic and transportation system. It is worth to mention that in line with the implementation of Indonesian event plan we are establishing national e-commerce roadmap in order to enhance the ICT based creative industries. This we believe is a significant steppingstone to what Indonesia could plan. In year 2014, we have reached 18 billion U.S. dollar; in expected tourist 24 billion U.S. dollar this year.

Ladies and gentlemen, Indonesia would like to be one of the biggest users and players in the ICT market. For instance, mobile user of cellular market is rapidly increasing, with a penetration rate estimated from 150 percent of the total population, reaching approximately 350 million subscriptions.

Meanwhile, the number of Internet users has reached 88.1 millions while the broadband has reached 48 million. It is expected to hit 30 percent this year and 70 percent by 2025. As part of our ambition, state and telecommunication operator in my country is planning to put another 20 million in access starting this year.

These vehicles have contributed to Indonesia economic growth of 5.6 percent since 2009, the second highest in the G20.

The growth is also parallel with the quality of ICT spending that treats 32.8 billion U.S. dollar in 2013, and 38 -- 36.9 billion U.S. dollar in 2014, or 12.5 percent positive growth. Ladies and gentlemen, underlying the importance of existing Internet Governance framework, Indonesia continues to support multistakeholder approach that engages governments, private business, Civil Society, and other components in the ICT ecosystem. Internet Governance has to be an impetus to ICT that respects the laws and embrace norms and principle of good governance and based on a set of ethics.

I would like to conclude by expressing for a betterment of our people, to a strong effective and affordable ICT ecosystem, which is inclusive, transparent, equal, and people centered. These are reminding the foundation of our work today, and days to come.

Therefore, let me once again stress Indonesia's strong commitment to strengthen to be an active participant in the IGF. We continue to be working with all stakeholders and we are pleased to be able to offer a multistakeholder Forum for open discussion of this and any other issue.

So let's continue working together to ensure that the entire world people can benefit from equitable, affordable and safe access to Internet. Thank you very much.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Your Excellency.

The next speaker on my list is Ms. Ellen Blackler, Vice President for Global Public Policy of the Walt Disney Company. You have the floor.

>> ELLEN BLACKLER: Boa tarde. I'm Ellen Blackler. I work for the Walt Disney Company. And I'm speaking for the BASIS initiative of the International Chamber of Commerce, whose global network reaches

6 million companies of all sizes and sectors across 130 countries. Representatives of the private sector come to the IGF each year to engage with all our colleagues in Civil Society, Government, and the technical community, build common understanding of the opportunities and challenges presented by the evolution of the information society, and Internet economy, and identify policy options to address those challenges and leverage those opportunities.

ICC and the individual businesses that travel to the IGF each year are committed to the goals of the WSIS and to creating a path for continued, sustainable and inclusive growth for the digital economy.

These goals can be best achieved by working cooperatively across all stakeholders. We support and advocate for effective and impactful multistakeholder approaches to Internet Governance. Progress towards our joint goals will be most successful when business, the technical community, Government and Civil Society each have an active role in the development and assessment of policy issues and solutions. This inclusion lowers the risk of unintended consequences, increases legitimacy, and facilitates implementation.

Critical to our ability to deliver on the potential for inclusive and sustainable growth of the digital economy is our ability to create an enabling environment for investment, creativity and innovation in the development and deployment of broadband infrastructure and the products and services which use it.

Key elements of that enabling environment are, interoperable policy and legal frameworks rooted in the rule of law, respect for human rights, the encouragement of open and competitive markets throughout the digital value chain, a safe and secure ecosystem that engenders confidence of all users in network availability, reliability and resiliency, one that protects businesses, consumers and other users from crime and delivers effective Cybersecurity practices and policies.

Where those components are in place, we are best positioned to advance an inclusive open Internet that serves Sustainable Development Goals. This enabling environment as well as sharing a recognition of the important role of voluntary commercial agreements and policies that promote efficiency through engineering driven design will best drive investment and improve the availability of the infrastructure for connectivity, a central need for developing economies, looking to create a sustainable broadband ecosystem. It will also best encourage continued innovation in the services, technologies and business models that further reduce costs, increase bandwidth and drive adoption. A positive enabling environment will increase the creation and availability of locally relevant content, resources and tools in all the world's languages, increasing adoption, and allowing more users to realize the full potential of participating online.

Protections for the freedom of expression, the press, privacy, and intellectual property, the development of e-commerce infrastructure, consumer protections, entrusted online payment systems are all important elements of an enabling environment for the investment in that content.

This positive enabling environment is critical to greater progress for full participation in the digital economy of the one billion people around the globe living with a disability, who continue to experience a variety of barriers to accessing ICTs, and for women, and others, who find themselves on the wrong side of persistent digital divides, for the protection of children, and for the increased efforts to deliver capacity building and skills development. The private sector is a critical partner in our efforts to reach those goals and we look forward to thoughtful and informative dialogue around Connecting the Next Billion, this week and in future IGFs for more years to come. Obrigada.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Tian Lin, Head of Delegation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China. Mr. Lin, you have the floor.

  (applause).

>> TIAN LIN: Thank you to the moderator. Ladies and gentlemen, I would initially like to represent the Chinese committee, congratulate on the success of the event, and thank the Brazilian Government and the

Secretariat for this organization. It is a great result of WSIS, IGF is holding its 10th meeting to promote its special function of promoting international Internet Governance. The Chinese Government supports its mandate and calls for active participation of various stakeholders to strengthen its real function, and promoting a multistakeholder platform, diverse, and transparency.

Well, international Internet is the new debate in the world, to build a world in peace, open, cooperative, and it's cyberspace. The Chinese part believes in four points. First, respect to sovereignty. Internet Governance does not change the principle of sovereignty that is part of the UN Charter. The principle of sovereignty should be also applied within the Internet space. Each country and each Government has the right to have its own legislation, according to the local situation. No other country can intervene in another country, harming its interests.

And clarifying the principle of sovereignty in the Internet Governance helps building healthy environment for international cooperation.

The second point: Equality. Let us not divide the country. No matter how big it is, each country should have equal rights. It should respect the right to develop the Internet, the right of national and international governance, especially increase the help to developing countries, so they can resolve or overcome the digital divide, so that the access can be made popular, in creating a space where human beings can be the center, an inclusion digital society.

The third point is multi-lateral participation. Internet is the common home of humanity. Only with a contribution of all can we actually benefit the best. The Government has the role of leadership. The Government combines the problems and defines the policies towards its resolutions.

The Internet related companies must have their responsibilities, and experts can support them, and Internet users must have an active participation, both for building and protecting them.

And also, have the right of freedom of expression, but anyhow, they have to comply with the laws.

The fourth point, joint governance. Internet belongs to each and every one. This means that everybody works towards building governance. Internet Governance is a important agenda of global governance. Thus, the construction of a fair and appropriate system is an important task.

It is a task that should never fail to envisage transparency, multi-laterality, and also democracy.

Being a country that has 600 million Internet users, we build, use and contribute to the Internet. We participate in an active way of the deliberative Forum at the UN to create the civil or the legal frameworks from the 16th to 18th of December. The office of digital information in China will organize a Forum with a theme, Internet activity, shared governance and creation, and Internet Governance.

I'd like to invite you all to take part of our event, so that we can all together create an increasingly healthier environment on the Internet. Thank you all very much.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Lin. The next speaker on my list is His Excellency, Andrus Ansip, Vice President of the European Commission in charge of the Digital Single Market.

Your Excellency, you have the floor.

>> ANDRUS ANSIP: Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be here for you today at the Internet Governance Forum at this point in time. I would like to thank all the organizers of this event.

Earlier this year we adopted in Europe a Digital Single Market strategy. This strategy reflects the importance of the digital economy to growth and having the right environment available to achieve this.

The governance of the Internet is fundamental to ensuring that our strategy is successful. But governance of the Internet is important for all of us. It is about how we, people, governments, companies, want the Internet to be and shaping it according to that vision.

The Internet has become a common food for humanity, bringing its benefits to everyone should be our common goal.

Internet Governance must make sure the Internet remains a global, open and free space, a space where people enjoy the same rights as they do off-line, and have the same degree of protection.

We need to make online opportunities open to all by closing the digital divide, guaranteeing equal access and allowing everyone to benefit.

We must use the digital revolution to really empower sustainable development. And the recent Sustainable Development Agenda reflects that. Next month, the UN General Assembly will review ten years of progress since the World Summit on the Information Society, and decide on the future of the Internet Governance Forum. For me the IGF provides the ideal space for all parties involve to discuss Internet Governance issues openly and to shape our common vision for the Internet together.

This is why its mandate should be extended for ten years. Here in Brazil, one and a half years ago, we saw the NETMundial statements produced. This stimulated our reflections on Internet Governance. It set out our common principles and values and outlined a way forward.

While the global Internet community has started to turn the vision into reality, even more focus and energy is still needed. The European Union is committed and ready to work, together with all parties, to operationalize a shared governance of the Internet based on clear, fair and transparent rules.

But we also must not forget the most fragile and vulnerable. In particular people in developing countries, and Civil Society, need to participate more in Internet Governance.

We want to build more capacity and confidence. This is why the European Commission has devoted a significant budget to support to the Global Internet Policy Observatory. To reach these goals we will also work with other similar initiatives.

As you know, changes at ICANN are taking place. Much progress has been made in developing a bottom up multistakeholder proposal to transfer oversight of the IANA functions to the whole community.

The global community has shown incredible dedication in this effort which also demonstrates how the multistakeholder model can work in practice.

Now, we just need to finalize work on improvements to ICANN accountability. We must not lessen our efforts to reach this goal.

The task is not easy. But it is worth it. It is only by including and involving everyone, all interested parties, that we can face and address the challenges of an ever interconnected and globalized world.

Thank you. Obrigado.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Ansip. The next speaker is Her Excellency, Hlengiwe Buhle Mkhize, Deputy Minister of Telecommunications and Postal Services, Department of Telecommunications and the Postal Service of South Africa. Your Excellency, you have the floor.

>> HLENGIWE BUHLE MKHIZE: Program director, thank you very much. Firstly, I would like to thank the host country, and the IGF Secretariat, for their excellent planning of this year's Internet Governance Forum. As South Africa, we are extremely grateful to be part of this high level opening.

Coming back to the topic, due to its multi-national scope and cross-cutting applications, ICTs have become a critical tool for sustainable development, especially for developing countries, and I'm making special reference also to Africa. We have seen how the Internet has changed people's lives and circumstances. Since the second phase of WSIS, developing countries have made strides with access to the Internet. This is evident by the increase of mobile penetration in the African continent and the mobile applications that have been developed such as M-pesa. Having said that, as we move forward to the cognizance of the many challenges ahead of us, some of the most vulnerable people especially in rural areas still do not have access.

This lack of access is underpinned by challenges of affordability, lack of relevant content, insufficient infrastructure, especially in areas that are not economically active, the rise in Cybercrime and lack of trust in the online environment.

As governments, it is important to ensure that people have affordable access to the Internet, and that their policies developed, create an enabling environment.

In South Africa in particular, we are in the process of implementing South Africa Connect, which in part addresses broadband rollout in rural areas, and also take into account the whole ecosystem, ensuring that there is relevant content, skills development, digital opportunities, to mention but a few.

This is an inclusive agenda, with clear targets for 2020 and 2030. Significant strides are being made in enhancing the education and awareness of our users in line with Government's commitment to ensure that our people are safe and they feel safe. Within the multi-lateral fora we are searching cooperation with African union and Briggs partners through existing mechanisms. South Africa is of the view that there is a void created by the lack of an international instrument dealing with Cybersecurity and Cybercrime.

The Budapest convention and the AU convention on Cybersecurity have their merits and can be utilized to elaborate an effective international instrument that can be accessed and owned equally by member states.

South Africa supports the WSIS vision of creating a program centered inclusive and development oriented information society, and has embraced it as an available tool to bring up economic information.

We developed an information society and development plan in 2007, to provide a national roadmap for the attainment of the WSIS action lines. The objective is to realize an information infrastructure that will meet the needs of citizens, business and the private sector, providing access to the wide range of services required for effective social and economic participation.

In line with the WSIS vision, ICTs are now a key component in the national development plan and vision 2030. In preparation for the 10th year reviews, South Africa is to report on its achievements of the WSIS outcomes to reflect on progress made, and contemplate on future goals and opportunities arising from new technologies.

Looking ahead to the review in December, South Africa would like to see more emphasis on privatization of Africa and other developing countries, capacity-building, and investment in backbone infrastructure to drive economic development, improved quality of access, addressing ICT illiteracy, education and innovation, bridging the gender and digital gap between and within countries.

Further to this, the outcome document should be aligned to the 2030 agenda as ICTs underpins the achievement of all 17 SDGs.

Equally so, South Africa is committed to sustainable development by implementing economic transformation to ensure that the youth meaningfully participate in the economy through job creation in the ICT sector. We see human capital development as a key factor in fostering inclusion. South Africa would like to thank the Brazilian Government and the IGF Secretariat for convening this meeting as it brings together all critical

stakeholders in the Internet community, each with their own valuable contribution to take the discussions forward.

We believe that we all have a role to play in line with the roles and responsibilities contained in the Tunis Agenda. Obrigada.

 (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker on my list is Mr. Hossam Elgahmal, Board Member and Treasurer, Africa Information and Communication Technologies Alliance, AfiCTA.

You have the floor.

>> HOSSAM ELGAHMAL: Distinguished guests, I'd like to begin by thanking our host, Brazil, for their warm welcome and to IGF Secretariat, and UN DESA, and to many stakeholders for their invaluable part in the preparation of this year's Forum on Internet Governance.

My name is Hossam Elgahmal. I am a Egyptian entrepreneur, who founded several ICT SMEs, and I'm also a board member of the African ICT alliance, that gathers the business community from over 20 African countries. I am on the IGF MAG, and I am part of the leadership of business action to support information society, an initiative led by the International Chamber of Commerce, known as ICC BASIS.

I'm pleased to have this opportunity to share my perspective as a SME and as an entrepreneur from a developing country.

Rapid changes in ICTs and Internet connectivity have made it possible for SMEs with minimal infrastructure investment to scale up and to trade across borders, entering the global economy.

The kinds of connectivity benefits for SMEs include, reaching customers and diversifying markets, accessing timely market information, creating new opportunities and means to innovate, bringing more women entrepreneurs into the marketplace, realizing agility and responsiveness to market vulnerabilities, crowdsourcing ideas and funds for specific projects, and access to Internet and mobile banking services.

In short, ICTs and the Internet are helping SMEs around the world to become more productive and more commercially competitive than ever before.

And this is of great benefit to all the society. Still more needs to be done from a policy perspective to ensure better access that is competitive, stable and secure.

Micro, small and medium-sized enterprises are vectors for job creation, particularly for women and for youth. And because 90 percent of all companies around the world are SMEs, and 60 percent of all the world's employees are employed by SMEs, more must be done to engage SME community, particularly in developing economies.

Every effort should also be made to enhance the capacity of women to access and use the Internet. According to one study, enabling Internet access to another 150 million women and girls has a potential to open up a market opportunity between 50 and $70 billion, that would support developing economies.

Bringing the next billion online to benefit from the information society requires, among other things, policy support for swifter access, reducing ICT investment risks, enhancing capacity building, facilitating local business innovation, encouraging local content creation, and strengthening institutional capacities.

Also international multistakeholder policies support is necessary and required to address Cybersecurity and privacy, to maintain a stable, secure and trusted Internet.

There are many great stories to tell about the potential of the Internet and how it has changed lives of people in developing countries.

We can speak of health and the mobile applications saving lives from epidemic diseases in Nigeria, or the telemedicine local solutions providing consultations and diagnoses improving care to patients in remote underdeveloped areas in Egypt. We can speak of education, and examples of local eLearning platforms and content made available to bridge the knowledge gap and improve equality through access for the least developed regions.

The Internet enables also funding alternatives such as crowdsourcing for innovative solutions, and creating an advanced and healthy ecosystem for young entrepreneurs.

Much has been achieved to date, but there is certainly more to do ahead to connect the next billion and more.

The IGF is so meaningful to the business community, including SMEs. At this Forum we have a unique opportunity to engage in a candid and constructive discussion with governments, the technical community, academics and Civil Society, all contributing valuable perspective.

This method of dynamic and substantive exchange must be safeguarded so that every stakeholder, including small business, can further harvest the benefits of connected ICTs.

At this crucial juncture in the history of the IGF we must encourage effort to bring Internet access to all global citizens improving cultural diversity, expanding local content and developing tools that promote access for those with disadvantages.

Getting more SMEs and start-ups from developing countries engaged would certainly give opportunity to discuss challenges firsthand, as well as local industry success stories. This will help to better shape policies to enable the information society in developing countries and to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

I very much look forward to working with all of you to advance on this important topic and I wish you a most enriching IGF, and thank you again for this opportunity to address you today. Thank you.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker is Mr. Shola Taylor, Secretary-General, the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation. Mr. Taylor, you have the floor.

>> SHOLA TAYLOR: Your Excellencies, all protocols do accept, let me first of all thank the present Government and IGF Secretariat for this excellent arrangement.

I also would like to congratulate the 73 young Brazilians who are participating at this event, for being lucky to be part of the future of the Internet.

Your Excellencies, just last year in March, the Commonwealth ICT ministers gave a mandate to the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation to ensure a constructive engagement on global ICT agenda. Just last week in Geneva, the CTU led a constructive engagement with other members of the global community, to ensure that spectrum, additional spectrum is allocated to services on an equal basis.

When the ministers met last year, Commonwealth ministers, they decided on a number of principles which they would support, they recognized and appreciate the central role which cyberspace plays in facilitating development and promoting linkages amongst people, communities and cultures. They expressed their willingness to subscribe to the openness, decentralized and distributed nature of the cyberspace which empowers the individual, fosters innovation, and also ensure that it empowers everyone that is involved in the Internet. Bound by a set of common values, the Commonwealth is to set an example of a complex collection of people, ideals and cultures, working together in harmony.

In recognition and in pursuance of the ministers' mandates the ministers adopted four principles which will guide cyber governance. They are as follows. 1, we contribute to a safe and effective global cyberspace. 2, our

actions in cyberspace supports broader economic and social developments. 3, we act individually and collectively to tackle Cybercrime. 4, we each exercise our rights and meets our responsibilities in cyberspace.

Today, this model provides useful guidance to Commonwealth countries, in certain practical action. We also note that enjoyment of the benefits of cyberspace relies upon its safety, security, and resilience. It is highly concerning to see the cyberspace being used today as a vehicle for crime. However, the necessary security measures to tackle these challenges may be intentioned with the very features that have made cyberspace a success.

It is definitely important to determine an equitable balance, and this is shared, this is based on the shared common values. This, these are the values upon which the, cornerstone upon which the Commonwealth based its values. As a result of that, the city has built the cyber Commonwealth approach to develop Cybersecurity strategies on a national basis. And this serves as a model not only to Commonwealth countries but also nonmembers.

I'm delighted to inform you that this model is being used to develop national Cybersecurity strategies, in Botswana and Cameroon and Fiji and Uganda.

As we head towards Commonwealth heads of Government meeting next month, towards this month in Malta, we look back at a period of highly constructive engagement with the globalized community. It is pertinent to note that the theme of the Commonwealth heads of state meeting is adding global value. CTU is proud to have been about providing values to the whole spectrum of ICTs including cyberspace. It's encouraging to note the recently adopted Sustainable Development Goals, recognizing the potential of cyberspace by setting the specific goal to provide affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by the year 2020.

Working together in partnership, with respect and value of all stakeholders regardless of their size, appreciating their strengths, I'm certain that cyberspace will continue to grow as a platform to bring people together and as a tool for social, economic development.

The past has been exciting, but the future will be more exciting. I'd like to conclude my statement with a quote from George Bernard Shaw's Methusulah, you see things and you say why. But I dream things that never was and I say, why not.

Today, let's ask ourselves why not. Thank you, Obrigado.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Our next speaker is Mr. Fadi Chehade, CEO of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN. You have the floor.

>> FADI CHEHADE: Minister Virgilio Almeida, Secretary Chengetai Masango and Mr. Koulov, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, I've said before that cyberspace is dead, because there is no such thing now as cyberspace. All space is now cyber. Everything. The Internet is like a powerful river that has permeated every aspect of life and every aspect of the economy. And like a powerful river, we may all try to govern it as we use that wonderful word, govern it. But governing a river is difficult. A river is powerful.

It can be maybe constrained. You could put walls, you could put dams, you could put bridges, you could put tunnels, you could come up with agreements on how to share it. But you cannot stop a river.

The Internet today is such a powerful river. Now, we are here at the Internet Governance Forum because one of the things we are trying to figure out is how to govern that powerful resource. And let me tell you that it is not easy right now.

Let me divide the governance of this powerful resource into two parts. One part is about how the Internet works. Let's call it the technical part. And one part about governing what runs on the Internet. And when it

comes to the technical part, I think things are pretty much coming into order. Most of the world sees the various organizations, whether it's the IETF or the ITU or the regional Internet registries or ICANN, IANA, all these functions as working relatively well.

Yes, we need to improve the accountability. Yes, we need to make ICANN independent with its functions. All of this is in the works. I can assure you that this program certainly to make ICANN independent and make it strong and accountable is on track and should be done next year.

But now, we move to what is on the Internet, and that has nothing to do with what ICANN, the IETF and these organizations do day in and day out.

Who will govern that? Who will decide on the many issues on running things on the Internet? Where will these mechanisms be built? What organizations will be needed? How will we do it and include governments, businesses, users, Civil Society and everyone? How do we do that?

It's not simple.

If you think it's been hard to get the technical part of the Internet governed, I can assure you that the challenges ahead are even bigger, because the issues of Cybersecurity, child protection, trade, taxation, and the list is long. In fact there is 90 of them exactly, are not simple to manage.

What will it take? How do we get there?

I believe that it will take public/private partnerships. It will take multistakeholder involvement, and it will take more than anything, trust. We need to build trust, because without trust, we will not be able to build together a safe Internet for everyone. Today there is a lack of trust. In fact, all the studies are showing that the confidence and trust in the digital space is going down. Why is it going down? Because it's not clear who is in charge, it is not clear what policies are affecting people, privacy issues, security issues are growing, and if we don't catch this early, we will start our digital century with a lack of trust.

We are here at the IGF to build trust.

This is a hopeful place. Here, in this room, we have governance, we have private sector, Civil Society and technical people working together to build trust. We need the IGF and we need spaces like the IGF to continue building this trust. So from this will rise the mechanisms, the rules, the institutions, whatever it takes, so that we can govern what is on the Internet as well as we have governed what is in the Internet. I wish us all luck. Build trust. Reach out across the aisle. Talk to people that you normally don't talk to. But we are all here together, no decisions need to be made. But trust should be built right here.

>> MODERATOR: the next speaker is Joana Varon Ferraz.

>> JOANA VARON FERRAZ: Hello. All protocols have been addressed. I would like to extend my general greetings for all the participants, and correct my affiliation. I'm actually researcher and human rights advocate, and founder director of Coding Rights which is a female organization focused in advancing the enforcement of human rights in the digital world by integrating usages and understandings of technology into policymaking process.

I have to say a few weeks ago, we were surprised by a E-mail saying that I've been nominated by my colleagues for this Opening Session. When I got the news, the first thing that crossed my mind were memories from when I attended my first IGF back in 2007, here in Brazil, in Rio de Janeiro.

It was just nine years ago, but as much as I changed, I got some trust from Civil Society colleagues that nominated me to be here today, the Internet has also changed a lot. And we have great innovations, more people connected, indeed, different kind of smart devices, but I'm concerned. The Internet was built with the core value of connectivity to be open, interoperable.

But our Internet is becoming more and more centralized, sometimes, by the action of governments, but mostly by market powers. That aspect poses problems to those core values that were originally embedded in the architecture of the Internet poses problems, protection and promotion of human rights, and also represents challenges to the Internet Governance processes.

Particularly concerning, how we address our endless search for the beloved utopia of a Democratic multistakeholder participation.

Mostly considering this from the mental power imbalances within the various stakeholder groups, some concerns, human rights and from the mental technical values for the Internet architecture, like end-to-end interoperability, confidentiality and many others are being solved, in this progressively more centralized Internet, coined by profit and control.

I give some examples of such centralization trends. In terms of connectivity, for instance, at least in developing countries or emerging economies, connectivities are still centralized in the hands of very few telecommunication companies. We need to discuss alternatives to this such as public regime for Internet services, discuss free spectrum, usage of cognitive radios. We have technologies for that. And I was glad that there was a particular plenary addressing this issue in this edition of IGF already.

Furthermore, we need to understand that Zero-Rating practices are not the solution to the digital divide. There are people, particularly from developing countries, that practically only access one service and think it's Internet.

Imagine if this perception would escalate. So, please let's not sell donkeys pretending they are horses. Internet org is not Internet, free basics is not free; we are paying for it.

It is more like --

  (applause).

It's more like you are basically getting free of your rights, the right to access global and free Internet.

So, we not only need open connectivity. We also really need implementable net neutrality. And in particular the representatives, Brazilian Government representatives that are here, I'd like to ask for them to please consider that there is a urgency to have a regulation of Marco Civil that decree that hopefully would set the tone about that.

Marco Civil was an example in terms of process and content worldwide, but without regulation, it is in danger, mostly by market practices.

Another example of decentralization is related to freedom of expression and privacy. As Special Rapporteur David Kaye said today and I find appealing, while we are reading a newspaper, the newspapers today, the newspapers is also reading us. All this data, data, our digital shadow, our powerful tool, that can be used against us, either by framing us, framing our will, or to be used for pressure or clashing groups of descent.

So while we have never been more connected, we have also never been so exposed as in the digital world, and pervasive surveillance, weak enforcement for data protection or discourse of Cybersecurity and terrorism does not make the perspectives very good. We need strong and enforceable data protection views, and here I call attention again to the situation in Brazil, we need to deliver our data protection bill. There was a result of a public consultation to the legislative, they have to approve as soon as possible so we have coherence with national and international agenda in the protection of digital rights or privacy rights.

We also need to understand and ensure that encryption and anonymity can and should be preserved. We need to solve jurisdictional conflicts to ensure that protection of freedom of expression and privacy are not

dependent on companies. We need to move forward with transparent and accountable IANA transition towards a global system.

And beyond policy approaches to human rights, we need to inform these principles for the development of technology. Technology is not neutral. We need to consider that what does it mean to have human rights considerations for standards and protocols.

We need to foster free software; as it has been said in sessions here, if we cannot see, we cannot trust it.

We need to work more closely to technical community to understand or at least expose the implications about what they do, and human rights.

Finally, we need more women and more diversity within those who develop technologies.

(applause).

And create policies for technologies. This imbalance is already very expressive in this Opening Session, in which you can count four women.

So to wrap my points, all this list of issues that can be developed further and further represent the challenges that are increasing, to protect and promote human rights and the core values of the architecture of the Internet in face of decentralization.

My final consideration for us to have in mind is, what is the Internet Governance system that can address all this? What is the role of IGF facing these issues?

IGF is indeed a unique space for multistakeholder dialogue. But we need to fulfill them in data of IGF as provided in the Tunis Agenda. We are currently in the process of reviewing the WSIS+10, where this issue can be addressed.

But the renewal of IGF cannot be used as a maintenance of the status quo, in which the Internet Governance ecosystem remains the same. No one can solve the issues that I have raised so far. The Internet that we were discussing during WSIS process in 2003 and 5, and later on here in Brazil, in IGF 2017, is not the same.

The challenges to maintaining a free, open and decentralized network have never been bigger, and the solution is related to access, whether the institutional arrangements that we built are able to protect and promote human rights, and enable us to maintain technical values that inspire the creation of the Internet.

I hope in these days to come, we can discuss this and other issues further, with all the reasons they require but not only discuss really, let us also protest freely. This is also political space. I've been looking and saw some Civil Society representatives are being harassed and taken out of the venue due to attempt of silent protest around free basics. It is a bit unacceptable in a context in which we are discussing free speech.

So please, let's let people who cannot be on the stage also symbolically express their key questions regarding the future of Internet in front of high level panels like this.

I hope this issue can be solved quickly.

Finally, let us also use this space to think what institutional arrangements are needed to move forward beyond the status quo, in order to reverse the strength of centralization of the Internet. Let us try to put at least many of the beautiful words that were said here and look good in paper, in practice, towards a real people-centered, open, free, global and inclusive Internet.

Thank you so much.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Lawrence Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information and Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, of the United States Department of Commerce.

You have the floor.

>> LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Thank you. At the outset, I want to congratulate our host nation, Brazil, as the first country to have hosted two meetings of the Internet Governance Forum. I think it is fitting that Brazil with its strong tradition of supporting multistakeholder Internet Governance be the first country to earn this honor.

Over the past ten years, the IGF has proven itself to be an indispensable platform for addressing Internet issues. Each year I look forward to attending the IGF and meeting with this very diverse collection of stakeholders to tackle the challenges facing the Internet. This year I am pleased to see important innovations in the IGF intersessional work on items such as the best practices forums, and the IGF policy options document on connecting the next billion to the Internet. These and other innovations will definitely enrich our conversations this week.

As we mark the ten-year anniversaries of WSIS and the IGF, it's important to take stock of where we have come, and the challenges ahead.

There is much to celebrate in how the Internet has evolved into a platform for global economic growth, innovation and free speech. The open Internet is helping the economies and societies of both developed and developing nations. Not only has it created a dynamic and growing digital economy it has transformed just about every facet of our day-to-day lives.

Every one of us has a stake in ensuring the continued growth, job formation and wealth creation that an open Internet brings. In the United States we attribute that success in large part to the bottom-up multistakeholder approach to resolving technical and policy challenges facing the Internet. This is why we are such strong supporters of the IGF, one of the preeminent international examples of this approach, and have called for an extension of the IGF that is consistent with its original mandate.

We are pleased that so many countries have echoed this call, and if collectively we continue to support multistakeholder Internet Governance, if we make it more inclusive of developing countries and more responsive to all stakeholders, then we can truly achieve the information society we envisioned ten years ago.

In the United States we are committed to multistakeholder Internet Governance as convincingly evidenced by our announcement in March of 2014 that the U.S. Government would transition its historical stewardship role over the Internet Domain Name System to the global multistakeholder community. Since that time the response from the community of technical experts, academics, Civil Society and industry has been nothing short of inspiring.

Over the past year and a half stakeholders have worked hundreds of hours to complete a transition proposal that meets the criteria we have outlined and we are hopeful that working groups will complete their work in the coming weeks.

This work has been tiring, sometimes contentious and perhaps exasperating. It's no doubt not an easy task, but it is an important one. And all of us should appreciate the effort and level of commitment demonstrated by all of the participants in the process. Most importantly, this process is working. I am confident it will be successful and it will be a testament to the strength of the multistakeholder process when the transition is completed.

But even with the growth of international support for multistakeholder governance, there is continued cause for concern. Freedom House's newest report on Internet freedom finds Internet freedom around the world is

in decline for a fifth consecutive year. More governments are censoring information from their citizens in attempting to put up barriers to the open Internet within their borders.

The growth of sophisticated malware and other Cybersecurity threats, the need to protect the privacy of Internet users and the online theft of intellectual property on line have challenged Government's ability to balance important interests with the equally important need for openness. Governments increasingly feel compelled to do something they see as meaningful to protect their citizens and their businesses from these threats.

But regrettably in their attempts to do something, governments sometimes rush to put up digital walls between their countries and the rest of the world, between their citizens and people abroad, and in recent years we have seen governments institute data localization laws as well as limitations on data storage and data transfer. Historically, these kinds of restrictive policies have tended to be pursued by authoritarian governments that want to try to control information and monitor the activities of their citizens but in recent years, even Democratic countries have considered restrictions on data flows.

Such proposals do far more harm than good. Restricting data flows and competition between firms increased costs for Internet users in businesses, retard technological innovation. This may seem like common sense to us in this room but it is not accepted by everyone, and that is why it is imperative that we continue multistakeholder venues like the IGF. They allow us as representatives of diverse stakeholder communities to come together to offer our unique perspectives and to work through our difficult problems and make a case for policies and practices that encourage the development of an open and innovative Internet.

In closing I urge all nations to step up and support of the free and open Internet and the multistakeholder process that has led to its success. If we want to maintain a vibrant and growing Internet, we must all take action to assure that the multistakeholder approach continues to define the future of Internet Governance.

Thank you for listening.

  (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker on my list is His Excellency Hasanul Haq Inu, Minister of Information, Ministry of Information of Bangladesh. Your Excellency, you have the floor.

>> HASANUL HAQ INU: Thank you very much. Good afternoon to you all, the Chair, Virgilio Almeida, the secretary of the IGF, Mr. Chengetai Masango and ministers, dignitaries, private sectors. Today I'm here in this IGF. I have been here several times. At this time it is a unique one, because a decision is going to be taken about the future of IGF. All the speakers by now have said that IGF should continue. I on behalf of Bangladesh support the idea that IGF should continue.

I greet you on behalf of 160 million in Bangladesh who are using mobiles, 120 million people are using mobiles and 46 million people are using Internet. I don't want to go to the details of this digitization process in Bangladesh. Ladies and gentlemen, today, in 1992 I was attending the summit of international in Rio de Janeiro where sustainable development was floated and agenda 21 was adopted.

To set the social and planetary boundaries of the world, over the years there is a parallel shift and the concept of development is put forward to strengthen the concept of sustainable development. Then when the world took the ICT evolution, the concept of digital development came to the forefront, because ICT became an enabling technology, and can be applied in all sectors of political and economic life, and also can be used to enhance the process of adaptation and mitigation to climate change.

Now, if we want to achieve sustainability, then we have to link the whole development process within development and also be linked with the digital development. Ladies and gentlemen, Internet has become still

a policy of inclusion is not totally followed, and there exists a democracy deficit in the governance of Internet. That is a problem of empowering sustainable development.

Another problem is that the issue of sustainable and green development is being addressed, but the world has not yet developed a common approach, so still the social and planetary boundaries of the world are under threat from climate change phenomenon.

Another problem exists in the economic and political process of the countries. The policy of inclusion is not yet practiced totally across the world. Ladies and gentlemen, so at the end of 2015, the world is still bogged down with three literacies language in information in ICT and there exists a digital divide, gender divide, disadvantage and advantage divide, urban and rural divide, economic divide.

Cyber criminals are chattering cyber press and cyberspace seems to be militarized. Affordability, accessibility is still a problem. The challenge of the world is to connect the unconnected, and for that we will have to address and welcome the carry over problems of 2015 and then empowering sustainable development can be achieved by 2030. But the magic tool is Internet and policy of inclusion. Ladies and gentlemen, NETMundial multistakeholder statement on development states that all people have a right to development and Internet has a vital role to play in helping to achieve the full realization of internationally agreed SDGs. It is a vital tool for giving people living in poverty the means to participate in development process.

Having said that, ladies and gentlemen, Internet helps empowerment of people, that paves the path towards a inclusive policy which is a precondition for sustainable development process. Let this Forum take the lead in ensuring secure, trustworthy, economy friendly, inclusive, diversified, right based and open Internet for all.

UN has already chartered the roadmap of to 2030, we to follow by adopting policies that helps in fostering sustainable development. For that we have one option, the policy of exclusion shall have to be abandoned, and we should follow the policy of inclusion, policy of inclusion for Internet Governance, for political governance, for economic process, for social empowerment, for global political management, for the policy of inclusion, to succeed we need to say no to militarization. To conclude let us agree to hold a umbrella of a global Cybersecurity treaty, and under that umbrella, let us agree to a roadmap, multistakeholder governance of Internet, two, common approach for climate change, three, to follow participatory economic model at the national level, four, agreed to the right of freedom, right to Internet, yes to human rights, no to Cybercrime. Five, ensure accessibility and affordability to technology, harmonize ICTs with SDGs.

Let me conclude by saying the challenge of the day is not technological or financial. The challenge of the day is to have the necessary political will, so it is a matter of political decision. I hope we will rise to the occasion to take the politicalization on the policy of inclusion for our mother earth and for our children to develop the policy of inclusion, Bangladesh supports the continuous of IGF.

There are only two mistakes one can make along the road to truth: Not going all the way, and not starting. We have already started. So let us go all the way to 2030.

Thank you very much.

  (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Your Excellency. Our next speaker is Mr. Malcolm Johnson, Deputy Secretary General of International Telecommunication Union, the ITU. Mr. Johnson, you have the floor.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Excellencies, distinguished colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, it's a great pleasure to be here at the Opening Session of the 10th IGF. Many thanks to Brazil for hosting this meeting in this beautiful part of the country. And congratulations to my colleagues in UN DESA for their excellent work in organizing this meeting.

This is a significant year with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals, the SDGs, and the review of the WSIS process. It's clear that ICTs and the Internet in particular are essential for the implementation of the SDGs.

I was very pleased that ICANN and the Internet Society joined ITU in a series of events recently to drive home this message. ITU plays its part in bringing the benefits of secure and trustworthy ICTs to all through the global coordination of the spectrum and the satellite orbits, through the adoption of international technical standards, and developmental support and providing a platform for convening policy dialogue. Approximately 85 percent of international traffic runs over fiberoptic cables complying to ITU standards, and the critical access to the Internet is from modems is based on ITU standards.

We have recently in ITU adopted a new standard called G.fast which provides up to one gigabits over the traditional telephone copper lines.

Currently in Geneva we are hosting the ITU World Radio Communication conference. This is reviewing the international treaty on the spectrum and satellite orbits and the main objective is to harmonize the use of the spectrum, so that it increases and provides for interoperability, and reduces cost through economies of scale.

These are highly complex and technical conferences and we have over 3,000 delegates there in Geneva from 160 countries, representing a multitude of stakeholders. With a tradition of striving for consensus through compromise, these conferences have proved to be successful. I'm sure this WRC will be equally successful.

One of the main items on the wide ranging agenda for the conference is the provision of more spectrum for mobile communications in the future.

There are now more mobile phone subscriptions than there are people in the world. And with mobile broadband penetration now reaching 32 percent compared to just 10 percent by fixed, radio spectrum is vital to extend Internet access to the four billion people still off-line.

This is particularly important in the developing world, where mobile broadband penetration rates are just 21 percent compared to 84 percent in developed countries.

Connecting the unconnected is the core of ITU's mission. And at last year's ITU Plenipotentiary Conference, the connect 2020 agenda for global telecommunications ICT development was adopted, setting out ambitious goals as well as measurable targets, including bringing the next 1.5 billion people online by 2020.

Achieving these goals will only be possible through the concerted efforts of everyone, and I'd like to invite you to join us at a workshop on the connect 2020 agenda on day 4, where we can discuss how we can all work together to bring the power of ICTs, especially the Internet to everyone, wherever they live, regardless of their income, gender or disability.

One of ITU's goals is to encourage innovation and entrepreneurship. Many national governments have taken initiatives such as innovation hubs to encourage this, but a huge gap remains in skills, funding, tools, and knowledge. To help bridge the gap, ITU together with eight other organizations has launched an initiative to support and promote small and medium enterprises, in particular those in emerging markets and with social impact.

In ITU, an open Forum was held this morning on this initiative. I would like to encourage you all to join us in this effort.

This is the 150th anniversary of the ITU. Our history shows that progress can only be achieved through collaboration. In the case of ITU's membership, 193 member states, over 700 private sector entities, 100 universities and Civil Society, all working together on an increasingly diverse range of issues. With ICTs becoming pervasive in all walks of life and business, ITU membership is attracting many new players, and we

are constantly increasing our collaboration with a wide range of organizations and making ITU more accessible, open and transparent.

A new low membership fee for universities proved particularly successful and we hope to be soon introducing a similar low fee for small and medium enterprises and nonprofit making bodies.

Good collaboration with the Internet community is essential for ITU to meet its goals, and we hope that these developments will facilitate this collaboration.

There is no single entity that can alone address all the challenges that the ICT sector is facing. These are complex global issues requiring global dialogue, cooperation and collaboration.

It is imperative that we all work together, and ITU is ready and willing to do so. Thank you for your attention. I wish you a very enjoyable and productive IGF.

Thank you.

  (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. The next speaker is Mr. Vint Cerf, Vice President and Chief Internet Evangelist of Google, Incorporated. You have the floor.

>> VINT CERF: Mr. Chairman, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, those of you who are still left in the room anyway, I am very grateful for an opportunity to address you briefly.

First of all, I have to say that when Bob Khan and I started designing Internet 40 years ago we did not imagine the IGF, and certainly did not imagine the level of global attention that this architecture was going to stimulate.

I'm an engineer. I'm going to look at this from the engineering point of view. Our job is to connect the next billions on the network, and from the technological point of view we appear to be making some good progress. For example, what we want, what the theme as you heard repeatedly over and over again is an open, accessible affordable and fully connected Internet for all. That's our target.

On the technology side, we have new lower cost, higher speed, fixed and mobile access technologies. Outside this building, I hope you will visit a tent that is labeled, O3B for other three billion, that is a satellite system that went into operation a couple of years ago. It's delivering 400 megabits on the down link and a hundred megabits on the up link. There is wi-fi there available. Please try it out.

You will see what is possible to deliver high-speed service anywhere in the world, 40 degrees north and south of the equator.

Google has its own fantasies. We are putting balloons up at 60,000 feet and we intend to let them cycle around the world at the same latitude and deliver high-speed Internet service. There are drones available, there are people working on small sats. There are new terrestrial unreceived fiber cables going into operation and there is LTE and 5G in the mobile world.

We have more than a handful of new technologies to try to achieve that objective of a fully connected widely accessible Internet.

However, we have some other work to do. One of them is to make sure that the IP version 6 part of the Internet is implemented everywhere. We are going to need it because the Internet of things demands it, and the population of the Internet demands it.

I think we have also discovered how important this inclusive multistakeholder policy formulation process is. We especially need to bring the developing world into this conversation more fully than it has been before.

I think you would all agree that all the speakers in the preceding me would agree that another target for us is the provision of safety or provision for safety, security and privacy for all users, so as to enhance the trust in the use of the Internet. The word "trust" has come up repeatedly in this conversation and in others. I assure you that this has to be one of our most important targets.

Finally, after talking about all this technology and everything else, I think it's important that we recognize that there are other elements of infrastructure that have to be in place if we are going to be successful, not the least of which is reliable provision of electrical power, increased education in the implementation, use and application of the Internet, increased local content in local languages, and finally, other tools like open source software that will enable more people to make use of the Internet as it continues to evolve.

Obrigado.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Kathryn Brown, President and CEO of Internet Society. You have the floor.

>> KATHRYN BROWN: Good evening, everyone. I want to thank our wonderful Brazilian hosts and to the IGF volunteers and Secretariat who have put together this wonderful meeting.

I'm with the Internet Society. We are a global organization with 112 volunteer chapters in 96 countries around the world, 146 organizational members, and almost 80,000 members all who are dedicated to an open, global open trusted Internet, everywhere for everyone.

The Internet has always been about the future, and the IGF has always been about the future. At its inception, it was charged with organizing itself to think about how to think about this thing called the Internet. It was going to be the future, one that was neither clear nor guaranteed.

For ten years, this Forum has been like a bazaar for ideas, for trading experiences, for learning about the implications of a global network of networks, that at first allowed us to communicate instantly across oceans and continents, and have since evolved to do so much more.

We have come a very long way in finding common ground and learning how to learn from and share with each other. Our best practices session widely attended today, I'm happy to say, are one of our most recent innovations. We have heard in the past two days very good news, that the mandate of the IGF is likely to be renewed for ten years.

So, again, we are tasked with thinking about the future. Today, we understand that the Internet has grown and evolved to a global knowledge network. It is now a dynamic marketplace, and it is a service delivery network that has no boundaries. Knowing what we now know, we have an extraordinary opportunity to use this powerful tool to do what humankind has been struggling to do for ages, alleviate poverty, provide essential human services and connect all parts of the global economies one with the many.

These achievable goals are only achievable if everyone everywhere has access to the Internet. Thus we believe at the Internet Society and clearly many speakers who spoke before me believe the same, that the imperative of our time is to connect the unconnected, and to ensure that this open global Internet is safe and trusted.

The IGF has an important responsibility as the premier bottom-up cross community multistakeholder Forum, to offer principled input into how we govern ourselves in this new world, a world that is changing once again.

As the Internet becomes essential to education, healthcare, transportation, banking and more, in every part of the world, we must open the doors of our Forum to new stakeholders, to a different group of stakeholders, with expanding expertise and passions.

How do we use the Internet in medicine? In healthcare, across -- have healthcare delivery, in education, who are those people who are going to help us think about how we do that? We must renew ourselves by acknowledging and nurturing the next generation of IGF leaders. I want to thank you, Joana, for your remarks.

Let me point out that there are over a hundred women and men between the ages of 18 and 25, digital natives from around the world and around this region, who are here at IGF now, as CGI and ISOC fellows. They are here this week. Where are you guys? (applause) They are ready to bring new levels of energy to innovate, build and use the Internet in ways that will shape their future. I look forward to important week. We should celebrate our success. We should pat ourselves on the back for the work we have done in the last ten years.

And then, we should quickly turn to building the future. Thank you.

  (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker on my list is Mr. Joseph Cannataci, Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy of the United Nations. You have the floor.

>> JOSEPH CANNATACI: Thank you very much. I'd like to first of all thank the Brazilian Government for its invitation for me to be here. This is the first time that UN Special Rapporteur on privacy is speaking at IGF, because it is the first time that there is a U.N. Special Rapporteur for privacy.

The good thing about speaking after so many other speakers who have spoken about how valuable IGF is, means that I can agree with most of the speakers who have come before me, agree how valuable it is. And then I can remember that I only have six minutes, and then I can focus on what some people have been asking me, so what exactly are we going to do about the privacy that we seek to protect and promote?

In fact, there are a number of things which I can talk about. I can talk about the need to improve our understanding of privacy across countries. I could talk about our need to improve existing legal instruments. I could talk about encouraging the use of technical means such as encryption to protect privacy.

But I would be talking in general, and here we are at the Internet Governance Forum, so I'd like to focus on the Internet.

As we celebrate all that is good about IGF, we should I think remember that there was, there were some things that IGF was not designed to do. I think that it's important to keep that in mind in order to see some of the things that people on the Internet expect. By that, when we are talking about an Internet without borders, many citizens today, users of the Internet, expect to find safeguards without borders. And added to that, added to safeguards, they also expect to find remedies which go across borders.

And IGF is an ideal place to identify this in a multistakeholder environment. But I'd like to take you back ten years quickly, to see just as IGF was being born, what two people, Jonathan Mathias and Milton Miller talked about it, and thought about other parts of Internet Governance which we need to think about.

What they had to say ten years ago was this: Still, global governance must be based on authoritative agreements among governments, and this is where I joined the Minister from Bangladesh in talking about for example the value of agreements such as treaties. And I would make exactly the same kind of parallels that he has drawn on international agreements about climate change.

Climate change agreements are difficult to achieve but we are still trying to do it anyway. What about agreements about the Internet? Let me go back quickly to what Jonathan Mathias and Milton Miller said. Authoritative agreements not only have to be legitimate, they have to be justiceable.

In international law, justiceable agreements are those that are included in conventions, legally binding international treaties. Thus, if Internet Governance is to be obtained, it must be treaty-based. The treaties must have universal adherence to be fully effective.

The next part which I'm going to read out on what they said was written ten years ago, but I think you will agree that it could have been yet written yesterday. We acknowledge the widespread reluctance of almost all parties in this process to take up the burden of a new international convention. We realize that everyone is looking for short cuts. We are convinced the shortcuts don't really exist and won't work. They will simply defray the day of reckoning and prolong the current state of tension and lack of resolution of outstanding governance problems.

Ladies and gentlemen, Your Excellencies, I put it to you, ten years down the line, the day of reckoning has come. As other speakers have said, it's time to look towards the future. There are many things we need to do in the future and perhaps discussing the value of international agreements is one of them.

When we talk about international agreements, we don't necessarily mean one treaty. We could have more than one treaty dealing, one part of one issue of the things that we need to fix on the Internet. But ultimately, nothing can substitute international agreement between governments acting on the advice and in the spirit of multistakeholder agreements.

This once again is where one echoes the vision of our colleague from Bangladesh who spoke about political will. Political will is also largely what is required here in a very difficult environment. We should look forward to IGF 2015 being a force for good by contributing to the discussions that can take place about Internet Governance in the future, in such a way as identifying those means which can help take us forward in the realistic way. Thank you very much for your attention, ladies and gentlemen. I look forward to the discussions we are going to have this week and hopefully in the future editions of Internet Governance. Thank you.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker on my list is Mr. David Kaye, Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expressions of the United Nations. You have the floor.

>> DAVID KAYE: Excellencies, Mr. Chair, participants, I'd like to begin by thanking the Government of Brazil and the organizers of this 10N Internet Governance Forum and thanks also to you hardy souls out there who are making it this far into the Opening Session, and thanks also to those who have preceded me on the dais for your sharp insights.

It is an honor to address this Opening Session. As the Special Rapporteur on freedom of opinion and expression, I enjoy mandate created by the United Nations Human Rights Council to gather information and report to the UN and to governments on developments related to the freedom of opinion and expression, whether highlighting challenges to freedom of opinion and expression or providing guidance on norms and laws.

I want to begin in part where my predecessor, Mr. Joseph Cannataci, Special Rapporteur on privacy left off, which is to talk about law. And I'll talk about existing law, existing treaty law.

First, of course, for nearly 70 years the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has guaranteed everyone under article 19 the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds regardless of frontiers and through any kind of media. For nearly 40 years, that same guarantee has been part of the global standard under article 19 of the international covenant on civil and political rights.

These protections conceived at a time when radio and print dominated communication, nonetheless apply to any media regardless of frontiers. They refer in effect to the Internet before it was even born.

In the years since the Internet has come to dominate communications worldwide, resolutions of the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly have repeated this foundational point that off-line rights apply

online. To a certain extent we here should or we here should ensure that these protections apply in fact, not merely in aspiration.

What are the challenges to freedom of expression online today? Let me begin by noting that international law, indeed article 19 of the ICCPR acknowledges the responsibilities of states to protect the right to life, national security, public order and health, and the rights of others. States may impose narrow restrictions on expression, but only where provided by clear and pre-existing law and when strictly necessary and proportionate to achieve a legitimate objective. Restrictions on holding an opinion by contrast may not be subject to any kind of restriction.

The challenges, I don't have time to list them all, as I'm sure you know. But given our focus on governance I'd like to highlight in brief the following five. First, challenges to the legal norm that article 19 freedoms apply, quote, regardless of frontiers, end quote. This is indeed an unusual provision of human rights law, emphasizing how the freedom of expressions a transboundary right. It is a challenge to traditional notions of Government control of territorial space, but it is a provision to be celebrated and put at the very center of Internet Governance, tying together people otherwise far removed from one another, in a chance to encourage understanding and the sharing of knowledge.

Second, legal uncertainty. Who in this room can say what common rules apply in the corporate ICT sector when it comes to freedom of opinion and expression? If you can, please see me afterwards. While diversity in approaches and platforms is to be encouraged, I believe that the lack of legal certainty, substantive jurisdictional, procedural, allows many around the world to perceive gaps in the application of human rights law online.

Third, online surveillance, mass and targeted, pose a direct threat to the ability of the media, NGOs, academics and activists to seek and receive information. Encryption and anonymity serve as protection, and they mainly exist to empower individuals to browse, read, develop and share opinions and information without interference, and they enable journalists, Civil Society organizations and many others to create the space necessary for Democratic participation and accountability.

Fourth, there is the challenge of connecting the next four billion users. This is just as much a question of governance as it is a question of resources, and I urge that we not merely seek connection, but connection based on rights, true and full access, and protection.

Finally, an overriding challenge is censorship. Whether in the form of content filtering, throttling, take downs of infrastructure, platforms, posts or tweets, or digital attacks on Civil Society organizations, censorship today is rampant, and a viral threat to freedom of expression. Challenges in the physical world also exist online. Attacks on those sharing information include attacks on print and broadcast journalists, but also bloggers, those who post on social media, academics, sharing research, activists and many others operating in an online environment.

It is critical that we not consider those using relatively new media online as somehow subject to less protection than provided by article 19 and understood to apply only to journalists.

Internet Governance must remain multistakeholder and take into account a vast array of interests, state and nonstate. Human rights law recognizes and incorporates this principle. I urge all those working on governance at the international, regional, national, and even local levels, to recall the basic human rights principles that should be baked into governance going forward.

Thank you very much.

  (applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr. Jean-Paul Philippot, President of the European Broadcasting Union. You have the floor.

>> JEAN-PAUL PHILIPPOT: First of all, on behalf of World Broadcasting Union, I would like to warmly thank our Brazilian host and the IGF organization for this important meeting.

To make a growing Internet sustainable, the answer to this question, quality representative of the broadcasting and media world at the IGF, is that this goal can be reached not only through investment and through more infrastructure, but also through education, some rules and content of, when you invest in new cars it is not enough to invest in model vehicles but you need to train people to use it or to drive the machine, with older person in cars, in order to do so. One of the ways is to use traditional media, radio and TV that still cover more than 90 percent of the population, even in the most remote areas, and are the most trusted source of information.

Media in Europe, after World War II, take part at the construction of inclusive, diverse and Democratic society. Something similar could be imagined now when new billions of people arrive to the meeting with the Internet without any preparation.

Radio and TV are the two most trusted sources of information. Independence, pluralism and diversity are crucial for citizens and society. They are view of Democratic society, they are part of our common remit. Protect user of Internet, children and privacy. Guarantee freedom of journalists and freedom of expression. Guarantee for the journalists' capacity to investigate, are crucial to safeguard, trust media for the society.

Coming back, to the form of a car, not only a rule is needed and a road, but you also need to think of the fuel that moves the car. This fuel in 90 percent of the case is what you call content, and what we call movies, TV programs, news, books; in other words, intellectual properties. The Internet Governance cannot intervene also on that. It is not a question of regulating pipelines, but also mainly to guarantee a fair treatment for other rides, to produce, to ensure the financing of local production contents.

We need the same level playing field for all the actors of the digital ecosystem. The second answer to this question comes from the combination of next billion users, with the concept of sustainable way. I urge everyone -- yesterday, I heard many voices saying access to a reduced Internet is always better than nothing. I'm not convinced of this simplistic assumptions.

The real value of the Internet is its openness, the ability of each individual to access whatever exists on the net with the only limitation that derive from the respect of human rights. So offer access only to a portion of it, it's a contradiction in terms. It will be denied to these latecomers, the same right, the first user, they enjoy since the invention of the Internet. The right of the first Internet user has to remain the same as the last. As Vint Cerf said yesterday, you can offer an access to Internet, restrict it in time or even in bandwidth, but you cannot restrict what an individual could access or not, once they start to be connected.

Are we imagining a two class citizenship in the brave new Internet world? Is the concept of net neutrality or open Internet a list to be reserved to the few, those that already have too much, or it's a human right that needs to be preserved and guaranteed for all?

Several countries already adapt OR in the process to set up rules to guarantee net neutrality as a right for its citizens. What about the rest of the world? In this approach, it brings me to the main reason why we are here, governance of the Internet.

The arrival of the next billion makes even more urgent to start to be effective in governing the Internet. It's complicated now to have common rules for three billion users. Let's imagine what we shall be at five or six. The magnitude of problems and their complexity will proportionally increase.

We need to seize this opportunity of renewal of the mandate of the IGF and to the WSIS at the UN General Assembly next month to give acceleration of this process, all of us, including NETMundial initiative are going to arrive to the conclusion in this next weeks and months, and so 2016 needs to become the turning point.

We are ready for it. I hope that at the next IGF, we shall meet finally to discuss all the concrete changes of governance of Internet and not yet if it's good or bad to change one day in a far-away future.

Thank you very much.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker and also our final speaker today is His Excellency Yasuo Sakamoto, Vice Minister for Policy Coordination, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications of Japan. Your Excellency, you have the floor.

>> YASUO SAKAMOTO: Thank you very much. Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. I'm from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication, Japan, Yasuo Sakamoto. IGF marks its 10th anniversary this year. Japan values highly this Forum, since it has been an effective place where thousands of stakeholders intensively having discussing and exchanging their views on timely Internet related issues, including global issues such as global warming.

As was stated in last year's Forum, and recognize that this year's Forum is much more substantial than before. For further improvement, it is important that IGF send its message worldwide, and show that concrete and practical objective for them.

I welcome the Best Practice Forum established last year to show such output as they have surely improved IGF.

I'm expecting that WSIS+10 overall review of this December will recognize the important role that IGF has played by all stakeholders, and conclude to extend IGF for ten or 15 years with the current mandate.

I'd like to mention Internet Governance. When we think about Internet Governance, the most important principle is to ensure the free flow of information across borders. Without the free flow of information, we humans cannot achieve a sound, sustainable and global ICT society, even if the digital divide is resolved, and Cybersecurity is ensured. In order to maximize the best from Internet globally, regionally or nationally, public/private partnership and international cooperation are essential. The Internet consists of various stakeholders who are playing their respective roles. ICT is a remarkable innovative field, a connected global space that every human and thing is globally connected will be achieved ten years from now.

All human beings are going to enjoy the benefit of ICT innovation. It is the private sector that has led these innovations. We should reaffirm that ICT society of today could not have been achieved without contribution from that private sector.

Consequently, the beneficial ICT society of the future could not be achieved without constructive contribution from enterprises, academia and Civil Society. It is regrettable to hear dispute over the multistakeholder approach which was concluded a decade ago.

Let us objectively evaluate the progress of the ICT society within this decade, including the activity of IGF.

Finally, I'd like to re-emphasize the importance of the multistakeholder approach, and propose to practically implement its concept in a variety of fields. Japan has a variety of its best practices to share with international society. All stakeholders in Japan will continue to constructively contribute to the international society, so that we can understand each other on Internet-related issues.

Let's all of us here as multistakeholder work towards a truly globally connected society. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

(applause).

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. This brings our Opening Session to a close. I would like to ask the coordinator of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, to close the meeting.

>> VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: Excellencies, distinguished experts, and delegates, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to thank you, to thank our speakers for providing us insightful remarks about IGF achievements in the last ten years and the challenges the Internet community will face in the future, and I'd like to thank Mr. Chengetai Masango and Mr. Koulov for their work in organizing IGF 2015. I wish you all a very successful meeting and a very pleasant stay in Joao Pessoa.

With this, I conclude the Opening Session of IGF 2015. We will resume tomorrow with our workshops and sessions and many hours of friendly and mutual dialogue. Obrigado.

Internet Economy and Sustainable Development

The following are the outputs of the real-time captioning taken during the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in João Pessoa, Brazil, from 10 to 13 November 2015. 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 event, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

***

>> Good morning. We are starting in a few minutes. Please sit down. (pause).

>> HENRIQUE FAULHABER: Good morning. Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we will now begin this morning's main session on the important topic of Internet economy and Sustainable Development.

I welcome you all here today, and I'm looking forward to our discussions. The value of ICTs and Internet to social, economic and Sustainable Development are difficult, whether it's for infrastructure for economic and social progress or in providing tools for programs, such as Government, health, finance and education. That value has grown with time due to the vast improvements in technology, including new service like social media, big data and cloud computing.

The Internet provides a platform for the growth of ICT and for an emerging digital economy in which production, distribution, consumption depend on broadband networks and services.

Clearly, information communication technology is a critical enabler of Sustainable Development. While attention needs to be paid to the Internet and to the Internet economy role in meeting information needs and facilitating agriculture, health, education as well as diverse business activities, Internet economy in Brazil is very strong. As a representative of ICT sector in cgi.br, I should mention the Brazilian companies to play a more significant role in this field, not just as consumers of global ICT industry; in fact, we urge to strengthen our position as a provider of solutions for Brazil and abroad.

I think our goal should shift to more participation in the global market of ICT products and services alliance with other economies' aspiration, even between the developed nations. I hope this morning we will have an important and interactive multistakeholder discussion addressing a number of policy questions pertaining to these important and pressing challenges.

I'd now like to give the floor to assistant Secretary-General UN DESA, Mr. Lenni Montiel. Please, the floor is yours.

>> LENNI MONTIEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And good morning, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Allow me also to thank the moderators and the panel members for this great opportunity we have this morning to discuss these very relevant and timely topics.

This main session is of a major importance to IGF 10, and definitely to the ongoing WSIS overall review by the General Assembly. The results of this main session can provide a valuable input to the preparatory process of the WSIS output document.

I want to highlight this point very much. For those who follow the WSIS overall review in New York at the UN General Assembly, you know that if there is one subject on which there is an emerging consensus, it is this consistent emphasis by member states and stakeholders on the close links between the WSIS follow-up and the follow-up of the 2030 agenda, the follow-up on the implementation of the Sustainable Development, SDGs.

During the WSIS preparation so far, the role of ICTs and the Internet as an enabler of Sustainable Development has been repeatedly emphasized by both developed and developing countries, by state -- by governments and stakeholders alike.

I want to thank our Brazilian host for highlighting the relationships between the Internet economy and Sustainable Development.

I think the contributions of the Internet economy to Sustainable Development are well documented. I will not go into details here.

Indeed, more than a dozen UN entities, including UN DESA, ITU, UNESCO, UNCTAD and others have worked together and developed a matrix linking specific WSIS actions, action lines to individual SDGs.

There is a very handy reference tool, and I strongly recommend colleagues to take a good look at it. It is available in the WSIS Web site. I'm quite confident that UN General Assembly will agree on specific steps to link WSIS follow-up with SDG follow-up. At this point, let me take this opportunity to share a few personal thoughts on the Internet economy and Sustainable Development.

First, I think we should take a more serious look on how to use the Internet as an engine for job creation, for income generation, for economic growth, that is inclusive and equitable and for providing equal opportunities to women and youth.

This is the unique power of the Internet economy, and its potential for fostering entrepreneurship is yet to be fully tapped.

Right now, the Internet economy remains dominated by a few giants and by large economies. The question here is, how can we extend this power to developing countries, LDCs, to Africa and more generalized groups. This is in my view a central challenge.

Second, we need to do more to tap the potential of the Internet economy as a social and economic equalizer, as a tool that encourages and fosters education, cultural development and that provides a digital space for our rich diverse realizations to flourish.

Right now, the Internet content is dominated by a few languages, and there is a serious lack of local content. The negative impacts on learning, education, knowledge sharing, and ultimately on preparing the youth for future employment are far-reaching and widespread.

This is of course part of the digital divide that we will be addressing in another session. But I want to highlight this here. If we do not breach this digital divide, there will be no true globalizing Internet economy, and there will be no contribution of Internet economy to Sustainable Development in the democratizing way that has been associated with the Internet.

If that will be the case, then we will continue seeing an Internet economy for some, and not for all.

Let me conclude by underscoring another point, this is dear to my heart, and this is capacity-building. Many have and will continue to highlight the importance of capacity-building, and I fully share this. I think we at the UN could have done more and indeed should do more in training and capacity-building that ultimately allow people in developing countries to create economic opportunities online, to create wealth online and to secure profits online.

Without the knowledge, skills, be they programming skills, technical management skills, applications, etcetera, the workforce for the Internet economy will be always missing in many developing countries, further aggravating the digital divide.

These are just a few points to share with my fellow panelists and participants. I look forward to a rich discussion this morning. Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you all. My name is Joseph Alhadeff, and I chair the ICC Digital Economy Commission, and I seem to have a day job with Oracle Corporation. I'm here as the moderator for this panel. Just so that everyone knows the logistics we are going to use, we have asked for panelists to make two three-minute interventions on different topics. We are providing questions as a roadmap for those. A couple of speakers, due to the need to leave early and also because they wanted to go into greater depth on one topic, will be speaking for a longer chunk on one topic as opposed to two topics.

But we will highlight those as we go along. At the end of each group of questions, and there will be three groups of questions, there will be time for audience participation. We ask all of our panelists to use the questions as a guide, and to feel free to be interactive in their use of the three minutes as to how they wish to provide the answers, and may do so in commenting on comments that have been made, etcetera.

With that, we will open up the programme. I am going to do a disservice to what is a very, very distinguished set of panelists, because if I had to introduce the distinguished resumes of every panelist, we would finish the panel at the end of introduction. Each has notoriety to be found on the Internet, and I suggest you look up what are very impressive biographies, but we just don't have the time to go into that at the moment.

With that, our first topic, and so the topic will have a number of questions underneath it, is the global vision. I thank the Assistant Secretary who set out a very good press of what the global vision is and what the challenges and benefits are. We hope we can capture your comments. I think you summarized the panel already. But hopefully we can engage in greater depth on each of the topics.

The first question under the global vision concept is how do we foresee the information economy as we move towards 2030, and what are we seeing as the trends in that direction from 2015? I'd like to start with Helani Galpaya, the CEO of LIRNEasia, who has done quite a bit of survey and research on the topic, and while these are issues in developed and developing economies, we will be focusing mostly on the literature in the views of the developing economies in this panel.

>> HELANI GALPAYA: Thank you. I will speak based on household surveys, representative of people in countries in Africa and south Asia, and a few countries in southeast Asia. These are different worlds. The developing world doesn't look like one developing world. There are regional differences. There are cross country differences and there are within country differences.

We really do need to take a differentiated approach to these. But inasmuch as the regions go, the mobile phones have, we know, been a success story. Prices are low and over 90 percent of Asia, including the poor, are making calls.

The numbers are less so in Africa. Historically the competition levels in Asia have been high, lower in Africa. This is directly reflected in the affordability of prices of mobile phones. The economic benefits through systematic reviews on, for example, rural income and livelihood is positive. So we are not just seeing

this in the developing countries. We have systematically reviewed the literature, and it is having a positive impact.

This is mobile phones which are primarily used for voice and SMS. The Internet is a different story. We have made progress. In 2006, 72 percent of the poor in India were saying they had not heard of the Internet. In 2011 this number had come down to 24 percent.

Similarly, in other countries, in Pakistan, 36 percent, down to, in 2011 everyone saying they at least know the Internet. Awareness is there and increasing. We have crossed that barrier.

What about youth? There we have a huge barrier to cross. We have come a long way, but still overall, in the countries in south Asia and southeast Asia, Internet access is under 20 percent. That is under 20 percent of a country's population is using the Internet.

This is a huge problem. This is the mobile Internet, so getting a mobile phone in the hands of these people is key. In Africa the numbers are lower. And in surveys, why do you not have a mobile phone and use it, in Asia the top reason given is, I don't see the need for it.

In Africa, interestingly, they are not even at the need position. They are at, I can't afford it is the top reason. I don't have coverage where I live is the second reason. Electricity, I can't charge it in my house is the third reason. This is representative sample survey data. These are all barriers we have to cross. That should show you just how different Asia and Africa alone are, because in Asia, we have met some of the affordability bars.

There is Internet available for under 5 percent of income, and still we have 20 percent of our people online, only.

Market innovations currently done by private companies, unfortunately not Government actions, are bringing people online, limited access packages that are driving people on to the Internet.

Social media is the biggest driver of the Internet use, and interestingly, it is acting in great extent as a substitute for traditional communication, because other alternatives are truly expensive for most people. So people on Facebook coordinating their activities, communicating with people, and using it as a substitute for SMS. This is how the evolution of the information economy has evolved for a majority of the world's poor. I'll stop at that.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I'll go to our next speaker, Sergio Quiroga da Cunha, head of Latin America for Ericsson, and Ericsson has -- apparently my eyesight is no longer good enough to read a card that far away (chuckles).

But Ericsson has done very interesting research in this space and I believe has looked at perhaps Latin America. If you could perhaps see some of the trending that you discovered in your research, and some of the ways to perhaps bridge some of the gaps, that would be great.

>> SERGIO QUIROGA da CUNHA: Yes. Good morning, everyone. It is good to be here. Ericsson, of course we are good at forecasting what is going to happen with the telecommunications world, what is going to happen with the mobile programs and so on.

Think about 2020, that there is the gap that we need to fill. We said that and we realize that 90 percent of the world will be connected through mobile broadband by 2020 for sure. If 90 percent of the people is talking now, in four years 90 percent is going to be connected via mobile broadband.

We, together with Columbia University, we did one study on how can we direct and guarantee that the 2030 goals on Sustainable Development are connected to that, so the answer of this study is that the business as usual will not be sufficient to achieve the Sustainable Development goals.

So we need partnerships. We need Government. We need the private sector, and of course, academia, to work together. So the things that we should do, of course, it's in the Government side, we should go to connectivity for all public facilities by 2020, yes, together with what we talked about.

ICT training for the public officials for sure, ICT-based delivery systems for healthcare, education, infrastructure, the third point. Development of Internet of Things, for sure that this is coming. And encouragement of university to scale up education incubation relating to the ICT solutions, with partnership with private sectors, and last but not least, the deployment of the ICT-based Sustainable Development Goal information system that connects public service and facilities and private sector and public.

These six items are the biggest findings of the study with Columbia University.

With that, we believe that, yes, everything that we are doing in the Telecom sector will go toward the Sustainable Development Goals that we have, and why Ericsson is there, because we are leading in the advocate of technology for good.

This is my role here, and this is the role of Ericsson, with full commitment from the top to bottom of the company on that.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. I think we start seeing problems and trends towards solutions, and I think we are going to see convergence of the conversation as we go along.

As we were looking through our speakers, Adjunct Professor at Division of Finance and Economics at the Columbia Institute of Tele-Information, Raul Katz has the word "economics" in his title, we thought this might be a good topic for him to give us some of the economic thinking that might be related to some of the trending that he sees both today going forward and to the future, and if I could ask you to start the three minutes, please.

>> RAUL L. KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Three minutes will be tough, but I'll try to give you a glance. I thought the best way to start thinking about 2030 is to see what the situation is in 2015, to see what areas we see that are going to evolve in some way, shape or form.

My sense is that from an infrastructure standpoint, broadband coverage is fairly advanced around the emerging world as well. My numbers in Latin America indicate fixed broadband ranges between 75 percent in Mexico to 95 percent in Argentina. Mobile on the other hand ranges between 70 percent in Paraguay and a hundred percent in Chile. Infrastructure is being deployed. However, quality of the facilities is uneven. In general on a prorated basis, Latin America gets on the fixed side 2.6 megabytes of service, while mobile gets 1.7, with wide ranges between Bolivia and Uruguay. Uruguay is advanced in that sense.

The key issue that we are facing in the development world is the demand gap, is the people that could buy, could access internet and could buy broadband services and don't, and the demand gap that Latin America is on the order of 40 percent for fixed broadband and 45 percent for mobile, meaning people have the wire coming from their house but don't actually purchase it. Why is that?

The main barrier is economic, and not so much because prices haven't dropped, because prices have been dropping like around 10 percent a year for mobile broadband, ever since 2010. The issue is one of affordability and has to do with the bottom of the pyramid phenomenon.

Only Latin America we have 165 million people whose average income for household is $325 per month. That ranges from 94 to Bolivia to 460 in Uruguay. Essentially, these people cannot afford buying no matter what the prices are going to be in terms of those dropping and whether there is enough competition. And that is where the Governments, the state has to intervene in some way, in order to alleviate that kind of economic concern.

Beyond those we have two other barriers; digital literacy, 22 percent of nonadopters indicate that they do not access the Internet because they don't know how to, or content relevance, they don't see what they would do. I'm going to come back to that, because in fact, when you see that, let's say Latin America by our studies of the 100 top sites on the Internet, only 26 have been developed locally. The number is 27 in the Middle East, 27 in southeast Asia.

We have an issue in terms of how do we develop content that is actually not only linguistically but culturally attuned to the needs of the population, particularly at the bottom of the pyramid.

What is my view for 2030? First, I see a convergence. I don't -- I see that when I look at the trends, both in Internet adoption, in broadband adoption, year after year, the emerging world is closing the gap with the OECD countries, clearly notwithstanding the issue of the bottom of the pyramid, which remains an economic barrier that needs to be addressed, but nevertheless I see that what we label the globalization of consumption is really permeating the rest of the world.

Now, having said that, with the issues and the imbalances that occur in the development of local content, we need to accentuate the development of entrepreneurship in order to develop more applications, more services, more software in the region. Here, we as Latin America, as an emerging market player, have a lot of barriers to face that have nothing to do in my way, in my sense, with cultural factors. The much noted concept that says that emerging markets are, entrepreneurs in emerging markets don't want to face risk as the Silicon Valley entrepreneurs do, is not true. The key issue is one of resources. And it's not resources on the public sector side, because by my count, the public sector in Latin America is spending $20 billion a year in the development of ICT applications. It is that money is badly spent. There is clearly coordination failure, redundancies, lack of visibility, so, lack of alignment between development, targets and where the money is being put. And the secondly, the second issue is that private capital is not there.

For instance, Latin America is spending today, the VCs, venture capitalists in Latin America are spending only $400 million a year in ICT. That is a drop of water. That is a drop in the bucket related to what we need. We need to create the right conditions for private sector to intervene, to accelerate their investment, to be willing to take risks in these new environments for developing applications and services.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. We have seen the trends where there is technology that isn't sufficiently used, there is investment that isn't where it needs to be, to help promote some of these things. There is infrastructure that isn't necessarily capitalized on as well as it could be. When we think about this, this isn't the first time we have had development goals.

We had a rich history of the Millennium Development Goals, and we had lots of other development opportunities and movements related to that. Perhaps we can think for a second as we look forward to the Sustainable Development Goals on lessons we may have learned that may address some of the issues as we go forward. And with that, I'll turn the floor to Jimson Olufuye, who is the Chairman of AfiCTA, and if you would start your three minutes, please.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Joe.

Really, there has been progress made, substantial progress made when it comes to a maintenance of the MDGs, not least in Africa. I would like to defer a little here. The figure is not about Internet penetration in Africa, run about 27 to 30 percent in Nigeria alone, 50 percent penetration level, and this has helped to eradicate a lot of issues, health issues. People are well educated. There are a lot of awareness. Social media content has increased. General outlook is very good, and there is great optimism that the goals set forth for SDG will be more rapidly achieved if we learn from experience, which is very important at this moment. As we review MDG, there are a lot of lessons we could learn.

Number one, a lot of organizations involved in MDG coordination were working on cross boxes. There is need for more opportunity for all agencies, maybe at national levels, to come together to streamline the operations and streamline their budget, have appropriate metrics that will help in knowing how far we are making progress in this project.

And also, there is the issue of corruption, that steps in from that, because a lot of resources will be used and you don't see much results. Going forward in SDG, if there is more transparency and accountability, then it will be easy for everyone to see the outcome of huge resources that will be budgeted into this focus.

Then also, there are a lot of policies that need to be developed going forward at the national level. So this needs to incorporate all stakeholders as we have been discussing yesterday, the private sector, the public sector, the Civil Society, they all need to come together, and also academia, and evolve this policy work together, and also implementation of these policies.

There is a lesson I think we can learn from an event in Nigeria, and the ICT sector, we do have what is called the people's Parliament, is an opportunity for everybody to come together, once any quarter, different regions in Nigeria. The users, they listen, they express themselves. The operators, they listen to what the users, users idea to moderate, so lessons we are taking home and to review afterwards.

So, in the rural areas as we all know, we need to use this universal service position phones effectively to construct or build more infrastructure into the interior, to enable more people to have access.

Finally, I know that before 2030, we can actually achieve these goals if we put all efforts on the table. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Another group that has been highly involved obviously in both the Millennium Development Goals and now in the Sustainable Development Goals is UNESCO, and I turn over to Lydia Brito for her thoughts on these topics.

>> LYDIA BRITO: Thank you very much, and good morning to all. I think this is a very interesting question, because it's good to look at lessons learned as we move to I would say even a more ambitious Development Agenda.

The MDGs, as it was said, they had an impact. And clearly in many countries and in many regions around the world, we were able to reduce poverty. We were able to improve access to education, to clean water and sanitation, to all services.

In my view, there were some positive aspects that I hope we will retain. One was the political commitment towards the goals. I think in that respect many of the governments and stakeholders in the countries really said these are goals that give us some vision for the future, and we need to commit to those goals.

I think this political commitment is a very important factor for success. I also believe that with all the issues and fragmentation that indeed happen in the beginning of the implementation of the MDGs, the reality is that towards the end, more partnerships were being built, both at national, regional and global level, and the reality is that in the SDGs, partnership is now one of the goals, how to strengthen the partnerships in order to, together, to be able to reach that.

I also believe that another interesting factor of success was the investment in capacity-building, in all the aspects of the Millennium Development Goals, national capacity to deal with policies, with implementation of policies, and very importantly, with the monitoring of the achievements and the ways and coming with alternative solutions to go.

Where are the less positive lessons and the ones that I would like to put forward as UNESCO, one of the feelings for us at the organization was that, very important, because in the traditional areas, as education monitoring, etcetera, of course there were successes, but we missed other areas that are building blocks to

public policies. The scientific knowledge, the capacity, the science capacity in the countries, the communication and information opportunities, culture for development, these were cross-cutting areas.

And in my view, really they are building blocks towards sustainable agenda. That is why during the SDG discussion and process, UNESCO really pushes forward the importance of having the different areas of science as permeating the SDGs, culture for development, a very important area, communication and information, and clearly, ICTs in the different, the overall specter of the technologies.

And since we are in the IGF, the transformative power of these technologies for development, they were not captured in the MDGs. And although we see much more permeation in the new agenda, I think the challenge will be how can we make sure that the public policies, both at national, regional and global level, indeed are able to use this transformative power of these technologies.

That is why, when we were talking about, and UNESCO, I'm very happy to say that our channel conference just approved the concept of Internet universality, that is really based in four pillars. One is about rights, human rights. When we talk about Internet and universality, it is to make sure it is about rights.

And also the fact that it is to be open, it needs to be creative and changing. It needs to be accessible. We already heard earlier about content, language, you know, the capacity for people to be really active actors in this Arena. Finally, the multistakeholder participation, that I think is fundamental.

But so, I think there are good lessons and lessons to change the way we went forward. Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. The previous speakers have just set the stage for the next topic which we are going to address, which is what regulatory and policy issues need to be addressed to improve the ecosystem. With that, I will turn to Bambang Heru Tjahjono, Director General for ICT applications, MCIT Indonesia. If I could ask you to start your three minutes. Thank you.

>> BAMBANG HERU TJAHJONO: Thank you. Good morning. Yes, we have the policy, but the policy now we are changing. The policy is not just regulate, but we are making some empowerment. Before I start with the policy, Mr. Moderator, based on the global index, around 144 countries, Indonesia in 2014, 2015 is ranked 34, compared to the year of 2013 and 2014 on 38 ratings.

So from twelve pillars of the global index Indonesia still has two of the four pillars, namely infrastructure, secondly, technology readiness for awareness of the people, also, like higher education and training and also innovation. Indonesia is now formally ICT for development in the supporting of the SDG with Indonesian plan, to create our system by 2020. The plan seeks to harness the full potential to the integration of IT infrastructure for the public facilities, and then mention logistics and transportation system for improving national economic growth. Ladies and gentlemen, Internet economy has grown up also very rapidly in Indonesia, since three years ago, starting from the growing the Internet users from 60 million to almost 90 million now by 2015.

As everybody said that mobile user of cellular market is rapidly increasing with penetration estimated around 150 percent of our total population, reaching approximately 350 million subscriber, subscription, while the broadband users have reached almost 50 million, broadband is expected to have 30 percent this year and around hopefully 70 percent in 2020; and also followed by increasing the use of number of utilizing social media in my country, which run almost 50 million users this year. So by utilizing the social media, therefore just making communication and socializations, we also make effectively that the social media offering the selling or promoting goods now especially for the small, medium enterprise.

E-commerce transaction initiative in 2014 also now reaches 18 billion U.S. dollars, and expected 24 billion U.S. dollar this year. The player is mostly micro, small and medium enterprise and also start-up company, in order to be, this gives opportunity to improve people economic in remote area, and also we want to increase the productivity by the adoption of the digital technology.

Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. I think we see some promising numbers, and some using infrastructure and technology readiness of the population as two important factors I think; very helpful comment. We now turn to the honorable Professor, Deputy Minister Department of Telecommunications and Postal Services for the Republic of South Africa, if you could start your three minutes, please.

>> HLENGIWE BUHLE MKHIZE: Thank you very much, Chairperson. In my understanding I have to address issues beyond technology challenges as to what is to be done.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think you can see what issues you think need to be addressed as part of the Sustainable Development goals. The questions are a guide, not a handcuff. Please feel free to go off question as you wish.

>> HLENGIWE BUHLE MKHIZE: I think the first point to add based on really lessons learned is the question of we are looking at how to improve education outcomes, so as to ensure that we produce a large number of young people with critical skills which are needed for the jobs of the 21st century. And for us, having met the MDGs goals, and we feel that is the area where we will concentrate, and of course, the question is how to do that, how to achieve that, besides investing in our own education system.

We see opportunities of using our bi-national and multi-lateral partners in ensuring that we revive exchange programs, and ensure that as many of our young people as possible have an opportunity of being exposed outside our own universities and companies.

The production capabilities is closely related to, that. Incubation and ensuring that we create sufficient space and we have adequate resources for young people to be able to come up with relevant applications and produce local content. So that is where we will be also spending a lot of time, so as to ensure that we remain on the forefront of the new agenda of using technology in first striking and achieving accurate results.

Also, we are looking at the importance of data in policy formulation. With the MDGs we spent a lot of time not setting realistic targets, and losing time, and towards the end, we picked up. But now with the SDGs it has become important for us to look at all ICT information and many other development agencies, their report, and try to come up with clear targets of what is to be achieved by when.

Policy implementation, when we look back, some of the results were delayed by the speed, the rate at which we implemented our good policies, and one of the things we have started now looking at how to achieve repeat results, looking at the Malaysian models and many other countries that have come up with those, and also providing leadership in ensuring that we closely monitor and evaluate the partnerships that we have developed and make sure that we cement it, almost in line with what we see with the operations of the IGF. And also looking at human rights, adopting the human rights centered approach in line with the constitution with a good Bill of Rights. And we are hoping that the WSIS process and action line follow-ups will remain relevant and be aligned to the identified sustainable goals and targets, and support provided through activity multistakeholder action and collaboration.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. For the last speaker on this panel, we turn to Mr. Daniel Sepulveda, Deputy Assistant Secretary, U.S. coordinator for International and Communications Policy for the U.S. Department of State.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: Thank you very much. First of all, thank you for the opportunity to participate on this panel. I think there has been a lot of useful ideas distributed already this morning. I would like to just add my voice to some of those concepts.

First of all, I think as we heard from our colleague from South Africa, digital strategies and ICT strategies need to be about more than ICTs. They need to be about skill development, creating an environment for

productive activity and for skills that people can have to create content and to participate as market participants on the Internet.

I think the second important point that others have raised is that the experience across the developing world is not monolithic. There are nations in the developing world that are struggling and nations that are doing well. From Estonia to Singapore to Colombia, to Chile, Kenya to Rwanda, you see public policy strategies that are working and that are not in a number of countries. Those countries that have public policy strategies that are working have a couple of things in common. First, they embrace market competition. You don't see a lot of countries with monopoly control of the telecommunications market doing well in this space.

They also encourage private sector participation through a regulatory and legal model that allows the private sector to come in, be able to anticipate what the legal and regulatory environment will be over time in order to make investments that they are secure and relatively risk-free, relative to environments in which they don't have that degree of certainty.

The last point is a market of light touch regulation, whether you see -- again, you can look at market effects and you see data localization efforts. Those raise the cost of cloud services. They raise the cost of SMEs. They raise the cost of governments using technology services to deliver services.

Taxation policies that treat digital products, whether that be computers, tablets, phones in a different manner than other services, raise the cost again for individuals, testing regimes that don't comply with international testing standards and require the added cost of conducting testing for services or products in a specific market by market case.

Again, you are denying the economies of scale to and the value that that derives to your people and proper spectrum management. If your nation has not transitioned, conducted a digital transition to date, then it's time. Maximizing the returns to the use of spectrum and ensuring that that wireless infrastructure is available for operators in your country is critically important.

Of course, there are always going to be market sectors due to geography or poverty that are just not reachable by the market and it needs to be functional universal service funds to ensure that individuals in those spaces are receiving affordable services.

But ultimately, it comes down to those three key things: One, market regulation, ensuring that the space is there to have the proper investment in the delivery of services; two, skills development, so that what we are trying to do here is not in any one country build an ICT sector specifically, but to create an environment in which any sector can use ICT effectively to be more productive, and if possible, ICT sector can organically be developed in that space.

Three, accountable institutions; institutions that are open, institutions in which market actors can participate, be heard, and know what is going to happen and invest with some degree of certainty.

I think again, you can look across the board of the developing world, whether you look at Raul's studies in Latin America and see disparities of outcome effects across a wide region, from a hundred percent mobile penetration in Chile to low mobile penetration in other countries, or you look at Africa or southeast Asia, no matter where you are looking, you see vast disparities in outcomes, and you can tie outcomes directly to public policy.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. We have had a vibrant conversation among ourselves, and it's now time for the audience to stop being freeloaders and get to the mics and ask some questions yourself. We are running a little behind time, but we have time for a few questions. If you would like to ask a question, please come to the microphone. Before the first question, let me ask, my colleague is a remote moderator in a darkened booth who we cannot see from here.

If the remote moderator would like to tell us whether there are any questions that have come in online, please chime in, as appropriate, to let us know. You will be the voice over the loud speakers. But with that, let me please take the first question. Could you please identify yourself when you start the question. If I would ask you to limit it to maximum two minutes.

>> STEVE ZELTZER: Technology here. Okay. Now it's on. Thank you. My name is Steve Zeltzer with LaborNet APC San Francisco and also labortech.net. The question that I have and I think needs to be raised here are, what is social implications of, in the global economy, of apps and temporary workers, because more and more workers are being transformed into a situation of being gig workers as they call it.

This means more temporary workers in the United States -- now there are 30 percent, there are growing numbers -- and more temporary workers in Japan, Korea and many other countries.

Workers are being marginalized and their living conditions are deteriorating in the United States, in part because of the introduction of this technology. We don't believe it's sustainable without regulation. That raises the question of companies like Uber and others who want to disrupt regulation, and basically want to just use their technology to make greater profits. They say they are helping society.

The question is, counterposing regulation to protect social rights, rights of working people internationally and the introduction of new technologies, and how that is going to be addressed in an organized way so working people and majority of people will be protected with the introduction of new technology, and the question of deregulation and relationship to that. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. We are going to take a couple of questions, and then we will ask panelists to see who would like to answer them.

>> Thank you. My name is Subi Chaturvedi, member of the MAG, and I come from India. My question is addressed to Ambassador Daniel Sepulveda. He spoke to the point of predictable accountable public institutions and policies which are not retrospective. He talked about open market competition and embracing the environment.

We do know that statistics reveal that they are not on all of the same page, and then there are statistics, and statistics. We can counterargue that in lesser developed countries, which are still embracing new technology, the learning curve is much steeper.

How do we balance the idea of, I'm not arguing for licenses, I'm not arguing for protection in this environments, but how to allow local content, local start-ups, SMEs from local regions to develop and scale up, because they cannot possibly compete with the Foxes and Disneys of the world. Even when we are talking about putting more content, we are putting more local services online, that has to be a balance between policy, how do you speak to that question? Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I will ask that this, we freeze the line on questions now, because this is about the amount we have time for. But we have two more and that will be fine. Let me just not answer the questions to be posed but also point that in our next chunk of discussion topics, local content will be a large discussion topic. I do not want to limit Ambassador Sepulveda's desire to answer, but I want to indicate it will be a topic of discussion on the next round. Please.

>> JUAN FERNANDEZ: I'm Juan Fernandez, Ministry of Communication of Cuba. I congratulate the organizers for having assembled a diverse group of panelists. I think it covers all the angles of a problematic, that it's a really multi-dimensional, as they said. The objective is not ICT for ICT sake but to use it in development.

I want to focus my question in one issue that was mentioned by Professor Katz and also the Ambassador that there is a need for pertinent use, pertinent local content, that is not only, this technology used for all the

nonproductive uses. Of course, all those uses are okay, but we have to encourage the development of pertinent Web sites, pertinent applications that are really relevant, not only cultural but economically.

And this in a way joins with Subi's question. Unfortunately, the market base strategies for having access not always takes into consideration this. It's only to increase the number of users, no matter what for what is being used, and there are some other tendencies that even tends to reduce the options of using this Zero-Rating and all these things, that it goes in the opposite direction of having real pertinent and real development oriented, yes, development oriented applications.

My question for the panelists is, how can these policies take this into account, especially financing, for financing this local content that sometimes is very difficult, as Subi said, because of the competition for the already-made content that is from elsewhere, that is really not relevant to our cultures and economies.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. As I had said before, we only have time for one more question so this is the last question on this round. You will have opportunities in the next round to ask a question. I will remind people, local content is a big chunk of the next round. Please.

>> GIACOMO MAZZONE: Thank you. Giacomo Mazzone, European Broadcasting Union. The Ambassador mentioned before the spectrum. The spectrum at the moment is already used by many other users. I think that is important to consider that it needs to be an arbitrage about the public interest, about the various group of interests, about users of the spectrum. Spectrum is a common good. It needs to be treated in a fair way.

The last consideration is that I've heard not so much about the role of the Government. I think that the Government probably from the European perspective have a important role to play, and would like that this would be even considered more in this discussion. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. With that, I'll turn it to the panel. I think Ambassador Sepulveda has won the popularity contest in terms of having been named. Raul Katz was mentioned in terms of economic research, but I'm not limiting answers to those two participants. But I will start with them since they were the names in the questions.

And on content, please be aware there will be a much larger discussion on content in the next round. We will have a little bit of discussion here, but there are lots of other people who will be speaking. We will catch the remote at the end of this. On the remote, we will take this round of questions, and we will take the remote because the remote obviously didn't hear about the last limit.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: Joe, you mentioned there is going to be a conversation on local content in the next panel. I'm going to reserve my comments on that space in the next panel.

Relative to the role of Government, like I said, we believe that the role of Government is to create a legal, regulatory, investment environment to secure private sector investment and ensure the people have the skills to use the capabilities made available to them by the innovations that the private sector is bringing to the market. We don't believe there needs to be a specific industrial policy in given countries to develop a specific type of company or a specific type of sector.

The vast majority of the benefits of the deployment of ICTs, 75 percent of the benefits go to nonICT sector companies. It is the use of ICTs that is critical to the development of a nation, not the creation of ICTs.

Second, relative to the public interest and the management of spectrum, yes, it is absolutely true. In fact, it is our primary obligation in the management of a public good like spectrum to ensure that it is used and deployed and licensed in a manner consistent with the public interest. We believe that modern technology, and the fact that, yes, spectrum has been licensed out previously due to a long history of how spectrum was licensed out, largely in ways that technology has made either irrelevant or significantly inefficient. The modern digital

transition and ability to take what was once a broadcast signal that took six megahertz to take up to send has now been dramatically reduced, freeing up space in the spectrum for other purposes. And again, those were spectrum licenses that were granted for free as opposed to the multiple mechanisms in which we grant spectrum licenses today.

There is a long debate about what works and what works well. Broadcasting and traditional mechanisms are centralized distribution of information, to many that remains a critical public good, particularly in cases of emergency or in use or in centrally filtered information that you need to have in that way.

The Internet provides a many to many mechanism for communications, and has revolutionized the way we provide information to each other, inform and educate ourselves, and needs to be a critical space to that as well.

Relative to Subi's questions on LDCs and the need to develop and scale services online, and this gets to some of the local content question, the premise that has been, my colleague from Cuba and Subi have questioned is, can the market enable and create an environment in which you have socially just outcomes. Those socially just outcomes include ensuring that people can provide services to their own people in their own voice in their own way.

That is a socially just outcome that we also support. What we believe is that the market today for the Internet as an open and flat platform enables a structure in which that is possible. Then what you need is investments in skill development, and if people have the skills and where people have the skills and they have an open platform and the freedom to use it, they create local content. They create local services.

The services in Kenya were not created in the United States. The services that we see all over Latin America, in southeast Asia, relative to agriculture and farm production, using locally derived applications, were not created in the United States. If you create the platform in which people can use their human ingenuity and capacity and desire to produce, they will produce.

If you limit that environment, if you close that down those services and you make them more expensive to use, you will limit that, those socially just ends that you are trying to produce.

I have a bunch of other thoughts. Oh, but quickly, on the, relative to the labor market and independent contractors as they relate to platform providers for the delivery of services of individuals providing services, that is a significant and real question. Senator Mark Warner in the United States and FTC have been doing significant work in the space. There is questions about having, ensuring there is a socially available safety net that is being reduced relative to traditional employer provided safety nets. We can have a longer conversation about that.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. We are running close on time. But if anyone wants to make a, I would ask the comments to be kept short if possible so we can get back to time.

>> SERGIO QUIROGA DA CUNHA: On the issue of Government, I think it's important, all the work that I've been doing in the past couple of years particularly, and there I agree with Ambassador Sepulveda that the key explanatory variable on how countries advance more and others don't is public policy and institution of founders. It's interesting because some economies say institutional factors, since we don't know how to measure it, we will eliminate it from the models. But nevertheless it's the most important one.

What does it mean, institutionalization of these policies? On one, policies need to be somewhat centralized. There needs to be more coordination. Every single country that I've seen, particularly in the developing world, has ten ministries touching on the topic with no central authority. There is no by chance that Colombia has advanced because they have a central authority and endorsement from the executive branch. So in that sense, the role of Government is critical. And I would agree with what was said before,

maybe we underemphasize it. On the issue of local content, I think we all agree on local content. The issue is where to focus.

I think underlying this discussion is somewhat of a notion, should developing countries go and develop their own version of Google or Facebook. I think that concept is wrong. I think that per se Google, YouTube or Twitter, Facebook, are multi-sided platforms that can be customized, that are willing to accept the development of local content, as and in fact need that in order to become viable in the developing world. And I believe in that sense we need to look in the developing world at those sectors, those niches that really add value to our own societies, or where we have an advantage. I think of commerce where the Brazilians have made big strides, social messaging, video distribution when there are indirect network effects, and more importantly digitization of production processes. Even for opportunity to pick up, we need to make sure that whatever we do in the ICT field goes from the consumption side to the production side, and here we have a big to-do.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I want to check to see, the remote moderator I think tried to send us a signal. Was there a question that the remote moderator had?

>> ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Yes, we have two questions --

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: We only have time for one. The first one.

>> ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Okay. The first one is from Ben Benin from Ramanou Biaou. The development of ICT today had an impact on climate change. How do governments think together and encourage the innovation of the Internet that uses screen technologies?

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Since we are going to get, do more of that in the next round, I'm going to park that question until the next round; please ask it again. What was the second question?

>> ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: The second question is from Akinbo Cornerstone from IGF Nigeria. His question is when we do not set up mechanisms to ensure the reduction of digital, of the digital divide, as it concerns IP blocking, without consideration for the development status of the source, we undermine the economic benefits from such a part of the world. Who gets to address the blacklisting of developing or underdeveloped countries?

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. That question too we are going to park for round 2, because it will be on there. But at the beginning of the question period for the next round, please have both of those be the leadoff questions because we are going to address how to bridge some of the gaps, and I think they will fit more closely to those topics.

We had two requests, one minute, and I will be Draconian in your one minute.

>> HELANI GALPAYA: The response on app development, I think more than worrying about how we are going to compete with big American companies, we need to look at our countries. It is not helping that Telecom operators insist on keeping 70 percent of the share and giving 30 percent to the developer. It couldn't help that people couldn't get payment from Pay Pal by selling apps; possible in India, not possible in other countries. There are a broad spectrum of issues that we need to look at.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: 20 seconds. Excellent.

>> LYDIA BRITO: In the question of the role of governments, I think to create the right environment is very important, and definitely is a very important role of governments. But I'm not sure that I agree that it is only about using ICTs.

I think all the world needs to put the brains together, to bring the technologies, new knowledge, for the very challenging world we live today.

So I wouldn't say, and I'm really, I really don't agree to say that it's only out to use ICTs. I think we need to tap on the creativity that we have in all the regions of the world. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. We are going to bridge into the next topic. The next topic, the general concept is the Internet role in the economy, challenges and successes in delivering Sustainable Development Goals. We took the topics a little out of order, because one of our speakers does have a pressing time constraint and a commitment on another panel, and will have to be leaving us. We are going to start off with the concept of intellectual property, and the question is innovation is an essential element to the digital economy and the information society.

How can innovation and developing economies that will be essential to the implementation of Sustainable Development Goals be supported through intellectual property? What consideration should be taken into account in developing intellectual property regimes?

That is the question. We are going to be a little indulgent and suggest that five minutes, because you will not have an opportunity to come back for a second round. But, Creative Industry Sector of the World Intellectual Property Organization, the floor is yours. And it will be for five minutes.

>> MICHELE WOODS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much, the organizer of this main session, to give us the opportunity to tackle this very important issue of the relation between intellectual property and Sustainable Development.

Of course, it is a theme that is close to the World Intellectual Property Organization, as our mission is to work with together 188 member states to promote an effective IP system that enables innovation and creativity for the development of economic, social, culture of all countries.

While a functioning IP system provides guarantees and incentives for innovation to take place and creativity to flourish, but a well-functioning IP system at the same time provides for flexibilities and limitations to the scope of protection that aim at guaranteeing that the interest of society and the general public are also taken into account.

In recent years we have seen that intellectual property has become a quite popular topic in public debates, especially when talking about the digital economy. This should not surprise us. It is a reflection of the growing economic and social importance of the intellectual property.

From the economic perspective, we see a growing awareness of the contribution of creative industries to national economies. The review is developed, a methodology to measure impact, and studies across more than 40 countries in developing transition and developed economies show us that on average, creative industries account for 5.2 percent of gross domestic product and some 5.3 percent of total employment.

More evidences are provided by the Global Innovation Index, GII, produced by the World Intellectual Property in partnership with Cornell University and INSEAD, is that measuring the innovation performance of 140 countries, reinforces the idea that innovation is a key driver for economic growth, especially digital environment, and not only for developed economies.

The GII vision of innovation is a broad one, and includes Internet access used, Internet freedom, knowledge diffusion, and online creativity.

Of course, creating an efficient innovation environment is a quite complex and ambitious goal, that depends on several elements and/or innovation inputs, to use the GII jargon, such as the contribution of institutions, human capital and research, infrastructure, market and business sophistications.

Although it's only one of the variables, public policies and regulatory framework, including the IP system, play a very important role in promoting innovation.

From the social angle, I believe it's even more pervasive. People around the globe wake up in the morning and start dealing with copyright issues in their daily routine, whenever they update an application, they post a picture on Facebook, they access a library Web Page to find a book for their exam or subscribe to a new online service.

Against this background, it's essential first to raise awareness of the IP system, and second, for Governments around the world to provide an appropriate framework that can face the challenges and take advantages of the opportunities of the digital age.

Much can be said about the important role and positive role of the intellectual property in connection to other important issues like access to knowledge, cultural diversity, accessibility and disability issues.

Of course, due to the time limitation, I won't be able to dig into those topics. But the key for having an IP system that actually promotes Sustainable Development is to strike a balance of course between various interests, while maintaining the necessary incentives for innovation and creation on the high value compelling content and technology we all want to enjoy.

This is not an easy task. In fact, our member states are continuously working to improve the IP system to work towards the objective. Although we are aware there are not magic formulas in this field, I think there are good arguments to believe that a balanced and effective IP system, far from being a barrier, is in fact an enabling factor for creating a healthy and wealthy digital environment.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Well within time. Thank you very much for that also. We thought we would also take another view on the topic, and I'll turn the floor over to Sunil Abraham, Executive Director for Center for Internet Society from Bangalore.

>> SUNIL ABRAHAM: Before I answer the question, I'd like to provide a brief critique of dogmatic multistakeholderism, and the critique goes like this. If you really believe in the multistakeholder model and you think it's appropriate for every aspect of Internet Governance, you should be advocating for the dismantling of the World Intellectual Property Organization and repealing of all international IP law, so that we can build them all up, ground up, using the multistakeholder model.

Of course, that is a joke. We can't undo 400 years of history. What intellectual property does, as Ronald Coase tells us, it prevents the tragedy of the commons by introducing property rights, but more recent scholars like Michael Heller tell us we live in a good economy, we have too much property rights and the subtitle to the book, Gridlock Economy, is how too much ownership wrecks markets, stops innovation and costs lives.

That is a serious cost that we are paying for too much intellectual property in our lives. What we need, as was said, is the other side, the business that doesn't happen at the World Intellectual Property Organization, access to knowledge. Clearly referenced in the Geneva but strangely missing in the latest draft of the WSIS outcome document, the Geneva declaration had section B3, titled, Access to Information and Knowledge. It had paragraph 25 and 26 that is explicitly referencing the public domain. Paragraph 27 spoke about free and open source software. Paragraph 44 spoke about open standards, and paragraph 28 spoke about open access. All of this is key to the innovation that is the Internet, and further integration that will be produced from the Internet.

I'll give you two examples of why flexibility and reconfiguration of the intellectual property regime is critical. In India, we have sub hundred dollar phones. One of the phones is called the spice.com M line 1000. At a hundred dollar price point, you will get a phone with a pico projector, support for dual sim cards, with a receiver for terrestrial television, receiver for FM radio with a loud in-built speaker. It ships with a tripod stand, external speakers, laser pointer and torch. If the average mobile phone which doesn't have any of these features sold in the U.S. market, has 36,000 patents, this innovation from the Indian market, of course produced in Chengjiang using Chinese entrepreneurs, might have 50,000 patents. But if this entrepreneur

wants to license some of these standards, such as the 4G standard, the voluntary pooling of these patents is no longer working.

There are four competing patent pools. Even if a manufacturer licenses from one pool, they will be sued by others. Therefore, we have mapped all the patents in the mobile phone, and we are advocating to our Government that, just like the Americans to win the world war established or encouraged the creation of patent pool and established a compulsory license a hundred years ago to produce military aircrafts, today, for India, to bridge the digital divide, we need to also establish a similar device level patent pool and have a compulsory license. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. Whenever Sunil Abraham says "but this is a joke," I always start to worry a little bit (chuckles) I sometimes don't find myself laughing at the joke.

Because one of our speakers is going to have to leave on this topic, let me get a clarification. Silvia, did you want to intervene on local content versus this? Or, I thought you wanted to do a bigger intervention on local content.

If there is one burning question in the audience, we will take it out of sequence because one of our speakers is leaving. I see someone racing to the mic. The question must actually be burning.

Oh, you are not going to the mic. Okay. (chuckles) Sorry.

Never mind.

We have one question. Excellent.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. Hi, thank you so much for the comments, and all the ideas.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Can you identify yourself?

>> LOUISE MARIE HUREL: My name is Louise Marie Hurel, and I'm part of the youth at IGF program funded by ISOC and cgi.br. I'm also part of the Youth Observatory, and it is our goal to empower the youth as a legitimate voice and create a common space where we may articulate ourselves and make sure that our voices are heard. This is why we would like to highlight all of the speeches that contemplated the youth and that take into account our space in the future.

We would like also to highlight the speech of the Assistant Secretary-General and the Deputy Minister of Telecommunications and Postal Services of South Africa. Thank you so much for your speech.

I guess this is more of a remark and reminder, rather than a question. But as youth, we urge that when thinking about trends and the possible future, we think about the place of the youth today and tomorrow, and how this intrinsically relates to Sustainable Development and the SDGs.

Thank you so much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. Thank you for that remark. But this was one burning question about the IP topics. If there isn't one, we will continue on. There doesn't seem to be one. Call me shocked.

But that's fine. Thank you. And whenever you need to leave, please feel free, and thank you very much for adjusting to us for this conflict.

In terms of just in time, we now turn to the next topic which is Internet and ICTs. We agree that they can support all of the 17 SDGs, and but we want to see which ones can make the maximum contribution and ensure their rapid achievement, and also how can ICT capacity-building in those areas best be delivered. And Gary Fowlie, the Head of Member State Relations at Intergovernmental Organisations for ITU, has joined us, and if you can please address that topic.

>> GARY FOWLIE: Thank you very much. Just to correct the record, I'm actually the head of the IG Liaison Office to the UN. For me to pick out which I think is the most important reference to ICTs in the SDG agenda is a tough one. But because --

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Can you speak a little closer to the mic?

>> GARY FOWLIE: How is that? Better? I'll repeat. I'm not the Head of Member State Relations. I'm the head of the IT Liaison Office to the UN. This would be, I wouldn't be representing Doria here. We will get the record straight.

Picking out the most important ICT reference is a bit of a challenge for me, because it was a long hard fight to get these four references in there. It's very encouraging to see the level of support that, now that they are in there, they are gaining; also the importance that science, technology and innovation took on in both, has taken on in the SDG outcome document, but also in the financing for development document. It is very encouraging, and the role of ICTs are highly noted.

The two that are most important, but the first, probably the overriding one that I think will have the biggest impact is in goal 9, which reflects infrastructure and the target that we should have, universal and affordable access to the Internet, in targeting the least developed countries, who have been calling for that since 2010, or 2011, in the plan of action. That was out there. It was nice to see it codified. And yes, that will make a huge difference once we, if you give people the tools of connectivity, they will use innate intelligence to solve their own problems with this. There is lots of proof to that.

But I think overall, the most important one is goal 17, the means of implementation, where ICTs are recognized as a tool of implementation and necessary means of implementation across all 17 goals. That gives us the opportunity to point the finger at each one of the goals, and say, okay, how have you implemented that, how have you improved health using ICTs? What can you do to improve health using ICTs? Then being accountable for it, and that will be the key. How can you be accountable for using ICTs across all 17 goals, all 169 targets? That is going to be a big challenge.

I think we are looking at the ITU through the WSIS Forum to begin to deal with that, how we manage to combine the WSIS action lines and SDGs. I'll come back to that. But means of implementation, we know here, inherently this is a tool of empowerment and tool of implementation. Now the world knows, now we have to put it in action. Thanks.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. As we consider the concepts of implementation, obviously one of the concepts is the first thing you have to think about the implementation of is the concept of access, because without access, many of these other opportunities do not actually exist.

With that, we want to talk about how we can expand the role of access and make it more available, and our first speaker will be His Excellency Minister of Information, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, if you could do your three minutes, please.

>> H.E. JUNAID AHMED PALAK: Thank you very much, Moderators. Excellencies, and ladies and gentlemen, actually, what I was wondering for the last few minutes, that we have excellent innovations and excellent job done by the private sector in the ICT world. But the point is that how to deliver this innovations to the public, the public that means the rural people, women, etcetera.

The major hurdle at the moment is content development. Another is ICT illiteracy. Another is accessibility, and of course, the women need to be brought to the empowerment of men. Then having said that, another is the necessary backbone and proper legislation for ICT; illiteracy, the Government needs to intervene. In Bangladesh we have 22,000 schools. The Government is investing free of cost to develop computer labs. That helps to educate. Content development, they are a challenge. That is to be developed. And here the Government should come again to facilitate to develop content in mother tongue. Accessibility is a very

important thing. In Bangladesh, we are setting up eCenters by the Government, at the rural level. Almost 5,000 eCenters have been set up.

And from that eCenters, the people can come and get the services. Apart from that, we need to develop specialized eCenters. We are farmers. EAgriculture centres, eHealth centers, that has also been set up by Bangladesh Government. 3,000 community clinics are already set up across the rural area. Where eHealth center is working and eCulture center, this is where all departments can get all the information regarding crop and the market. Well, and for the services by the Government, the Government needs to develop Web sites. Bangladesh has developed a Web portal with 25,000 Web sites, that helps the people to get services and information from the Government, and that bridges the gap between the Government and the people.

Well, having said that, the important challenge for a country like Bangladesh and other island nations, how to apply ICT to climate change phenomenon in Bangladesh and across the world. Here ICT is doing an excellent job. Here the private sector is here. But the community reduces the cost of bills, mobile phones, and ICT applications at the coastal build that helps to adopt, to mitigate the climate change phenomenon. And that saves life and property, and that disseminates knowledge.

Well, lastly I should say that the role of media is very important. That has not been discussed as yet, how the media should act to enhance and monitor SDGs. Throughout the year, reports of how the Government is doing, how the nonGovernment sector is doing, how the private sector is doing, that will enhance implementation of SDGs. Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I recall that we had a comment from our colleague from South Africa about the fact that they were actually looking at the data related to policy implementation, so again another way of measuring and monitoring these items, which is very important. I turn the floor over now to Madam, if you could please.

>> KOTCHOFFA AMEHOU FELICITE: Thank you, Mr. President, Mr. Chairman. I am the Deputy Director of the Ministry of Communications and Information Technologies and Communication. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to talk about the current situation of Internet Governance in Benin. But before this, I'd like to tell you that the view of the head of state, Mr. Boni Yayi, is making Benin the digital country in Africa by 2025.

The digital market provides three categories of products, fixed broadband, wireless and mobile. In Benin, fixed broadband moved from 4,700 in 2013 to 46,997 in 2015, a growth of 894 percent. The penetration was assessed in .25 percent in 2005.

Broadband moved to over 1,911,000 in July, 2015.

This is an increase of 202 percent. And the penetration is assessed in 18.95 percent on the 30th of July, 2015.

Considering the differences of progression, we may conclude that the access to the Internet has faced in Benin a great improvement. The Benin administration since 2011 has established the Internet Week that aims at promoting and disseminating the Internet as well as other information technologies and communication.

The 2015 edition or version had as a theme connecting Benin, a dream to be fulfilled. The factors that have contributed to the development of the Internet in Benin are, amongst others, the adoption of the law on economic communication, and postal office, the development of 3G, the entry and functioning of the installation, and functioning of underwater cables, and the deployment of IXP, or Internet exchange points in the country.

The next development of transportation network of high flow is also one of the next steps. And this will allow the access to an Internet connection with high-speed, and I would -- we would need for this to generalize the

use of fiberoptics and also develop access technologies, as well as ensuring the permanent availability of electric power, as well as quality.

I must talk about the Internet quality in Benin, that should still be improved. The second, the 10th actually, IGF is the ideal medium to speed up the quality and accessibility of the Internet. Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. And this is very interesting to hear your observations, because this is something we can insert in the access in the context of everything that can be done to promote access. Thank you very much for your important words.

Let me first find out, do we have a remote participant on this one who is coming in remotely, Mohammed Tarek, and I don't know if he's joined us in a remote fashion. Is there any way to discover that? Perhaps some people try to figure out whether we have him remotely or not. Let me continue on to Jari Arkko, the Chairman of IETF, please.

>> JARI ARKKO: Good morning. I'm happy to be here. I have a very positive vision of the ongoing development. The future is bright. I don't want to minimize the current problems or the issues that we have ahead. But I believe broadband for the majority of people on the planet is a reachable goal.

Looking at the growth of mobile broadband, as Sergio mentioned earlier, Ericsson's research predicts that by 2020, 90 percent of the people on the planet can have mobile broadband available for them. This is a good situation, even if getting there still means a lot of work ahead.

But, I want to take a look at things a little bit beyond this. And I think there is barriers. The first one I want to mention is that it's easy to have a too rigid view of the Internet services and what they are today and modern day vision.

For instance, we tend to focus on only the people. In fact, I think the real situation that we need to look at is a broader picture, on things, the Internet of Things for instance, agriculture, environment, things like that. And some of those issues are, or application areas are very important in developing world, for instance.

I think the question is not just how to connect everybody, but how to connect everything, how can we ensure that the crops in Africa in some field are doing okay, that they are under best conditions, and how can ICT help in monitoring and caring for them.

That is the challenge. There are technical and economic aspects of that.

I know that we are discussing access, but I wanted to briefly highlight that this is not just about access, so I don't want to dispel the myth that, as long as we give people bits per second or whatever that everything is fine. What is in those bits does matter.

Some of the bits that do matter is that, for instance, the Internet retains its natural ability to allow permissionless innovation. That is the engine of economic growth, that is important here. Secondly, I'm here as a chair of the IETF, an organization that improves core technology. One of our focus areas is security, ensuring that we have technology that can keep communications over the Internet private.

As a way of one example here, in the 1990s we at the IGF had a heated debate about whether we can use encryption in Internet for various things. At the time, several agencies were opposed to that. But fortunately, we made of course the right decision that we need these kinds of tools for eCommerce and so forth. Some decades later, of course, we are glad that those decisions were made at the time.

These debates continue today, and we still need to continue to make the right decisions around those things. While positive, I want to caution that we have to go beyond people. We also have to go beyond just delivering the bits. We need also the right bits. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I think we start to see a trend forming of it's technology, people, processes, creativity harnessed across all the sources we have available.

Then we have the potential to do many interesting and beneficial projects and applications that may help close the gaps and advance the Sustainable Development Goals. We have specific sectors like health and education that may benefit from such applications, and we also need to promote innovation across the technologies and sectoral applications, and we may need to consider what best or good practices are available in that space.

With that, if I could turn again to Sergio Quiroga da Cunha from Ericsson, to talk maybe about some of those examples, perhaps from Latin America.

>> SERGIO QUIROGA da CUNHA: Yes, thank you. We can divide the examples in enablement-related and Internet economy related.

If I go to education, for instance, we have a project called Connect to Learn, starting in Brazil six years ago. We installed one base station, one single base station here close, from here it's a little bit closer, but it could be in the middle of nowhere. That one base station in Belterra, triple the population, triple with just one base station. It was a place that the operator would never touch, would never go install, because they see no business there.

Today I'm happy to say that they have this Connect to Learn is business, it's health, it's eCommerce, etcetera. They have three base stations. Together with projects like this we have similar things in Chile or Mexico. This is SDG number 4 that we consider that.

Talk about SDG number 5, we have the gender equality. And we have a big program inside our company, Ericsson, that we are quite pioneering things. And now of course the diversity inclusion, we have a target of 30 percent of the Ericsson population, in technology and service company, 30 percent must be women by 2020. It's a difficult task, I can tell you.

It's perhaps the most difficult thing of the day. We have reduced inequalities. We have the SDG and number 10, that we have the problem of penetration, connecting the unconnected and bridging the digital divide in Brazil's lands. And it's amazing what we do in Brazil with very huge projects. And we see that the traffic there in the favelas and sometimes in the jungles, I'm talking about Colombian jungle as well, that we had untouchable base station installed there, that not the army nor the guerilla could touch because it was the way for communicating to the outside world. It's amazing reduction of inequalities is even in this sense.

Talk about jobs, we have of course the problem, together with World Bank, we are following what is happening with increases in the base station, the number of base stations connecting to the problem of the world, and the problem increase to 10 percent penetration means in economies increase of 1.38 percent of the GDP. So increase 10 percent, the GDP will grow. Wow. It's difficult sometimes. It's a seesaw thing, because, okay, GDP growth, and creates Telecom. I go the other way around. Unfortunately, we have governments that do not prioritize the ICT sector. We are screaming for that, because ICT prioritized means economic growth. Just see what is happening in countries like Sweden, Korea, etcetera, that had examples on innovation and infrastructure, that they were quite pioneer in that.

We have some examples here in Brazil, in cities like San Campos, that here outside Sao Paulo, that we have a complete security from one place that we are helping a lot there. In terms of transportation systems, with connection of Volvo and Ericsson in Goias, access San Pedro, connection between us and telephone, we put smart parking and smart lighting, and that is a very big smart city. Santiago and many countries here in Latin America are already in the sustainable communities and cities that we are, of course, with the partnership. Using partnerships now, we are starting to talk about 5G, 5G in Latin America.

We announced a big time with American mobile we are going to start tests next year. That is a little bit of the examples we have.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you.

>> SERGIO QUIROGA da CUNHA: I have ten more seconds.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Our colleague has decided to be generous and give everyone five minutes instead of three. That is the problem. If you are speaking, do math, the only one who gets an exception from the math is going to be Silvia, because she wanted to actually put all her comments in one spot. Silvia will get the five. All of you, it's the three. I know that all of you are masters of math and can do that subtraction.

So and our colleague in the back has now become a master of math as well. With that, I did want to say that since there was a smart transportation system, I'm going to turn to Helani Galpaya again, because I think that may be one of the things that you have also looked at in some of the research, some of the concepts of how transport logistics can be helped, and some of the data that you may be able to glean from it and analytics you may be able to bring to it.

>> HELANI GALPAYA: Let me take a broader view. That ICTs can help certain SDGs is without question. We have a real issue of how do we monitor our progress towards all of these SDGs. Here, ICTs can really contribute. The work we are doing takes whole detail records that is CDRs, that is the digital trace we all leave when we make a phone call, SMS, have Internet browsing session. This is a very rich data set. It is, has almost universal coverage, because most of the people, including the poor, which is very important, are using phones. This is one of the few data sets that is representative of the poor, depending on the question you are trying to answer.

Because of the universal coverage, it allows us to really combine with other traditional data sets, like income expenditure surveys, household surveys that are done every four, five years. We can actually take the data from that and extrapolate to the larger population based on big data, because analytics are quite rich.

It tells us about movement of people. We can look at what happens when a new highway is built. What happens to mobility, we can look at migration, be it long-term or short-term migration, if you are talking about cities in SDG 11. If we are talking about poverty, the analysis of core detail records combined with the reload data is turning out to be a very good indicator to develop multi-dimensional poverty indices, as Christopher Smith's work has shown. We can really at a granular level measure poverty.

And it is very high-resolution. That is the other thing. Unlike census data or survey data which stops at a particular enumeration area, particularly in cities we get very granular insights, so we can look at over time how a particular very small area, almost a part of a signal area, a cell is changing from a residential area to a commercial characteristic.

What does that mean in terms of delivery of public services? So, it's universal, it's high-resolution and it's near realtime. So this also then helps with disasters. What is happening, can we obviously, other than warning people, big data, where are people congregating? Where are people moving? How can we then deliver services and information to them? All of these things can help.

SDG 9 talks about infrastructure and getting financial access to small industries and small businesses in emerging economies. The biggest problem that these small industries, SMEs have, is lack of access to finances, because they are asset poor. They can't get loans. When you combine variables created from cell phone data, including expenditure data, top of data, last remaining load, etcetera, you get good proxy indicators about a person's creditworthiness.

This is being used already in Brazil to extend credit, microloans to entrepreneurs. The monitoring and actual implementation of some of the SDGs is hugely enhanced by the availability of a specific form of big data that is generated through mobile phones and people carrying mobile phones acting as sensors.

Imagine the possibilities if this is now combined with a lot of other data, data sources, like putting sensors on buses. Majority of the poor people travel in buses. The fact that they arrive on time or the knowledge of when the bus is arriving can make a huge difference in a person's life. These are some of the possibilities.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much for that. You are so far at the gold star level for keeping on time.

Our next participant will be a remote participant. I think he is in the remote room. And if we have the technological capability, I give the floor to Mohammed Tarek from the Misr Elkheir Foundation.

>> MOHAMMED TAREK: Thank you for giving me the chance. I'm not sure if you can hear me.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yes, we can hear you.

>> MOHAMMED TAREK: To put this into perspective, I can tell you that in the last years Egypt has been developing in terms of IT infrastructure, and accordingly, there were a lot of solutions that provide also actually accessibility to education and healthcare, and also more importantly the crowdsourcing of challenges and solutions. Internally we have supported four main initiatives in that sense in the last two years, one of which is called Monetizer, which is a solution that connects all NGOs and have been accessed to the Internet, and also connect them with volunteers, which all of them can participate based on their interests, and also connect them with programs, corporates that are interested in these projects or problems.

The second one is another start-up that is incubated in one of our programs here in MEK. They have a solution and that transfers any surface, regular surface into an interactive white board, and you can save all the data taught. And with that, you can have, all students can have access to all taught data. We are currently applying this in 50 of our schools that is built by MEK.

Another solution is also related to education, which is providing access to children that have no access to schools. We are talking here about more than two million plus for only basic education. So the solution is mainly about providing a tablet or a device that can be given to facilitators and through which all facilitators can have regular meetings with children and teach them through the curricula stored inside these tablets.

The final one, which is related with healthcare, it's more like a preventative solution for fraud donation. So basically donors can have some privilege in Egypt, like a free meal or something. So they basically, if they have capacity, for example, they would go from one bank to another and provide a donation which costs a lot in terms of tests and retesting again.

This platform provides an alert in the system, because we cannot afford with limited budgets several tests.

Outside MEK we have also multiple solutions regarding access to education as well. But we have never seen a scale up, even in any case health. So the rule here is never fail but never escape.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much for that. I have come back again at this point to Jari Arkko from IETF, to perhaps talk about some of the applications, especially perhaps in sectors like health and education and also concepts of driving and preserving innovation.

>> JARI ARKKO: Thank you. Once again I'm approaching this question from the techie angle. This determines the interesting opportunities in enabling the Internet of Things, on education, open sharing of information or participation.

To cover examples, healthcare is one of the key application areas for the Internet of Things, giving you one-button import example perhaps. Better tracking of health parameters allows more focus on prevention, care at home, and consideration of hospital resources on the critical cases. Environment protection, another case for the Internet of Things, both in terms of monitoring the situation, prevention, as well as optimizing various industrial and other society processes for less environmental burden.

Education, I believe we are at the verge of a major change, transformation, when we disconnect physical presence from education specialization, and to some extent also economies of scale start to have an effect.

Many many more people will be able to have the best possible education in the world that they need in their particular field because of this. In order to enable these changes, there is obviously both technical and other challenges or work ahead.

We are working on that, on some of these aspects, with the rest of the ecosystem, on enabling technologies for these fields at the IETF. For instance, with video and realtime communications from browsers, or with protocol suitable multiple devices that are used in various Internet of Things for health applications, but it is not just about underlying Internet technology. This is a big project that encompasses also the fields themselves.

They have to do it all. For example, when you take IT technology into a business, it's usually not just about supporting the business as is, but it's about transforming the business itself to doing something in a very different way.

The same thing applies here. We have to transform education, transform healthcare, so it's not just about the Internet. We have to do it together, hand in hand. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. You are rivaling for the gold star now too.

This is the long-awaited topic. Let me remind everybody, we had a couple of questions on the topic of local content. And one of them had to do with the policy environment, and one of them had to do with pertinent local content, and there were also some questions for financing.

I wanted to lay those out for the speakers who are going to be addressing local content, just if they wish to address any of those aspects in their comments, it might be helpful to the questioners who were providing questions on local content in the last panel.

Obviously, we are developing these applications, we are looking at projection, looking at beneficial solutions that are going to be applied in a local area, and obviously the development of local content and local application plays a important role. We don't always have regulatory and investment regimes that help support that development, and so what can be done to improve the chances of successful promotion of local content and applications. And I'll start this by asking Sunil Abraham to give us a three-minute intervention.

>> SUNIL ABRAHAM: I've been following language technologies and local content for about 15 years now. And progress is painfully slow. Perhaps this is one clear case of market failure. There are language communities that are too small to be a viable market for proprietary software companies. In specific, for the last three years, we have been working with five wikipedia communities thanks to a grant from the community foundation, and we are trying to grow these communities both organically and inorganically. That means, inorganically would mean having existing encyclopedia relicensed and integrated into the wikipedia.

The problem is huge. Just to give you an idea of scale, 20 official languages in India, 200 major languages, and for most of those languages, apart from the first 20, there are no forms, no input methods, no dictionary, no thesaurus, no voice to text, to text to voice, no machine translation and no voiceover. There has been substantial progress though from the proprietary software industry. Google's Translate today supports, Google's OCR technology today supports 200 languages. That is a significant feat.

Also, Google's Translate works very effectively, thanks to its ability to leverage a crowdsourced corpus of information.

The complication is, using proprietary technologies comes with a surveillance overhead, and there is an infringement of the right to privacy. And while we can't wish all of that away, governments have to start working on the solution. I have three recommendations.

The first is to use the money we get from spectrum auctions in the area of language and content development. In the last spectrum auction the Indian Government earned $14 billion. That shouldn't be used to balance the deficit budget. It should be used to invest in information societies.

We could also have regulations and procurement mandates in the European Union. I'm told that any phone that is sold must support the 20 official European languages. We can do similar things in Myanmar, for example. When governments buy technology, they could have a long-term strategy to building free and open source based language technologies. And finally curriculum, if we have neutral curriculum and transform students from being computer operators to computer scientists, they could contribute to free projects and also establish credentials globally. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. I now turn to Silvia Rabello, President of the Rio Film Trade Association, and since you chose to concentrate your comments, could you please give us a five-minute comment.

>> SILVIA RABELLO: Good morning. Thank you very much for giving me time for my presentation. I am going to address all topics that we have been hearing so far, but in a lighter version, so to speak. I'm going to speak on the perception of independent audiovisual producers, and how that can be a sustainable activity.

The topic, sustainability, refers to the topic of future. This is the environment of where we live, based on what we have had in the past. This is where we perform professionally and personally. We have to maintain the environment or try to improve it for future generations. There is at least three dimensions within which we can consider the topic of sustainability. To be sustainable, an activity has to be environmentally correct, socially fair, and economically viable.

It's a triple borderline. AV industry feels very comfortable to operate within this concept, because we focused on a very low environmental impact activity. Economists might say that we have more positive externalities than negative externalities. Rather than polluting, we inform people, including about pollution.

Concerning our relationship with planet, species, natural resources, we are doing quite okay. Social justice is a more complex concept, which really considers some level of subjectivity. However, there are some international parameters to which we can abide by.

Social justice is related with dignity, living and working with dignity. Technology is within ourselves in all our activities, but it's not an end.

We have content. It is not simply neglecting technology, but leveraging the human development of the productive chain. This is why our jobs are not easily replaced by machines.

We really depend on human beings. I don't know if you know, but in Brazil, AV industry generates 200,000 jobs. It's a lot; the same as tourism, for example, which has always been relevant for job generation. Content is absolutely key. This is what drives us and takes us to the third dimension of the concept of sustainability, economic sphere.

What is our business is to bring together talent, transforming them into a piece of work and showing that to the audiences. In this process, we obtain rights over text, songs, image. We select, organize, edit, and finally, we get to a final product whose market value can be then commercially traded according to the return on investment strategy that we all have, and according to the rules of the market.

Therefore, legal security is very important. So for AV industry as well as for any other kind of industry, and this is why the discussion about intellectual property and copyright is really important for content producers and generators, if we invest time and money, usually a lot of both, in developing a film, a TV series, a soap opera or a documentary, it does not feel flattered when the product of our investment is simply copied and be

distributed without our knowledge, because it's exactly when broadcasting our products that we expect to have resources to pay our initial investment and start planning for future investments.

Technology has brought a number of new opportunities for AV production. We have different possibilities and different opportunities where we can interact with our audiences. The content of these dialogues is absolutely key for our process of collective development. And this is why sustainability of this industry responsible for creation, production and distribution is really of all level interest, because we do not listen to iPod or iPads. What we see is what they show. We listen to songs using our iPads. So we really have to protect the product of human minds. As we have heard from the Brazilian singer, no electronic brain can really help us with glass eyes. Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. There were questions about the economics related to local content. It has been raised in one of the questions. Professor Raul Katz, might you be able to address those concepts for us in three minutes?

>> RAUL L. KATZ: Yeah. My comments are not going to counter those that were mentioned before either by Mr. Abraham or by Silvia Rabello, because they are relevant when it concerns linguistic idiosyncracies or protection of intellectual property.

I'll just add another layer to the problem. I think that content development is something that we all agree with on the need, but maybe still we haven't done a good diagnostic as to what the barriers are. I wanted to give you some numbers, to frame the discussion.

As I mentioned before, there is limited private sector investment going into the development of local content or local applications. As I mentioned before, Latin America has only $412 million that comes from venture capital. If I normalize that number, in Latin America it's $1.67 per person. In India it's $4.63 of VC money. Israel is 818.

So, there is clearly an issue of critical mass and resources. Obviously, Israel has seven million and a half people. But nevertheless there is not enough private sector money going there. We need to think about how do we stimulate the flow of private sector money, particularly VC money into this sector.

Second, and as I mentioned before, we have coordination failures in the allocation of public capital. $20 billion are going annually in Latin America, for instance, to the development of applications, content, scholarships, even scaleability and export promotion. Of those monies, 13 percent only goes to projects and start-ups.

Very little is assigned to that particular part that is critical in the value chain of development of new applications and content.

Third is, I'm referring my example is Latin America, we have a very high attrition rate on projects. I analyzed the numbers of start-up Chile, one of the most successful incubators in our region. And of the projects that are coming up as ideas and up front in the funnel, only .3 percent make it to the point where they receive some infusion of private sector money.

That attrition rate is very low. That says there is a lot of creativity, but we are very bad at taking that creativity into projects that are viable business models.

The pipeline is spread too thin. We have an issue on human capital. We are producing right now in Latin America 150,000 engineers per year, of which Brazil produces 58,000. These are UNESCO numbers. The economics indicate that we need 200,000. Just to give you a benchmark, the U.S. is producing 300,000 on an annual basis.

So a country, so we have a issue of critical mass, that if we don't overcome, this issue of development of local content is not going to materialize.

Recommendations: I think we need to rationalize public sector spending. We need to add all these $20 billion and assign it in a proper way linking it back to development goals, and reducing the frictional cost that exists between different Government entities, the subnational entities and the like.

Secondly, we need to avoid tropicalization. In the developing world we tend to imitate a lot. And we need to come up with a situation where we can actually develop things that are linked more to the needs of our population in our regions.

Third, we need to increase the project success rate. We need to improve the practices and incubation. I could talk quite a bit more about that. Finally, we need more of a digital strategy. What is our vision, what is it that we are trying to achieve? On what areas are we going to focus? How are we going to solve the human capital gap? Those are critical things that we need to address.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. That was helpful. We have looked at the strong potential for benefit from ICTs, looked at hurdles that have to be overcome technologically, but we also have looked at other concepts which include the need to invest in human capital development for needed skills to make productive use of ICT. We have to think about the obstacles that may exist to entrepreneurship. We have to eliminate perhaps the barriers to equality, whether based on gender or other factors.

Part of the question is, are there thoughts on how to address these or other issues which you see which stand in the way of obtaining the benefits of ICT and Internet support for the SDGs? I'm going to lead off on that again with Bambang Heru Tjahjono, Director General for ICT application, MCIT, Indonesia.

>> BAMBANG HERU TJAHJONO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we are fully agreed regarding the development of ICTs are so complex. In my country we are a little changing regarding the policy, because before we decide that policy, so at least that we should have a lot of data; like the Ambassador said, IT is many to many.

So inform all of things, not only the -- all of the people itself. So before we decide the policy of regulation, better that we cooperate with the multistakeholders, from the development, the players and other things from the academical, in order to set up the roadmap itself. It means that it takes a long time to decide, but it could be better if we have some of the result with the, agree with others for the multistakeholder, so that way, that now regarding the eCommerce, because the eCommerce, we set up the mission of the eCommerce, inform a lot of parameters, a lot of institutions. But this is along the roadmap itself.

So after four or five years at least, that we have some of the, a good policy regarding the fulfilling of the Internet itself.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. I will say that southeast Asia is very fond of roadmaps. Every member nation has, and to your credit, you keep to your roadmap. So well-done, and good planning.

I now turn the floor to His Excellency, the Minister of Information, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, if you could give us three minutes, please.

>> H.E. JUNAID AHMED PALAK: Thank you. I did mention that the major hurdle for the process of the developing world is that the ICT literacy and content development, and that sense of necessary ICT backbone, and also necessary absence of proper -- ICT developing Internet economy, and at the same time, ICT is developing as hyperspace which needs to be peaceful.

Here, we need certain steps from the commit side, because as I said, in Bangladesh, 20,000 schools are equipped with computer laboratories. And if we look into the matter, from eight, nine, ten, grades, so three years, so if we started this year, these three years, so that the boys and girls are equipped with ICT literacy, but

the point is that how to apply ICT, how to apply, that is another question there. We have targeted, we cannot go for a targeted approach.

For example, turning up boys and girls at the grass root level, and targeting women, one laptop, one woman, can become a, women can be empowered. We are approaching in that line. We are empowering 100,000 women with laptops so that the women can become part of the digital society. At the same time, we need to develop a training program where the young generation at the grass root level, rural level can learn how to, learn the applications. Here we are not as yet taking any firm stance because the Government cannot do it. We have the private/public partnership as necessary. We have asked major giant ICT companies to come up with the solution to keep training. But apart from this, the important thing, the proper utilization is necessary to back up the ICT market.

That is also not done. So coming back to all the original question, how these services can be given to the people quickly, for that I have already said that eCenters are spread across the country. Any country can do their industry intervene, here the private sector is not coming up. We have set up eCenters, and I will tell you that Bangladesh has mapped the whole agricultural field. And with the click of a mouse the farmer can get the information, what type of manure, what type of water, what type of seed is to be planted, for what crop in that particular area.

The whole Bangladesh have mapped the quality for 89 crops. So spreading of eAgriculture centers at the rural level can empower farmer not only with the knowledge of farming but also the market. The farmers can have access to the market also.

EHealth center, I said there is another important thing, 12,000 communities have been set up across the country with eHealth centers. The rural people and the women can have a primary knowledge of health problems. I do know that Bangladesh has been successful in MDGs, child, maternal, we have achieved the target.

Last year, I should say the reducing the bandwidth causes important issue. In Asia, the submarine cables is a main connecting fiber. But if we can develop information highway in Asia with 32 countries, more than 200-kilometers, that will drastically reduce the bandwidth cost issue, because in other countries the bandwidth is cheaper than submarine cables.

Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much as well. We now turn to the Deputy Minister from South Africa, and please give us three minutes as well.

>> HLENGIWE BUHLE MKHIZE: Thank you very much, Chairperson. I'll try not to repeat what colleagues have said. We, in closing, it's important to emphasize that we move from the premise that information and communication technologies including Internet are key enablers of development, and also that they are catalyst for accelerating outcomes of all three pillars of Sustainable Development, that is economic development, social inclusion, environmental protection.

We have a population of more than 50 percent which is still not connected; hence, the priorities is to roll out the broadband to those communities. Of course, in line with other colleagues, who are putting a lot of emphasis on eGovernment strategy, whereby we are creating a demand by putting services online for everybody, and strengthening our e strategy whereby people acquire critical skills of being able to do, to use the mobile technology of which ICT as I said yesterday were more than 20 percent penetration of the mobile technology.

Investing in that for e-learning, eHealth is priorities and of course the justice. But the eCommerce is a critical one, where we are trying to work, to deal with what we see are priorities for economic inclusion. The small business enterprises, we see them as the driver of the economy, and we are using Internet to make sure that

people learn from each other in terms of financial management, also how to access the markets and also what they need to grow their economies, how they access their major players.

But of course, included in that is this whole area of the partnership between Government, education system, and the private sector, which you see as a major area of concentration, where sometimes even the institutions of higher learning, they do not really give you what you require if you want to scale up.

So treading carefully in that area, we are a new Ministry focusing on monitoring and evaluation, working very closely with the statistics of South Africa, so that where we see as gaps we are able to close them. And we are interactive on a ongoing basis with institutions of higher learning. And of course, students have captured that area and started talking about that, if we want to succeed, education should be free immediately. They are using the hashtag, again technology, to put pressure on governments to quickly move towards a free education.

And the question, well, I hope as we move forward we look at also the question of affordability of Internet usage, especially in developing countries, because if we oversimplify that, we might miss an opportunity of how investment should be directed, and in which areas in developing countries if we are to close the digital gap, not to widen it. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much.

When we considered these issues, I think there is a theme in the two comments you have made, and clearly people in the Ministry are measuring, and they are keeping tabs on where things are, where gaps exist, quantifying them and thinking how to address them.

I think that is a valuable lesson across the table, and also thematically referenced in a number of other comments about how we have to deal with these issues, because we first have to identify them, quantify them and then deal with them. I think that is a very important concept.

If Mohammed Tarek is still on the phone, I was wondering if there were any issues he would like to address under this. Mohammed, are you still with us?

>> Hello?

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: We can hear you, Mohammed. Go ahead. Did you hear the question or do you want me to paraphrase it for you?

>> MOHAMMED TAREK: Yes, thank you. I can hear. Basically, there are many stakeholders in terms of taking a solution for these problems, with these challenges.

From my perspective, I can speak about entrepreneurship perspective or the supporting entities for entrepreneurs, and also the NGOs. Regarding entrepreneurship, I think there is a very huge room for moving the entrepreneurship system to solve local challenges, by addressing the real challenges in the market, and studying what is in each sector the real challenge, and where is it, and how to tackle this for entrepreneurship.

The second issue here regarding NGOs, they can work also on raising awareness about the importance of ICT sector as a whole, and how multiple challenges have been solved through ICT sector. Also the promotion for existing solutions, so we have multiple entrepreneurs that are working on real solutions, but they are lacking the accessibility to local communities. So NGOs can help a lot in that field.

Also, they can source the real data about their challenges, in order to make it clear how the challenge is big or not, and how specifically they can tackle these challenges.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much for that. We have been speaking now for quite a long time. And it's time to go back to the floor. I remember we had two questions that were parked with us. I actually think two of the interventions have answered the environmental question.

But remote moderator, could you remind us of the first question that had been asked, which I don't think we dealt with, because I think it dealt with blocking access to data, if I'm not mistaken. And also remote moderator, are there any other questions accumulated in the interim? Those who would like to make a intervention, please head towards the mic.

>> ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Okay, so there are the two questions. One of them is dealing with climate change and the other one was the IP blocking.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Right. I'm suggesting the climate change one has already been addressed in comments. But I don't think the first one was.

>> ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: This question is, when we do not have a setup mechanism to ensure the reduction of digital divide as it concerns IP blocking, without consideration for the development status of the source, we undermine the economic benefits from such part of the world. Who gets to address the blacklisting of developing or underdeveloped countries?

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: So the question for the panel is, who wants to address this question, if anyone? Jimson Olufuye is brave.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much. That is a serious issue in developing, where a lot of IP addresses is blocked and not usable. What we have found out is that the country responsible, outside the African region, the bases where they capitalize on the capacity level, capacity in developing countries, to address this. And it brings about reputational damage. It is a serious issue.

I think we need to broaden capacity, and to getting this challenge, increasing know-how, network configurations, and how to remediate and tackle repetition damage this brings about.

So it's a serious issue. We need to work on capacity, improve the know-how of administrators, network administrators and techies in developing countries.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Did anyone else want to address that? If not, we will go to the mic. Please go ahead. Identify yourself. I can't figure out whether you wanted to also address the question that had been asked.

>> JUAN FERNANDEZ: No, I want to follow up in my previous question. My name is Juan Fernandez, from the Ministry of Communication of Cuba. Following on in my previous question, it was given some answers by Ambassador Sepulveda and also Professor Raul Katz and some other, of some of the indispensable conditions needed for this local content to flourish. It was mentioned the openness of the market, that this is a condition of course, capacity to do that.

Professor Raul Katz mentioned the need for institutions and institution to carry out the problem, but my view is that all those conditions are necessary, but for us are not sufficient, as we see, as we say in science. I think that there is a need for some affirmative action in some way, in order that the bits that goes on, it's like the colleague for IGF said the right or the bits that are really needed.

For this, for to put more precision to my question, I'm going to tell this paradox. I've been following in Latin America, there is an award called the Freida award that makes, every year that gives awards to very nice projects on Internet and ICTs.

I have found out, those awards mainly are the ones that are mentioned for agriculture and mainly free, not paying, not services that you pay for. They are free and useful award for fishermen, in Trinidad, for sign readers, a lot of those, very interesting and very good applications and Web sites.

But we have found out that mostly all those projects have been financed through grants, through donations, and when that source of funding finished, it cuts out, the project dies.

My question for the panelists is, because this is different conditions in different parts of the world, in the U.S. there is a huge advertising company that fuels companies like Google, Facebook and others that are able to do, to give wonderful services for free. But that condition does not apply in many part of the world.

So I ask the panelists, how can they envision a way, a model of, for economic sustainability, because it was mentioned here that the Sustainable Development has three parts, threes pillars, the environmental, the social, but also the economic sustainability of this project.

So I ask the panelists how they envision, not with the view from advertising fuel that is only in a few countries. In the rest of the world, how do you see the sustainability financially to have this free Web site, the right bits as my colleague said before?

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: If we can take a couple more questions at the same time, and then we will do a round of answers. Please introduce yourself. Thank you.

>> GIACOMO MAZZONE: Giacomo Mazzone, European Broadcasting Union. Because you said this was the appropriate moment for question about local contents, I want to bring to your attention that again European model, that is one I know more, in Europe we have every year from the broadcasting sector around 40 billion Euros invested in local content production. This is a model that could be replicated in other parts of the world; in South Africa for instance, we have a strong presence of public sector in the broadcasting areas.

This money goes mainly to local producer, to local authors, to local screenwriters, etcetera, etcetera, people that could develop creativity. And then where is the link with our work in the discussion of today?

20 years ago, the Government of the UK discussed with BBC how to enhance the quantity and quality of the contents on the online world, and asked to BBC because BBC knows how to do it. BBC invests and today is the biggest access point for content over the Internet.

So this is a very simple model, and synergy with existing reality that immediately could be implemented. And I address this point to your attention, and community radio, because in some countries we have strong public sector, but in others we have communities. Bangladesh is a place where the community sector is as important as public sector.

The second point that I want to, is simply thank Ambassador Sepulveda what he said about spectrum. Unfortunately, there is a mislink of communication with his representatives in Geneva, that WRC today are asking to use all the rest of the bands spectrum for broadcasting for other uses for Telecom use.

There is a problem. I hope that Mr. Sepulveda could send a link to Geneva and then the position will be more homogeneous.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. We have one more question at the mic. If anyone else has a question, please come up to the mic now. We can take about one more.

 (no English interpretation).

>> INTERPRETER: Apologize for no interpretation.

>> AUDIENCE: Amessinou Kossi. We can take care of the challenges that are both in electricity, and the spaces to be able to receive the data and the Internet traffic for to access the data, and how from the technical standpoint, and from a financial standpoint as well as strategic, how can we face such challenge.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I would like to have an answer regarding this question. Thank you. This round of questions, we have had two questions based, actually three questions based in economic models and how you may finance creativity. And then there was one question on spectrum allocation, which I'm going to lead with that one because I'm sure that is a somewhat narrower answer. And I'll ask Ambassador Sepulveda to answer the spectrum allocation if he wants to do that, or answer it bilaterally at your own time, whatever you prefer.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: I will answer both questions and in exchange sacrifice my time on the next panel. European Broadcasting question, what is going on at the WRC, the question is whether or not nations can themselves determine whether or not they want to reallocate aspects of the broadcast spectrum, all of it, some of it, any of it for mobile broadband purposes. That will be a decision made up by each individual nation. As you may or may not know, in the United States we have a incentive auction system for the reallocation of some parts of the broadcast spectrum, to meet the growing demand for mobile spectrum.

As it was presented, there is a proposal before the WRC to take away all the broadcast spectrum, make it mobile spectrum. That is factually incorrect.

Second, I wanted to address Juan's questions. I'd like to hear what Juan's proposal is. There is a proposal embedded in the underlying question I think. But I would point to how the successful models that we have seen relative to content creation and economically sustainable mechanisms for local content creation, and I want to make sure I address the point raised by the colleague from UNESCO. When we talk about encouraging the use of ICTs, we are talking about encouraging the use of ICTs for local content creation, for local creativity.

Some of the greatest creative works in the whole world have come out of, my family is from Latin America and some of the other parts of the developing world, but relative to Juan's question, I'd look at private sector initiatives, like wire incubator initiatives. I've been doing incubation centers where telephony voluntarily creates a space in which you have entrepreneurs creating and developing services delivered over the Internet from a local space. I'd look at start-up Chile which is an initiative out of Chile. They encourage start-up businesses from around the world to come to Chile, create their business in Chile, and in exchange, tutor and mentor Chileans themselves for creation of start-up programs. I would look in Colombia, another example in which you see multiple investments in creation of the use of ICTs within Colombia across sectors for local content creation. Three successful models. I'm not sure if there were other models that Juan would like us to look at. We would be happy to have a conversation about it. I didn't understand the third question. I wasn't able to hear it.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: The third question actually I think went to some of the similar ground, but was looking at the breadth of potential economic models related to the development of local content and was looking at strategy and other issues on that as well.

I think I've got Professor Raul Katz willing to opine on that one.

>> RAUL L. KATZ: Not only on the last one but also on Juan's question. I think that Juan pointed specifically to issue of scaleability. What happens when we have a business model that has been proving it's prototyped and we have to take it to market. Who is funding that scaleability?

Clearly, there is a problem. On start-up Chile, they detected that and created a fund which was precisely addressed to the notion of taking it to market. But we have a gap. I'm saying private sector of VCs are not going into the scaleability.

Even the public sector, BNDS doesn't fund these things because they consider them too risky. We have an issue there, as beyond getting to the prototype on the business case, proven business model, how do we take it to market. The funds aren't there and we have to change parameters.

In the private sector and VCs, the VCs go when necessary conditions exist. When there is capital markets that is developed, when there is good taxation treatment for the investments, where is good bankruptcy procedures, where there is no corruption, and there is a fact today that VCs in Latin America are shying away from this sector because they see that there is not appropriate transparency and visibility. We need to change those.

As to the question from the gentleman, I don't see the economics of servers or IXPs being the interconnection points being a barrier for LDCs. These are very scalable pieces of infrastructure. We have developed and implemented those starting with a very small investment, and these servers grow. You pay as you go.

I think that this is a little bit of red herring. I think there is no barrier, and as Sergio will attest, prices are dropping on infrastructure. We can handle them.

I'm not very concerned about that being a barrier.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Did anyone else want to add anything to those questions?

>> SERGIO QUIROGA DA CUNHA: Thanks for remembering that the prices are dropping. I'm used to one base station for one million dollar and now it's in the 20,000-dollar. But whatever.

But prices aside, and everything that we are talking here is mobility, broadband, and cloud. The mobility I was talking at the beginning of the session here, if we talk about regulations and development and Sustainable Development, all the convergence and the public sector and private sector must go into convergence towards this development because we will not be able to regulate this technology that is happening. How to regulate the cloud? I heard a comment on jobs or job loss in many countries. Talk about Brazil, the labor laws from 1943, and now, and now remote jobs that we are buying services from India let's say, and whatever. Come on, it's impossible to regulate that.

And this is worsening and worsening and worsening. We need to prepare the world for cloud as a reality, that they will create this ecosystem, that we grow together.

>> JARI ARKKO: I want to briefly add the answer to the question. I agree with my colleagues on the panel of course. The one thing that I wanted to say is that many of these innovations are not freestanding alone things, but they are actually part of something else, a part of industry, part of the healthcare system, part of agriculture, part of something else.

I think part of the answer is in trying to figure out in those industries exactly how they allocate money, and where they put their resources and figure out what they actually need. There is a clear local need, as this existing funding for a particular industry already, and being able to use ICT technologies there is crucial.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. We have one last bucket of questions which is a small bucket of questions, which really goes to how the IGF and other Internet Governance organizations might better support the Sustainable Development Goals. I want to first call on Jimson Olufuye, because of some interesting work being done in Nigeria on how to actually use the IGF, local IGFs, and most interestingly subnational IGF as a vehicle for actually having these conversations with local populations.

If you can give us three minutes.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Joe. The African IGF lead the presence in African continent and from Africa IGF to Nigeria IGF, and specifically this year we are motivated to go subnational. And so we add the first subnational IGF in Canoo states Nigeria which belongs to the northern part. I was actually last week Tuesday there and brought in about six states around that zone, and they came together to see what is this all about, bringing discourse to the local community, what is the perspective of the private sector, concerning IGF, concerning topics of Cybersecurity, of freedom of expression, IP rights, etcetera, what is the perspective of Civil Society, what is the general rule for the Government dealing and also the people themselves. So this is opportunity for all citizenry to have their voices heard. It will only lead to the SDG that we are talking about now.

I think it's a good example for many of us to emulate. It brings more awareness. It gets people more better informed, and we are going to expand that process next year. Thank you, Joe.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. As the last part we are going to take the concept of identifying the synergies between the SDGs and WSIS action lines, and more importantly the practical measures towards their implementation.

A number of the speakers around the table have spoken about the importance of implementation. Having theory is insufficient. We need theory to become practice.

So, with that I'll turn the floor over to UNESCO, and if we could have three minutes, please.

>> LYDIA BRITO: Thank you very much. Let me say that first of all, I know that we were only speaking about Internet economy in this panel. But for example, for UNESCO, one of the very important SDGs for ICTs and for Internet in particular is the SDG 16 that is related to peace and justice. Because we are talking about Sustainable Development, we have to have the economy but also the social and the environment.

Once again, there and maybe in line with a comment that was done on the existing draft of WSIS, is that the target 16.10 really talks about ensuring the access to information and knowledge, and also to the fundamental rights. And again, if we want to have wholistic approach to the importance of ICTs and Internet in the new agenda, we need to also bring this social and cultural and education component that needs to be addressed.

That is why yesterday we made this point during the consultation.

Practical issues, a lot of people mention the importance of monitoring, and I did so also in relation to MDGs. One of the issues that UNESCO is working now, it's how can we develop the indicators that really allow us to support member states, in seeing how Internet is really being used to Sustainable Development, and taking into consideration what in UNESCO we talked about the principles for Internet universality, that is precisely the human rights component, freedom of expression, access to education, through the technology, cultural diversity, language and so on.

Also, the question of being open and again, we were not only talking about producing local content. We are saying that people have to produce also new technologies. There is still a lot of space for new ways of developing and using technology. So we would defend that it's not just about capacity to use, but this capacity to produce new technology and different technology and different contexts.

That means that human skills, it's also not only about illiteracy. It's also about capacity to program. Someone today or the day before, during the high level meetings, said why not to say that all, everybody should know how to program from young to old people, like learning how to read and write and do things, not just to be programmers, but to really use the best, in the best possible way, the technology.

So we are one concrete area; it's really how to develop these indicators, that do allow governments to see how they are advancing and what are the gaps and how can we reform, change that.

Also very concretely, really work in this awareness how these technologies can be indeed enabling tools for Sustainable Development, and the need to look at it in the three pillars of Sustainable Development. Thank you very much.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I'll give the chair to Gary Fowlie, if you want to give us three minutes on the aspects of this topic you would like to address.

>> GARY FOWLIE: Thank you. I'm not prepared to speak on behalf of the whole UN system, UN colleagues, but UN funds, programs and agencies have been asked how they are going to align their policies, programs to the SDGs, so that at the highest level that is the point of the beginning of the implementation within the UN system.

For ITU, what we did or have done, started and continue to do, is to take the WSIS action lines -- I'm going to hold this up to show the matrix that we are working on which combines the Sustainable Development Goals

and the WSIS action lines SDGs on the, going down, like across the action lines and asking all of the -- I know. It looks like a dog's breakfast, I know. But one has to, often has to start with the dog's breakfast before they can get global Internet connectivity maybe.

Anyway, the idea was to ask all of the action line coordinators to look at the SDGs and propose which WSIS action lines, which of the SDG goals would align to one of the goals, which targets might fit into the particular box, doing that matrix and looking at the action lines and the SDGs and doing that matrix. Where do we start? Which of the ones are going to be most meaningful to ICT implementation?

That matrix has been done. The action line coordinators have provided that input. It is available for your comment and your consideration at WWW.WSIS.org\SDG. If you have a look at that, so what happens next? In the short term, I think we need to populate this matrix with case studies and best practices and applications. We have to identify existing research that supports it. That is a big area where there is many gaps.

We need better and more research that will support the matrix and the confluence of these SDGs and WSIS action lines. The intermediate term, we need to be cognizant that each of the SDGs have targets. There is 169 targets. We need to drill down on the targets and which will be most easily achievable with ICT access deployment.

The longer term, and I'm talking about March of next year, each of the targets will have at least two statistical indicators which will be the proof points. That work will have to be done to determine whether these goals and targets have received -- at that point, when these indicators come out, that is going to put a focus on what Helani Galpaya was talking about. We really need all the kinds of ICT data that are going to be generated to not only measure those targets, those indicators, but to determine whether or not they have been successful or not. That is what we have to do, in the short term, medium term and long term. Then at the WSIS Forum next year, we will I'm sure look at this.

In June, there is an integration segment of the ECOSOC where we are going to look at how digital technologies can be harnessed for Sustainable Development. All this SDG work feeds into the high level political Forum of the UN next July, to give you those milestones as we go forward too.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Our speakers in the second half have been incredibly well behaved on time. Because of that, we actually still have some time.

Ambassador Sepulveda, if you would like to make remarks, you are welcome to.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: I'll defer to my colleagues from the UN system. We will be working with them to support assuring that there are synergies and linkages between the WSIS and ICT action lines we are trying to effect and SDGs.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: At this point we have time to take questions from the audience. If anyone, remote moderator, do we have anything new that has come in? I'm sorry. You have a frequent flier program now. (chuckles).

>> AUDIENCE: Juan Fernandez. I'm sorry, but well anyway, I received a question from my colleagues, so I may ask -- I may answer that. He asked if I have some idea. As a matter of fact, I was asking them, because they have, and I think that the program that he mentioned are very valuable, and also Professor Raul Katz mentioned VC, venture capital.

But this goes mainly to projects that could generate revenues, not the project that I was talking about.

I think that we need, because my colleague asked what my idea, this is a rough idea that I'm throwing around for you, as food of thought. We need some green field funding. We need something maybe to reinvigorate the digital gateway that World Bank had for many years, but maybe specifically for this kind of projects that are not-for-profit, projects that are free of this kind of the use of the Internet that you don't pay.

During WSIS, the first part of WSIS, there was this idea of the digital solidarity fund, that maybe something like that could come again.

Also because I feel that the money is there. Everybody talks about how vibrant is the Internet economy, so the money is there. So but it has to be moved around to some of them for these purposes. Maybe with all this auctions of domain names, in which the word "baby" is getting income and money, maybe all those monies or part of that could be part of this fund of the new World Bank for this kind of investment of green field investment in projects for social return, not monetary return.

That is some idea that I think that the policymakers here and everybody, all stakeholders could think around, because everybody talks how vibrant is the Internet economy. Okay, let's get that vibrance and put it into work. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. The floor is open for responses. Sunil Abraham.

>> SUNIL ABRAHAM: I'm not particularly sure whether projects like this can depend solely on funding from grant-making organizations. I think there are several layers to the problem, and I'll start my story from Hoskote, 20 kilometers from Bangalore. If you go there and turn on the television, apart from all the licensed TV channels, there is a local pirate TV channel, playing the latest movies, and that is funded through local advertising, the local barbershop, local tailor, advertises on the pirate TV channel.

Therefore, I don't buy the argument that you can't unlock advertising revenue in even depressed or poorer economies and markets.

So what is the problem? About 10 or 20 percent of the Chinese made phones available in India have receivers for terrestrial television. For about two thousand dollars, the lab in my center has created a pirate television station. That is how cheap it is today.

But slums and villages in India cannot create their own community television station. That is prohibited, because of the way spectrum is regulated in the country. So if we allow that to change, the forward path in terms of demand of what movies they should seek or go over IP and the return part of video heavy content, which is not good on IP networks, could come through television channels.

So we need several pieces of tinkering. We need to allow these type of business, we need to legitimize them. You wouldn't have cable television in the U.S., if it won't first have compensatory licensing. The innovation of cable TV in the U.S. happened precisely because of those exceptions in intellectual property law. We need similar exceptions that would allow communities to set up their own infrastructure, and that is prevented today because of what I earlier referred to as the excess of property rights.

Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Other comments around the table? Other questions from the audience?

Anyone at the table have any comments they would like to make that they haven't had an opportunity to make? We do still have a little bit of time.

>> RAUL KATZ: I don't know about property rights on content, but one stimulation could be this spectrum that is unlicensed that can give entry to all the innovation. In the U.S., the economic value of unlicensed spectrum has been quantified at over $140 billion. From wi-fi that we all know to RFID to wisps to a number of things. I could see some of your proposals being taken from that part.

This is something that clearly the emerging world we are looking at white space, but the licensed spectrum isn't something we are considering yet, but is something I'm starting to propose more to foster some of these.

The other thing, going back to Juan's point, I think I insist that the issue is less so how you fund the start-up through the point that they get to the launch. I think that the burn rate is relatively low until you get to the

priority. The issue is how you fund the scale, the scaling part of it. And unfortunately, I don't know whether either public sources or -- you can't do it through grants. You need to create necessary conditions for prior capital to gravitate to that area, and those aren't there yet, as we all know.

There is some things that could happen, like I could see development banks playing the role of market-makers in the sense of ensuring some sort of reliability of how those funds are being assigned. But if we don't have the pension funds, if we don't have obviously venture capitalists, if we don't have private equity trying to put into the market, we are not going to have the necessary resources.

It's everywhere. The fact is it's not only governments that haven't set the right frameworks. It's that private capital doesn't understand the market either, particularly in a region, I'm talking about Latin America because I know better, they don't understand what the digital economy is all about. It's very little. The people that are investing are the people that could monetize earlier exit strategies, but not new capital. New capital is going to cement construction, steel, things that they know and they sort of understand and there is somewhat of a lower risk. That is something to be considered.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I have one new question. I'll ask you to make a short question, not a remark but a question. We will give the floor to South Africa and U.S. and anyone who wants to further respond to that question. If you can give your question, please keep it as short as possible and tell us who you are.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm Jose Eduardo Rojas from Bolivia. The spectrum, the electromagnetic spectrum is divided into parts that is divided by the law, the state, private sector, and Civil Society.

This shows scenario to balance the market for service providers, telecos putting new players to be able to render services not necessarily aiming at profit, but my question is, how do you see the outlook of the Bolivian state and the distribution of the electromagnetic spectrum to insert new players in services which could significantly change the criteria of information or ICTs, directed not only towards profit but to access information.

In Bolivia, what we are trying to resolve today is how to fund Civil Society and communities, and enable them to have service rendering companies, not aiming at profit, but access to information. How do you see this kind of challenge and how this could contribute to our debate?

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'll allow you to make the intervention you were going to make at the time. If you would like to answer that question too, feel free to do so. But I know you had already asked for the floor.

>> HLENGIWE BUHLE MKHIZE: Thank you very much, Chairperson. I wanted to say, I hope we really don't miss the opportunity to pitch conversations among the multistakeholder community for sustained interest.

The question keeps on coming, how to ensure that we have got money which we will use to invest into a social, cultural level.

I have flagged the issue of partnerships with the private sector, and I'm hoping that as we move forward, we will have critical information which will assist all players, even the private sector, to begin to understand responsibilities beyond commercial benefits. If we really want to bring a new agenda of how the use of ICTs helps us to step up our efforts, to equalize and create a sustainable society, we have to deepen our conversations as partners, and as to what responsibilities do we bear, how do we measure the commitments?

Often when talking to the private sector, we talk about spectrum allocation. And we have had those opportunities, and people have moved out, and left huge gaps in society. But I'm sure as we move forward, we can step up efforts in such a way that we begin to share benefits and begin to create dignified societies that are sustainable. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you very much. Ambassador Sepulveda.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: I wanted to add to some of the things that Raul was talking about in terms of the challenge and how to meet it. I agree with Juan that the money is available and the technology is available to deploy these services to people around the world.

And once you build a platform, human ingenuity will take root and market demand in those places will drive the development of services. But there is a fundamental challenge to the degree of how easy or how hard it is to invest in infrastructure and to deploy services in any given market.

The reason in the United States that you can build a service and that it's deployable across 50 states and 300 million people, makes it a very attractive place to invest money. India, you have 750 billion people connected to a single network. There is a lot of money being invested in China in the development of Chinese companies and Chinese services delivered over intellectual property, I mean over the Internet. You are going to see the same thing happen in India once the digital India initiative is deployed effectively. You will see the same thing happen in Brazil once you have the economies of scale in Brazil. If you can piece markets together the way they are trying to do with a single digital market in Europe, if you can do it in Latin America, other parts of the world, you get the scale necessary to attract investment, but you need easier regulatory spaces to do it in. You need significantly more open markets and significantly greater certainty of investment. Otherwise the money won't come.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. One last opportunity if anyone wants to make a further answer to the question that was posed.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Quickly to say from the private sector perspective, really support the last two speakers. The private sector is always looking forward to enabling environment. Once what we called E-frictions are removed, like cases of multiple taxation, indications where there is no transparency, even in policy, or no political will to see a policy driven to the end, challenges. I want to note that.

Secondly, to say that the issue of IP black list is a very serious issue, because you are strong as a weakest link. We need to underscore the need for more capacity in developing nation, with regard to the Internet economy and Cybersecurity particularly. Thank you.

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I'm going to make a couple of observations of terms and concepts I've heard without making any conclusion related to them.

And then I'll turn it over to Hossam Elgahmal for a slight summary perhaps of actual conclusion and then for a closing to our host chair.

We heard that SDGs were relevant across, sorry, ICTs are relevant across all SDGs, that they are key enablers of development across all three pillars of Sustainable Development. But that we need practical implementation and need to be accountable for implementation. There are issues of metrics and measurement which must be had. There needs to be a diffusion of application and technologies. We saw examples of how sensors in buses and crowdsourcing of mobile phones using the digital exhaust of those phones could be beneficial and provide new applications that could help individuals. There were discussions of applications including local applications that are, quote-unquote, pertinent because that was one of the questions, are the applications pertinent. They were in agriculture, traffic and e-Health and used to broaden market access.

There was a question of access to ICT, access to Internet, access to broadband, access to knowledge as a separate concept, the need for e-commerce, economic inclusion especially for entrepreneurs and small and medium size enterprises and obviously also at the educational level and also across gender divides.

There needs to be skilling. There were questions raised from the audience about dislocation aspects of new technologies and sharing economy and how skills gaps may affect that.

The fact that there were concerns of local economics, local economies may not supply the continuous funding basis for all of the models. There was some dispute as to whether that is or is not the case. But there was an agreement that sustainable funding for models is important whether it comes from venture, commercial or other sources.

How to develop the right business and investment ecosystem for local players, whether green field funding might be useful, the use of ICT as a means to creativity, to digital economy and societal benefit, but also the importance perhaps of having some ability to participate in the production elements, whether in programming or other concepts.

The ideas of cloud emerging technology and the innovation ecosystem, whether you need and how you develop a facilitating policy ecosystem, for those kinds of developments, how we can all capitalize from these benefits while still addressing privacy, security and fundamental rights, and how in partnership with the private sector you can have developments, but also understanding the role of the private sector in the SDGs that goes beyond commercial interest in those SDGs.

That was by no means a complete capture of the breadth of topics and ideas, but I can only write so fast.

I'll turn it over to Hossam for a few comments. He did all the heavy lifting for organising this panel.

>> HOSSAM ELGAMAL: Thank you for the moderation and thank you for participating, especially all the panelists, ministers and all the guests, and it was a very rich panel.

Some of you have attended yesterday's Opening Session. I put a word, it was related a little bit to our session. But mainly now, I just want to summarize in a few what I understood. We have three main approaches, or depending on the maturity of different economy, it seems.

So we have heard regarding countries and places where the change is not about expanding the access, but about having basic requirements in testing. I think approaching those types of challenges might be different, and this is what was expressed. How can we provide this with a very cost effective manner, so that we can help those areas develop much faster, and benefit from the Internet and ICT.

We have the second path is regarding the policies empowering more access efficiently and with competitiveness, transparency, security, openness, and providing ease of investment plans, so to encourage investment to come in, and to bring the next billion online.

It's very important for many countries to have better policies in order to really engage further multistakeholders.

But we have heard the third one, which is many developing countries who have already invested in access are currently looking for beyond the access, and looking for the result in their development, in their societal and cultural development.

And they have a problem, because they are not able to develop their own ICT industry, that current ecosystem is not helping. So they need economic development, social inclusiveness, environmental protection. And all of those business models are not available easily. They will need help and assistance in order to be able to implement the information society, to enable societal and economic development.

How to ensure local Internet content and ICT industry development with the proper ecosystem investment tools, to raise industry sustainability and competitiveness with the idea of the international cooperation. I think that there is a social responsibility on the international cooperation, to work hand in hand with developing countries in order to be able to provide Sustainable Development goals through ICT and Internet.

And by this, I do thank you and I give it to --

>> JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Have we missed anything, to our Rapporteur?

(off microphone).

>> HOSSAM ELGAHMAL: Back to the chair. Mr. Chair, thank you.

>> HENRIQUE FAULHABER: It's time to close the session. Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for a very informative consultation session, and thank you, all the partners and the panelists and moderators for making the discussion so informative. I thank the moderator and the organizer for this that they provide. I have my thanks to all of you being here this morning, and your valuable contribution to our important discussion. It is now my pleasure to close the session. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

IGF Intersessional Work: Policy Options and Best Practices for Connecting the Next Billion

The following are the outputs of the real-time captioning taken during the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in João Pessoa, Brazil, from 10 to 13 November 2015. 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 event, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

***

>> MAXIMILIANO MARTINHAO: Good afternoon, everyone.

I'm Maximiliano Martinhao, Secretary of Telecommunications of the Ministry of Communications of Brazil.

I would like to ask you all to take your seats. We're about to begin.

I would first like to greet Mr. Lenni Montiel, UN Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development. And I would like to greet my colleagues on the panel, ladies and gentlemen.

Distinguished members of the panel, we start this session on intersessional work entitled Policy Options and Best Practices for Connecting the Next Billion.

I would like to welcome you all in Paraiba, Brazil. I'm quite excited regarding the works we're going to start now. The Internet is a democratic instrument of access to information with reducing geographic, social, regional differences. In addition it has fundamental rights as education, healthcare, employment, culture, leisure, freedom of expression.

We're aware of the fact by the aim of 2015 over 3 billion people will be connected. However, we still have 4 billion people far from the Internet, prevented from benefiting from this virtual environment. Including these people is more challenging because citizens currently disconnected represent as a rule the poorer part of the world population. We see that the socioeconomic issue is in many cases in the roots of the digital gap. This year the Policy Options for connecting the best next billion has a multistakeholder resolve designed by all of the Internet community.

The Best Practices for the IGF have actually yield many results for the community to serve other pertinent forum and drivers to regulation that are a designed development and response to cyber-attacks, development of mechanisms of multistakeholder, implementation of traffic exchange points. The purpose of this session is to bring the IGF community to a roundtable to have interactive debate and guided to result aiming at seeking paths for conducting or Connecting the Next Billion to the Internet from the Brazilian perspective I would like to bring some inputs from the debate.

The intersectional programs have identified five parts for connecting, increase of investment, public-private investment, increase use of availability, availability, citizens to use applications, development of local content

allowing online inclusion of all based on Human Rights, youngsters, women, age, disabled, affordability and the open character of the Internet.

The Brazilian recommendation regarding infrastructure is the focus of the satellite of defense and strategic communications operating on the band Ka covering territory with the ability of connecting any citizen at most remote places in our country. As a way of getting increasing connection in the northern area of the country without compromising the environment we are developing the Amazon Connected Project which to the largest connection of communication project in the eastern hemisphere with over 7,000 kilometers of fiberoptics in the Amazon Rivers. It is a creative, innovative form of connecting 20 million people that are isolated around the region of the forest, the rain forest. We have this undersea cable, transocean cable between South America, Africa, South America, Europe, in addition to this South American cable to connect the countries in the region because we believe that the interconnection effort cannot be made isolatedly. It is important to have the coordination between the countries to identify connection roots to the benefit of all Internet users.

With regards to the recommendation of increase of use by citizens in Brazil, we highlight a set of policies to develop applications with start-ups in various categories, and the development of digital plants and parks that have potential of becoming positive arrangements that are local. This is the few measures and highlight the policies to expand infrastructure and access, but also of capacity building people to be able to use all the qualities of the Internet. Regarding the need of ensuring protection of Human Rights and the digital world as well as Internet access of global quality and open for citizens to be connected. The passing of the Internet Marco da Civil in our country was an important step, we have supported and taken various measures for reduced prices, reducing the tax burden and allowing access to terminals that connect to the Internet. However, we alert that high cost of interconnectivity internationally as well as having data being housed from the house in point make it difficult to reduce prices and improve quality for the access by the end user. Brazilian Government has worked in the definition of the broadband for all with a goal of updating the goals and instruments of the national policy to broadband access. The focus is to broaden the network structure for -- in terms of distance and also expanding the access of users. This is some Brazilian examples. We want more. We want to share and learn from other experiences. We are, therefore, open to debate, endeavoring to have the best results of the session with identification of bottle next and opportunities for the expansion of world connectivity.

To conclude, I would like to express my satisfaction to be part of this panel, and to say that we should move forward in concrete actions for the issues brought up here.

After these opening remarks I would like to give the floor to Mr. Lenni Montiel, UN Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development in the department of the Economic and Social Affairs.

>> LENNI MONTIEL: Thank you, moderators, panel members this afternoon for being here.

At the outset let me express my appreciation for the intersessional activities carried out in advancing the IGF work on this important topic. This morning in our discussion on the Internet Economy and Sustainable Development we talk about the digital divide. My view, Connecting the Next Billion is a strategic approach to bridging the Digital Divide. This session, in my view complements well our discussion this morning and I want to commend, again, the MAG and host Chair for this session. Likewise, I hope the results of this discussion will be a valuable contribution to the preparatory process of the WSIS outcome document. In fact, addressing the Digital Divide was featured prominently in the Zero draft of the WSIS outcome document. In the preparatory meetings as well as in the informal interactive discussions with stakeholders, delegates and speakers called for intensifying efforts to bridge with the Digital Divide, including the gender Digital Divide.

There is no doubt about the fact that we have had remarkable progress over the last decade. It is aptly recognized also in the Zero draft.

Member States agreed there have been many ICT enabled breakthroughs in eGovernment, eBusiness, eEducation, eHealth, eEmployment, eAgriculture, eScience allowing, of course, greater numbers of peoples access to services and data. At the same time, there was general agreement that large Digital Divides remain in place including within and between countries and women and men. This indoubtly slows down Sustainable Development. Both the remarkable achievement and the continuing Digital Divides are well documented and substantiated by a range of data and statistics.

The key question, what to do? Some of the answers emerge in the discussion this morning, and I think that the WSIS action line and the SDG matrix that I referred to this morning that's been prepared by a group of UN entities that's available in the UN WSIS -- in the WSIS website lays out specific areas for focusing our action. Let me reiterate a few points which I think are essential to our strategies to connect the next billion.

First, it may sound cliché, but I don't think investment is crucial, and I don't hesitate to say that private sector has a major role to play there. Governments also have their roles in putting in place and enabling environment that encourages and facilitates business investment in infrastructure. I also want to stress that investment in physical infrastructure on its own is not sufficient which brings me to my second point, training and capacity building.

We talked earlier about capacity building, about multilingualism, about education, training. I believe we should also do more in investing in human capacities. Is there a role for international cooperation and official development assistance in this area? I know by asking such questions I'm stepping into controversial territory these days. Personally, I do feel that there is much space for international development cooperation in bridging the Digital Divide. Just as ITC and the Internet can play a powerful role in enabling progress in SDGs, investments in official development assistance channels, the Digital Divide can be productive investments in SDGs and our sustainable future. For example, I think training capacity building, it is an effective use of development resources for overcoming the Digital Divide and accelerating process in ATGs.

Third, we need targeted action, in fact, in hunger, poverty, Human Rights, the international Human Rights abuse -- sorry, the international community has developed many targeted initiative. We need similar actions to inspire support for overcoming the Digital Divides. We need IT engineers without borders. We need digital peace. We need global efforts for helping women and youth acquire digital literacy, creating jobs, income, livelihood online. We need incentive and measures to promote affordability and working to increasing access to ICT, that at the end of the day is to connect the next billion.

We can do it if we have the will. We can do it if we work in partnership, and that's why we strongly believe in multistakeholder approach. The UN, multilateral family, is large enough to embrace multistakeholders. Once again, I look forward to a rich discussion, and I thank you for your attention.

Thank you.

>> MAXIMILIANO MARTINHAO: Let me now give the floor to our moderators, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca and Constance Bommelaer.

Ambassador, please?

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you very much, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

I will speak English.

Thank you to Constance Bommelaer from ISOC. I was honored by the Chair of MAG to lead the team that prepared the document on policy actions, this is further explained by my co-moderator, Constance Bommelaer. I just wanted to say it is an honor for us to be able to present to the IGF the outcome of this work which indeed we think should constitute a piece of work that should be improved and serve as a useful tool for all of us.

With this very brief initial word, I would like to turn to Constance Bommelaer.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Ambassador.

I think I'm going to start perhaps by taking a step back to talk about the essence of the IGF intersessional work, basically why we have done this.

We have seen over the past decade with acceleration of Internet deployment and new usage a number of issues whether technical, policy focused emerge. With this, a strong appetite of stakeholders all year long to have a place for solutions. This is a place to discuss Best Practices and Policy Options, it gathers all relevant stakeholders and we could not imagine tackling Internet issues without all expertise required at the table. This evolution is in line with the mandate of the IGF which leaves room for it to grow, and here I will state -- I will quote paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, the mandate of the forum is to identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention relevant bodies and the general public and where appropriate make recommendations.

We conducted a Society this year on Internet governance which was widely taken. An overwhelming number of respondents felt they needed the global network of IGFs, national and regional, and also, of course, the global IGF to be strengthened as a platform where the community could work on the formulation of non-binding recommendations to tackle existing, but also emerging Internet issues. This confirmed the consensus of the Working Group on improvements of the IGF calling for more tangible outputs to embrace -- to enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy.

In light of the renewal of the mandate of the IGF to be discussed this year at the WSIS+10 in December it was critical for the IGF community to address this call for the IGF to evolve. In this context, the MAG rolled up its sleeves this year and decided to launch a new program on intersessional work all year long intended to complement existing work.

Over the year experts from all stakeholder groups have gathered working in a bottom-up multistakeholder fashion to develop six Best Practice documents, all supporting the overarching goal of connecting the next billion. Today we'll present and discuss the outcomes of the year-long effort from the IGF community, the Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion and Best Practices on multistakeholder mechanisms, mitigating spam, establishing, establishing successful IXPs and encountering abuse against women online. In terms of next steps, comments from the audience will be welcome, and we'll enrich all of the documents that will then be finalized in a few weeks after the IGF, then all disseminated, shared with relevant stakeholders and organizations as requested by the Tunis Agenda.

Thank you, Ambassador.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you, Constance, for setting the scene and for those background context remarks.

I will now turn -- we will -- we will initially focus on the document on Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion online. The version we will be examining is available online at the IGF site and reflects the work that's been done so far and the idea is that should be a living document that should be continuously improved.

In order to also set the stage for the discussion on the document I would like to invite Dr. Pepper, Vice President, Global Technology Policy, Cisco for initial remarks.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much, Ambassador.

Thank you for the MAG for putting this together, this session, which I frankly believe is the most important session this week because it is addressing in a pragmatic way how do we close the Digital Divide. Unless we close the Digital Divide, all of the other issues are secondary. Everybody has to be connected.

I also want to thank you, personally, Max for doing a great job as host. It is a second time for the IGF in Brazil. This is wonderful.

Let me start with -- we have already heard why this is important. We know it is important. I want to point out what we call sort of the income inequality paradox of the Internet. There is some work that a colleague and I did earlier this year that was published as part of the World Economic Forums Global Information Technology report in which we looked at what happens when people connect to the Internet in a country. If you get over a 20, 25% threshold, the more people that connect in a country, it increases the standard of living in that country. Connecting to the Internet is an income multiplier. It closes the income inequality gap between countries. Countries rise if you're over that threshold.

The paradox is that as more people connect in a country, it widens the digital divide, the income inequality in a country. At first people say how can that be? When you think about it for a moment, the people connected improve much faster than the people who are not connected. In the name of equality we're not telling people to disconnect so there is only one option, everybody has to be connected. That's -- that really goes to the heart of this session. It is about Connecting the Next Billion, but frankly, that's too modest. Let me explain why.

Every year we conduct this study, a five-year rolling forecast of everything to do with the Internet. We have done it for ten years. We actually can go back and report out what did we forecast, how did we do, we're usually within 10%. I'm going to say I'm pretty confident in it.

We're forecasting that between now and 2019 1.1 billion more people will be connected to the Internet. That's organic growth. If we do nothing, another billion people will be connected. I actually think we need to be more aggressive. Number one, maybe we should ask the question how can we accelerate and speed up Connecting the Next Billion so we don't wait for five years; and then beyond that, we need to connect the next billion after that and the next billion after that.

How do we accelerate Connecting the Next Billion? How do we get more people? There is very specific challenges and they are addressed in the IGF Policy Options because of all of the intersessional work. It is a combination of supply -- what I call supply and demand.

If we look at the data here in Brazil, for example, there was a really good study published by the Regional Center for the Studies in the Development of the Information Society. What it found, it was that 90% of people in Brazil have access to some form of 3G. You know, the quality will vary if you're at the end of the line, it is a long link. 90%, but only 52% of people are using it to connect to the Internet. The question is, what's keeping them back? The first thing people think about, it is affordability. People can't afford it. Well, it turns out that that's only a very, very small part of why people are not connected. People have the option to, you know, respond to multiple answers. 70% of the people who could have it but are not connected say they don't see the need, they're not interested, the Internet is not relevant to them. 70% of people said they lack the skills to connect and use and benefit from the Internet. Less than 20% said it was affordability. Affordability is important but there are other things that are even more important that I believe are low-hanging fruit that we can do much, much more to close that gap. What are some of the challenges?

There's a project that I'm involved in -- I'm also speaking on behalf of at the World Economic Forum -- called the Future of the Internet Project. One of the actions, one of the project's within that future of Internet initiative it is a project that we call Internet For All. We debated a million, 2 billion, we said no, Internet for everybody. We identified four challenges, infrastructure, access, if it is not there, that's the prerequisite, you have to have the ability to be connected. Second challenge, affordability, if you can't afford it, even if you think you want it, you can't get there.

By the way, the infrastructure is the supply side; affordability, really the demand side.

And then the other two are clearly demand side, skills and capacity building, and then the fourth is awareness, right, and content that leads to relevance. Again, we have already heard a little bit about that. When we look at the Policy Options on what to do about it, right, it goes right to those.

There is an additional piece here. That's we have also took a look as part of our study looking at this income inequality. One of the things we found -- I'm glad it was already mentioned -- in some countries -- not Brazil -- but in some countries, the gender gap in the use of the Internet essentially disenfranchises half of the people in a country. It harms that country economically as well as socially, and that the Digital Divide in gender using and benefiting from the Internet is a huge gap. What we do know empirically from the work we have done, when women and girls connect to the Internet, they use it for more things like education, information seeking for healthcare, and for activities that actually are beneficial to the family and themselves individually and their communities. That's a really important focus. I'm really glad it was already mentioned.

How do we do this? You know, the IGF as the multistakeholder organization group -- hardly an organization, but a collection process -- it is the way to do that, and the intersessional work.

Some of the other work that we've done, back in 2013 I said on the UN broadband -- I sat on the Broadband Commission of the UN, we studied national broadband bands and digital strategies. A finding of that study was that if government tries to do it alone or if the private sector tries to do it alone it is not as effective as when there is a public-private partnership precisely for the reasons discussed about investment, about filling gaps, enabling policies, but it also must include all of the stakeholders as well as local communities.

You know, we really have an opportunity today with the Best Practices -- although I must say, I actually don't like Best Practices, but a menu of good practices, there is a collection and every country is different, you can't say this is best, that's better. There is a menu of really good practices and things that we can do to intervene both governments, private sector, Civil Society, technical community, working together and through this intersessional process to make a difference, and we can't wait. It is urgent. It is essential. I want to accelerate Connecting the Next Billion. I don't want to wait five years.

With that, Mr. Ambassador, I turn it back to you.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you, Dr. Robert Pepper for your presentation, and for inviting us to raise the higher ambition of the task we have assigned to ourselves.

I would like to before returning to the presenting of the main findings of the document, I would like to acknowledge the participation of other MAG members that contributed to putting together this document.

So first of all, I would like to acknowledge Constance Bommelaer. I think we should all know that Constance was a real force behind the preparation of this document, and I really thank you for this.

Also I want to acknowledge participation of Lynn St. Amour, Carolyn Nguyen and Marilyn and others as well who assisted in the outreach for the regional, national IGFs.

With this, I would like to turn to Brian, the Secretariat for the presentation of the document.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca, Constance Bommelaer, Dr. Pepper, as well for the introduction.

To frame this a bit, I'll invite everybody here and participating online, if you do have a laptop or an iPad, something like that in front of you, to go to the IGF website, to the home page and there you will find a tab across the top which says Connecting the Next Billion.

When Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca refers to the output, it is actually a collection. You will find three things there. There is a compilation document which is the collection of inputs and contributions which I will detail

more in a bit. Many of the organizations and individuals who contributed to this compilation, they're actually here at the table. Some of you are in the room. I think that was the biggest success that we had in this process, was the amount of contributions that we got to this theme and this work which was very important. The theme came from the IGF community. The compilation document was framed, the structure came from an open mailing list group and drafting group that decided on the structure. The structure was based on the initial inputs we got from the community, how they defined the issue and the major subtopics within Connecting the Next Billion which as we found means very different things to different people depending on where you are in the world and what kind of access you have already.

So thanks to everybody for joining, in particular to the more than 80 individuals and organizations that contributed to the process. It was really fantastic. On the IGF website you can find the compilation document which is very long, and some may think it is a bit boring. There is a five-page document, and then there is a list of contributions of the more than 80 contributions in full that are all very interesting that give unique perspectives. They outline both opportunities and challenges and recommendations from all these different groups, multistakeholder groups, about how to tackle this challenge.

Following, again, what we have online, we got more than 80 contributions. Five regional IGF initiatives took on this theme at their meetings in the last year, since the 2014 ninth IGF in Istanbul, the Asia-Pacific, the African IGF, the Latin America and Caribbean IGF, the European Dialogue on Internet Governance, the EuroDIG and the Arab IGF. That was great. National initiatives from Zimbabwe, Mozambique -- I won't list every contribution here, please go to the website to see all of those that contributed and we'll hear from them in detail shortly.

The governments from Mexico, from Brazil, from Uruguay, the ITU, World Bank, World Economic Forum, Civil Society groups that are doing great work on this topic, the Alliance for Affordable Internet, APC, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Again, I'm not intentionally leaving anybody out, but I'm just presenting some highlights. We have contributions from Google, from Microsoft, from Telefonica, from the EBU, Facebook, and a lot of great individuals from around the world shared their perspectives. There was an online forum that many filled -- form that many filled out with guiding questions to serve this.

Our findings, the compilation is a mosaic or puzzle of highlights and collections from the contributions that, again, can be found in full on the IGF website. They follow a structure which you can see in the paper online, but there are five sections. We begin with deploying infrastructure, then move on to increasing usability, enabling user, ensuring affordability and then the last section, which is the longest section focuses on the Policy Options, the policy recommendations for creating an environment for Connecting the Next Billion. The Secretariat put together a short list you can read and a shorter list of highlights and specific recommendations, conclusions based on the inputs. I will go through them now quickly and then we'll move on to our speakers and give the floor to the audience talking about their individual contributions and what's important to them.

In the deploying of infrastructure, many said that much more investment and public private cooperation is necessary to strengthen national backbones in the developing world and in particular rural populations and to increase and scale up cross-border connectivity. Infrastructure development is a key driver for a socioeconomic growth and access to that infrastructure is paramount to development. To increase usability it is important to ensure the availability for the applications to stimulate the local content and service in all languages and to implement strategies for safeguarding access to people with disabilities.

Policies that promote and continue creation of locally relevant content should be encouraged, including protections for the freedom of expression, the press, privacy and Intellectual Property, the development of eCommerce infrastructure, consumer protections and entrusted online -- and trusted online payment systems.

This is some recommendations, highlights we extracted that permeated through many of the inputs received.

To enable users online emphasis should be placed on the promotion of Human Rights and enablement of young people, women and girls, the elderly, Persons with Disabilities. Access to the Internet is essential for the full realization of human development and facilities, facilitates the exercise and enjoyments of a number of Human Rights and freedoms including the rights to freedoms of expression and access to information, peaceful assembly, association, fostering public access points, for example, in public libraries, community centers and promoting the spaces and digital literacy and local content production will also secure better conditions for Internet access and use of interconnecting the Next Billions to the Internet to ensure affordability in addressing the Digital Divide, increased efforts in investment are necessary to increase supply and lower the cost of access. Increasing affordable Internet access is essential if countries are to achieve the social development and inclusive knowledge-based economies they desire.

Many of the challenges and improving Internet affordability requires innovative policies and methods to make the strategic innovation guys reality. There are many well-known benefits to infrastructure share, lowering industry costs, to encourage this practice and make operators more amendable to sharing governments can put in place guidelines and regulations to support infrastructure sharing and introduce new business opportunities.

Finally, in creating an enabling environment, future connectivity efforts need to ensure that those coming online have access to the entire global and open Internet, access should be universal, equitable, secure, affordable, high-quality on the basis of Human Rights and the rule of law and respect should be given to privacy and freedom of expression.

Again, this is not an exhaustive list, but just highlights that we pulled from inputs. We can give the floor to many speakers. I hand it back to you, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca. Thank you to all that contributed. Looking forward to a good discussion.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you, Brian, for this.

As you have indicated, this document represents a collective work, outcome of collective work that have assisted us and evolved in putting together the document, establishing parameters and guidelines, but basically it was populated by contributions coming from all of you. It is a collective achievement. I think we should all take pride in that. Beyond this, to be continuously stimulated to improve the document. I think by doing this we should take the call by Dr. Pepper to seek to accelerate and raise the ambition of our exercise continuously.

I would like to turn to those participants that have been collaborating closely in the development of the documents. I would start by calling on Mr. Makane Faye, Knowledge Management and Library Services, UNECA, you have the floor.

>> MAKANE FAYE: Thank you.

I would like to speak on behalf of the African IGF Secretariat hosted by the African European Commission and ECA.

On Connecting the Next Billion session, we had a panel which was moderated by the President of The African ICT Alliance who also gave a statement, and we had Constance who gave us a global perspective through video conference and we had a coordinator from Uganda and others. The African ICT was organized with the support of several partners, including the Centrality of South Africa, APC, ICANN, ESOC, UNESCO and others.

Following the presentation of the panelist we had given the floor to participants and asked those indicated by the previous speaker there were recommendations which came from the participants. We had 150 participants from multistakeholder groups, private sector, Civil Society, technical community, academia, government as well as other communities which is a business stakeholder in Africa.

We had eight recommendations: The first, Connecting the Next Billion should be viewed as a program project by countries and stakeholders, and as such the approach should be used using a program project, Best Practices and methodologies.

The second, department in charge of communication and IT should review the ICT and broadband policy and plans through enhancing multistakeholder cooperation involving diverse multistakeholder groups because we have seen as indicated earlier, in some places government will just work isolated or they'll give it to the private sector or private sector will work with the government without involving the stakeholders which have Civil Society, for example, and technical activity, they have a very important role to play in making, bringing inclusiveness.

The third one, there is a need to develop strategic partnerships between government regulators, network operator, technical community and Civil Society to support infrastructure development to have the access and connect the underserved communities at the same time enabling access affordability because affordability may not be an issue in some countries, but in Africa, it still -- because when you go to a country where someone will pay $80 U.S. dollar to have a 2-megabyte bandwidth a month, it is recommended that people should not spend more than 5% of their salary, $80, it is maybe 150% of most of African salaries. So affordability, it is an issue in Africa.

The fourth recommendation was to enable sustainable use of ICT implement and application. Power grid capacity should be boosted through diverse sources because there is no need to have a recommendation if there is no power to make them sustainable. There is a need to also look parallel when talking about ICT to look at the electric dimension.

There was also a local content. We said that you cannot just develop the road without cars, and I believe that this is important here.

We had number five, local content development and eLearning initiatives are necessary to promote the creation of local content online to boost the demand in order to promote inclusive access. Also there is a need to produce content locally and translate external content to local languages and in other formats to reach a maximum number of people because we have a large Internet population and they will understand what you give them in their local language but they may not be able to read it.

In addition, there is need to invest in local developers to promote innovation. That's also one way to boost local content development and eLearning initiatives.

The number six is increased access to information and knowledge is a social pillar to the sustainable development, however. Not everyone has a smartphone or commuter to help them get online in Africa, hence public access to ICTs is needed to help more than 4 billion people in the world who do not use the Internet individually because even in the developed world we are going to the U.S., you see people going to the public library to be able to have access, to look for jobs, so on.

So here what we said, the libraries worldwide provide public access and should be supported as spaces to provide access to the Internet, but also access to information and knowledge and also can provide capacity building to the users.

The seventh, we should explore the creation of a continental free Internet platform with telcos and other stakeholders to preserve the identity and unique cultural heritage of Africa.

The final one, it was in order to follow-up the implementation, successes and failures, there is a need to have a monitoring and evolution program using online realtime reporting.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. I thank Africa for the contribution to the document. You have been providing us with good examples of solutions, and we certainly are aware of the challenges. We certainly wish that this document will be useful for you and others in Africa. Thank you very much for this.

I would like to turn now to other panelists that also will make interventions on this topic on the document. I would like to ask to the extent possible that interventions should if possible not extend 2 minutes. We have a large number of panelists and we would like also to give the opportunity for the audience to make comments on this.

We would like with this to turn first to Dr. Tomas Lamanauskas from the ITU.

>> TOMAS LAMANAUSKAS: Thank you.

Not yet a doctor, but hopefully in the future.

Also thank you to the General Secretariat and to Constance and the contributors for the excellent compilation of the policy practices that could be used to connect the next billion or more. That's the thing, also something to discuss in this panel.

Also, I think it is very timely discussion, of course, with the Sustainable Development Goals which we recognize the need and the importance of ICTs for the Sustainable Development overall, especially goals 9C and 18.8 which clearly say that we need them.

We have many good stories: We have 3.2 billion online. Also, I think -- I like Bob's optimism, but I also like to be optimistic but we also have some other sides of the story. Another side of the story is 4 billion people are still offline and if we look at LDCs, 10% of the people there, only 10% are online.

When you look at the graphs, they decelerate, it is not optimistic, but if we see that it actually -- the growth is not accelerating, but decelerating which is something that's interesting to see how it is a problem and how to deal with that. That's not surprising. You know, every next billion is more difficult, more rural, more remote, less skills. It will not be easier, but will be more difficult. That's why it is, again, a timely discussion to have how we connect that.

Again, when you look at the broadband, it is not just about having people connected. Now it is about what are they connected to. Broadband is not the same broadband any more. If we count the 3G connection on a smartphone as mobile broadband users, whether -- does that mean they can use all of the abilities of the new communications? Whether we actually need, you know, high speed broadband connectivities. When we look at the gain, for example, in new opportunities like Internet of Things we see a number of connected devices, some regions actually not even -- we're not having a catching up, but a widening of the Digital Divide. It is not to paint a optimistic picture, but to say we came a long way, but there is a long way to go and it is very early to say that, you know, now it will be easy, we just have to push. We need to work together on that.

Also the good thing also about that, more and more stakeholders recognize that. Especially we saw a flurry of initiatives saying that we want to help, and we want to be connected, and we have a few people around this table who will speak about their initiatives. It is not up for me to refer to them. What is important though, for all of us to work together and look for synergies and how to contribute to that and we'll try to also do this week with our connecting workshops.

On that, I'm kind of -- another aspect I want to mention, important to have a vision. There is a vision of 1 billion connected, but what's also important from our perspective, have a clear, measurable indicator of where you want to be. In ITUs, the meeting last year, it came with Global Agenda for connecting and it sets targets for connectivity in general, but also inclusiveness as well as sustainability and innovation.

Just to try to wrap up a bit, this is important, having a vision, what's the tool? Some tools, again, I would -- the speech will lack something if I wouldn't mention what's now happening across the ocean in Geneva. We have a World Radio Conference happening which is coming to agreements on the new Spectrum for the mobile broadband, the next generation. We agreed on 29th of October what -- how this third generation will look like. Now this conference, World Radio Conference, we'll find the Spectrum for that. That's enabling a generation of opportunities and faster speed to everybody, Spectrum.

Also, Bob mentioned, it is important, national leadership, national broadband plans and again, we have good traction in 148 countries not having national broadband plans and 6 countries developing them. And I will go along with what's in those plans but leadership, it is important.

To finish, I think a few things, it is important, part of the discussion here, we have in other sessions also, small stakeholder engagement, not only about business, academia, Civil Society, within those, we have different stakeholder, we have the government, we have the communication, finance, education, health, they also need to have them around the table to tackle the demand issues and supply issues.

Also -- and the last thing just to -- the real last thing, sorry, Constance -- the really last thing, it is that we also want those people that are connected not to be users, passive consumers of the content, but want them to be active contributors and active participants of the economy. From ITU we're launching partnership was another seven partners from various stakeholder groups, public sector, Civil Society and again, this is a discussion of how -- it is encouraging to hear from Africa, that this is something that's recognized as important and how to together work towards that goal.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your statement.

I will keep calling you doctor, especially since we're in a forward-looking exercise.

>> (Laughter).

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you. I touch now to you, you have the floor.

>> AVRI DORIA: I look at this report. I'm fascinated and impressed by how much information we were able to collect. And then the question occurs now what?

One of the thing is, we're here, we're talking about it, we'll get a good report out of it. How do we take it forward? Especially looking at what Dr. Pepper mentioned in terms of using this stuff to accelerate the work, some of these things came out in discussions, we have an IGF meeting and we absorb a lot of information, but we don't take it further. We then have perhaps another next year's IGF regionals, nationals, we collect more information. Somehow we have to find a way, I think, in taking this to sort of, A, pinpoint some of the objects. There is an immense amount here, you hand, you know, the 27 pages of the full report to people. Where do they start? How do we take this material and actually do something about it that's useful? How do we build on it? How do we next year sort of take it and go down a level? Some of these options are at a very high level. How do we take it down?

Especially when I look at the issues I'm very interested in, how we avoid the problem of while narrowing the gap internationally we're increasing it nationally. That's been a trend that's been going on for over a decade now when it was first noticed in terms of women within countries, now it is a general tendency. I really think we have to now start focusing in on some of these narrower issues and find the smallest thing we can fix for improvement.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your statement.

I will give the floor now to Carolyn Nguyen from Microsoft.

>> CAROLYN NGUYEN: Thank you, Ambassador. Thank you for allowing me to participate in this panel.

First I would like to thank Constance and also the tremendous work by the Secretariat to organization and collect this tremendous collection of information.

I would like to share Microsoft's perspective and also completely agree with Avri's question on what's the next step. I also completely agree with Dr. Pepper's challenge with respect to commemorating and the need to compulate the conversation in the Digital Divide and it is now where we're at the point of moving the conversation to how and this document, to your point, and -- it is a unique value and invaluable asset in addressing that question of how.

Firstly, just to share Microsoft's perspective, we have been actively participating in the process. We fully believe in addressing the Digital Divide. Our mission statement is to empower every person in every organization on the planet to achieve more. It is completely aligned with the goals and objectives that's been shared thus far. As a company we're focused on creating innovative ICT solutions and initiatives that are inclusive by design and help to realize the full potential of peoples around the world while enabling sustainable socioeconomic development through partnerships with all of the stakeholders. It is in that spirit that we submit a contribution in to the process and into the intersessional work addressing specific examples of issues on both the supply side in terms of how to provide affordable access to remote areas, including very practical solutions such as using solar energy to enable access to areas that have no utilities, infrastructure. We also address a demand side with respect to capacity building.

Here just to share a couple of statistics with respect to economic growth, furthering on the information that Dr. Pepper shared earlier, for example, we note that for every 10% increase in broadband network penetration in the country the World Bank estimated GDP growth between 1.38 and 1.8% for developing and developed countries.

The impact, it is -- it is a network effect. To give you an example, again, in Africa, for every $1 that Microsoft makes, between 9 and 11 is made by local partners. That's a network effect we're looking at in looking at ICT to enable the Sustainable Development. Bringing additional 600 million women and girls online could boost global GDP by 18 billion according to the ITU.

Those are some of the objectives and the concrete examples as to why we contributed and why we firmly believe in this.

Our contribution also had specific examples under role of ICT in addressing SDG goals 8, 9, 14 and 16. I want to do a high level review of what was hour thinking.

With respect to our thinking, with respect to Avri's question, what's next, answering, trying to put on the table the -- and answering Dr. Pepper's question of accelerating this, it is to do it by evidence, it is about evidence-based policy making. This -- because around the world each region, each nation, each city, community, village, they're starting on this effort at different stages of development. It is not possible to say what is the single best approach. We cannot debate it. There is no single best approach. There is Best Practices -- there are practices I should say, and that's why I really, really like the example of the title in terms of Policy Options. Where you are, you can find examples in other countries, et cetera, and get some examples as starting points again focusing on how and acceleration.

Another point that I would like to make that was very unique about this document, it is that it is -- it has a framework that addressed the issues related to connectivity holistically. If you look at the outline, what's included in here, it is essentially almost a framework, a set of tools that countries, communities can use for addressing this issue from everything from infrastructure to policy. If you look at that in terms of what's

needed, again, it is a helpful tool as people -- as countries, communities, policy regulators, as they look at how to implement this Digital Divide.

The third point is that through this process, which is unique, there's been a unique platform for communication and information sharing between multiple stakeholders. Everybody is participating. There is no centralized -- there is no central headquarters. If I may use an example, it is almost -- it is accessible, like Wikipedia, information is out there, but also people contributing information and there is also opportunity to say what worked and doesn't.

Going forward, one of the questions I would like to put on the table is how can this platform for communication and information sharing be continued?

Constance, in the opening remark you mentioned finalizing a document. I think it is a living process. The question is how to make the information accessible, what is the platform that enables contributions and modifications. It is that Policy Options.

The WSIS review, it is ongoing right now. Part of this question, it is how can this information be shared more widely with policymakers? One of the questions I would like to put on the table for consideration is if we look at the draft of the current outcome statement, look at the evidence that's presented here, some of the evidence somewhat contradicts what's in the draft today. How do we reconcile that? You know, there is a set of very, very clear evidence and example sharing right now.

Lastly, to look at the question of, you know, what next? Asking the questions, should this be -- can this be some sort of a set of connectivity principles, a framework, a tool set? I think with that, that's my last question.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much for your statement.

I would like to just remind all those who make interventions to stick to the 2-minute time we have set. We have provided a clock to help you, to discipline to the extent possible.

I now turn to Manu Khardwaj from the U.S. State Department.

You have the floor, sir.

>> MANU KHARDWAJ: Thank you, Ambassador.

Max, I want to start by recognizing the terrific work of the Secretariat and Constance and putting together this terrific document for all of us to use today, facilitating a productive discussion.

To go to the question that was asked by a fellow panelist, what next? We thought hard about this question at the IGF U.S.A. a few months ago. We had wide consultations on this issue of Connecting the Next Billion both in a closing panel, closing plenary, a lot of the discussions we had at the IGF U.S.A. reflected the recommendations here and also the discussion that's occurred so far.

After these consultations, because of the IGF is the premier venue for international Internet policy making and because the stakeholder community wanted us to really do more in terms of the development we have launched our U.S. State Department joined by major development organizations launched a new Diplomatic initiative called Global Connect seeking to bring an additional 1.5 million people online by 2020, internationally agreed upon goal. Through this effort we're also recognizing the critical importance of the Internet in achieving all of the SGs at our launch and the IGF U.S.A., all of the stakeholders involved, we have been thrilled with the support from so far 22 global NGOs, Jim Keim of the World Bank, President of Tanzania, other foreign dignitaries from the developed and developing world. As part of Global Connect we're increasing our own development assistance. Since the Secretary of State's speech, major U.S. development organizations including Opic announced major commitments for financing in Kenya, other, and we hope to

continue to provide this level of development assistance to mainstream the view that the Internet is as important to every country's economy as energy, electricity, highways, roads, and we need to prioritize the Internet infrastructure on the Agenda and that resonates with all.

In terms of going back to Avri's question on what's next, this is a terrific set of policy recommendations to potentially guide initiatives like Global Connect, other efforts underway, we should all now think seriously about how we might operationalize this as global community to really build more support that, you know, these types of government policies are the ways to unlock digital growth and expand the benefits of connectivity to the world and we look forward to working with partner countries, stakeholders as we continue to not only our initiative global connect but the IGF's important work of Connecting the Next Billions.

Thank you, Ambassador.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your statement very much, your comments.

I turn now to Mr. Jack Deasy from O3B Networks

>> JACK DEASY: Thank you.

It is a pleasure to be here. I second all of the congratulations to the Chair and the group that put this document together. The breadth of information gathered here, it is really striking. I would like to comment briefly on the infrastructure at the beginning of the document. There is a lot of important commentary about the importance of additional investment in infrastructure. I think that the other striking comment that I heard was that the incremental difficulty of Connecting the Next Billion is notable, it is harder as we add the billions in.

The good news is that part of the solution of that is a significant range of new investment going particularly in the satellite industry which up until now has lagged in terms of ability to support real broadband and this is all long-term investment. There is a significant number of new initiatives over the satellite industry to improve the offerings by the satellite to these particularly unconnected, more difficult to connect communities and that's an important part of the work going forward.

I also want to comment just in discussing here at the table as we were getting ready, when you connect communities with significant broadband from a standing start, the importance of the menu of good practices that's been presented here becomes even more important. The communities have to absorb essentially overnight what a lot of communities have taken 10, 15 years to absorb. The work that's been done here to put that in a manageable, accessible format is really valuable I think to the communities going forward.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your statement.

I turn now to the last speaker on the panel, and then we wish to take comments and questions from the audience.

I turn now then to Mr. Kevin Martin from Facebook.

>> KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you.

We agree with the multistakeholder approach being critical in solving this problem ,and we appreciate the reporting recognition of the multifaceted nature of the policy necessary to address it. I think the Secretariat described it as a mosaic in the report. That's not surprising considering that the challenges are so different in connecting.

As Dr. Pepper outlined before, that the challenges for the remaining people that aren't connected yet to the Internet vary dramatically. We at Facebook see that is three buckets of people, a billion of people that lack

access to the necessary infrastructure to be able to connect, about a billion people who cost is the significant barrier, but the largest group of people is actually 2 billion that live within a signal as Dr. Pepper indicated in some of his remarks, but that relevance and awareness are the biggest barrier to connectivity. We think that the policies and actions need to reflect the fact that you have such dramatically different problems. We at Facebook have initiatives trying to be multifaceted and efforts to address the lack of infrastructure with the connectivity labs for satellites, for drones, app, other technologies to lower the cost of access to those that are currently lacking the access to that infrastructure. We also have significant programs to try to address the issues that we're talking about in the report about increasing usability, enabling users that would try to address the relevance factors that Dr. Pepper alluded to.

We have rolled out a service of free basic service, an open platform of basic content that's available for free to consumers. Those -- that basic service includes news, education, health, jobs, government sites. There is a couple of key characteristics of that program, it is not exclusive, open to any operator in the countries that we have rolled it out. It is non-discriminatory, an open platform. There is only limited by the technical standards to participate. It is free. It is -- Facebook doesn't pay the operators and content owners are not required to pay and the consumers are able to access it without any data charges.

Most importantly, going to Dr. Pepper's questions of how do we accelerate this people coming online, we have eventually seen that it is working in the countries where we rolled it out, the 29 countries of accelerating access. We see a 50% increase in the rate of people coming online for the operators who actually rollout the service and most importantly, that's because 50% of the people that try the service become full Internet subscribers within 30 days. We think this is exactly the kind of program to accelerate the very challenges that would have been outlined in the largest group of people unconnected and we think that the policies should reflect the approach that again is multifaceted and involving a mosaic of solutions to a multifaceted problem.

Thank you very much.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

We would like now to offer the opportunity for those in the audience to make short comments or address questions or remarks to the extent possible to improve the document or an input to the discussion. We have microphones on two sides of the room. I see a gentleman standing.

You have the floor, sir.

>> MAX SENGES: Good afternoon.

Thank you, Chair.

I'm Max Senges. I work for Google Research and report on the research project that I do as visiting Fellow with the Stanford Center for Democracy Development and the Rule of Law.

First of all, I would like to congratulate everybody who was involved in this important work. We agree that Connecting the Next Billion is a very important, if not the most important step for Internet governance and for the future of the Internet.

Allow me to tell you about our pilot project that is on access to the next billion, the results of which we would like to offer to complement the work that's been done so far by the IGF and the collaborators, it is built on expertise of two Stanford professors, Larry Diamond and Dr. Fishkin who is with us, the director, they're world-known experts on democratic practices in the globalized 21st Century and I'm on the Advisory Board of which IGF stakeholders believe the methods are interesting to add democratic practices which has been discussed in the variety of formats to the multistakeholder governance practices that are occurring here.

This is a scientific method that's been applied and developed further in 23 countries and more than 80 iterations with all kinds of policy proposals over more than 20 years. We chose access for the next billion as

topic for this first deliberative pole because we agree with Dr. Pepper and the distinguished panel that we have here that access is one of the key priorities right now. The deliberative pole is designed to gage the sample of what it would take, what it did take, we did the pilot, if the positions were informed by balanced information and structured discussion with peers and experts. The project touched on almost all of the options that are discussed in the report, Zero Rating, how to evaluate access projects and how to fund them.

We conducted the pilot both online and face-to-face on day 0 and allowed us to learn a lot where we were happy that we tried it as a pilot this year and hope to improve the application and discuss with the community how to further have it rations and adopt a method nor particular community. We would like to analyze that data quantitatively and qualitatively.

We think that anyone that witnessed the depth of the discussion on Monday and online will be impressed with how engaged the participants were in discussing the trade-offs and the quality of the questions that were produced with the questions with the experts we provided. To give you a taste, it was a wide range of access discussed, the questions as discussed in the report.

We cannot share with the preliminary results right now but we'll do so in a workshop on Friday morning from 9:00 to 10:30 and we invite critical feedback, constructive feedback from the community and we'll be in workshop room 4.

With that, I would like to close my comments.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your contribution.

You have the floor, sir.

>> ANDRE LUCAS FERNANDES: Hello. I'm from the youth IGF program and from the Observatory of the Youth in Latin America.

I would like to ask the members of the session about an issue of the expansion of the Internet with the connection of the next billion, and its process. A specific point that bothers me, I mean, specifically, will this process be guided in a way to respect the principles of the Internet, the social, cultural particularities of the country and the people that are out of the Internet or this process will go as a vertical expansion that ignores the particularities and imposes the prejudice and other standards to specific countries and in the world. If I think about the expression with the participation of the youth or others, they said digital natives, we see a second way, there is a discussion in multiple ways about the youth and Internet and the expression of the Internet, but the youth is not effectively listened or participating in the process of the construction of the policies in this sense.

I would like to know what you think about this.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

I think we'll take a few comments and questions and try to answer collectively at the end.

I see that the line has grown rapidly.

I think that maybe at this point in time we can take only those that are already in line. I would like to close the list after those five participants will take the floor.

You have the floor, sir, on my left.

>> MIKE ENSON: Thank you. It is Mike Enson from the Association of Progressive Communications.

I was very disheartened to hear the comment by the representative of the ITU that we have to look at the type of connection. Connecting the Next Billion is not a binary problem. I feel we have billions of what we call that are barely connected rather than just fully connected. We have to address their needs as well as the people that are not yet connected today. In doing that, as mentioned by the panelists, we have to be pragmatic rather than comprehensive in the possible Policy Options. We have to focus on some of the key ones that really are going to make a difference than look at those that will follow through afterwards.

From the perspective of ours, there are three, one, in very great importance, it is increasing the competition. It is not sufficient to just have one form of infrastructure available. This doesn't provide the level of choice we need to provide downward pressure on prices and to create an affordable type of connectivity. Part of that solution is also opening up the Spectrum so that it goes beyond providing Spectrum for mobile broadband, but for other types of wireless infrastructure as well as we have seen already by the huge success of Wi-Fi.

The third option, it is to promote infrastructure sharing. This isn't just infrastructure sharing between Telecom operators, but also infrastructure sharing between Telecom operators and the operators of roads, power lines, where there can be huge savings in the deployment of infrastructure. We found, for example, in a recent study we did on this that if you just add a duct to road deployment project, it increases the cost of the road deployment by only 1.5%, there is huge savings made by ensuring that every new road, every new power line that's put in place has ducts for fiber, has provisions for passive infrastructure.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your statement.

I recognize Ambassador Janis Karlins who Chaired the MAG, the preparatory Committee for this meeting, you have the floor, sir.

>> JANIS KARLINS: Thank you very much, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca. Thank you.

I would like to address the question what next. I think I remember in '91 when we asked the first Ambassador of Germany how we can put the name Latvia on the world map. The answer was simple. You do good work and tell the rest of the world about it. Then here, we have done very good work with assistance of national, regional IFG initiatives with the contribution of a number of countries.

We have gathered together information what's worked and what's not. What we need to do now, we need to disseminate that information as wide as possible.

Here I think that United Nations system in general, through the SIRTS, committees, ITU, through IT council, through UNESCO, through council meetings can disseminate this information and make public officials aware of what's worked and what circumstances and what's not. This would be most probably the best way of going forward.

That's my contribution in this discussion.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you, Ambassador, for those important comments.

I recall that in the MAG one of the things that we discussed continuously was how to make the work of IGF known to people outside of the IGF community, how to make sure that other participants from other sectors, those that are involved. I think as you have said, Ambassador, that the work that we have produced, an output that's available tool should -- we should think of ways of making it known to people outside of our community those that have been involved more closely with IGF and with the IGF brand name. This is exactly what we want to make known through concrete outputs. The kind of work that it is possible to achieve through the stakeholder cooperation within the context of IGF.

Thank you very much for your comment.

I would like to turn to the lady on my left side.

Please, you have the floor.

>> EVELYN NAMARA: Thank you. I'm Evelyn Namara, I'm an Internet Society Ambassador. My comment, it is I read the document, it is very good.

I would love to know what strategies are being put in place after Connecting the Next Billion in terms of governments and different companies and countries thinking about moving forward. What are the strategies being put in place after the next billion has been online in terms of training, capacity building, are those strategies being made now? We have to start thinking about those discussions right now.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

I would like to give the floor to the gentleman on my right hand.

>> PAUL MUSAFIRI NALWANGO: Mr. Ambassador, I'm from the Democratic Republic of Congo, I'm the head of cabinet, chief of staff of the Vice Prime Minister in charge of ITCs.

I would like to ask, I'm here to ask that the Internet or the connection and the connection of the next billion should not be in the sphere of this panel a difference, in my opinion, and as it has been decided, the Internet connection should be an element not -- not an element that should bring differences, but an instrument that allows us to bridge the gaps and barriers between people just as the lady that just has spoken. I would like us to be pragmatic regarding the solutions that we're going to come to at the end of this panel so that we can -- we can think of what we can do for the countries that have no possibility of connection.

We have discussed this in the African panel. We know that 1 billion people will be connected, but we should take into consideration what the starting point is. We have illiterate people that cannot read or write, thus we should actually tackle illiteracy, we have to fight against this. Otherwise, the connection will only increase the divide between those connected and those that are not. There are many people in the world that cannot even read or write, most of them in Africa. There are many people that have no access to electric power. This should also be taken into consideration.

The document, it is very good.

It is full of interesting contents. For it to be understood, we must take into consideration the fight against illiteracy and the need of access to electric power. All of this so that the IGF endeavor can be indeed useful. Otherwise, this will have no local practical effect. There are people that don't even know what Facebook is and we must work considering all of these realities and being practical regarding that.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: The person on the left side for the last intervention on that section.

After that, I'll turn to my co-moderator for comments in regard to the questions and the comments that were made and as appropriate maybe some panelists also would like to make very short interventions with regards to the points raised by the audience.

You have the floor, sir.

>> NICOLAS ECHANIZ: Hello.

I'm Nicolas Echaniz from Argentina.

We have been working for some years now, especially with community networks that are grassroots networks built by the same people that need connectivity. We are actually working with an international team from Italy, Catalonia, North America developing free software to enable communities where they have no people with special skills to build their own networks so they can actually build the networks without more education on the matter than just a few videos, the video tutorials that would help them build antennas and infrastructure. This has been actually working very well in the places that it has been tested.

We believe it would be interesting to have more relation between this grassroots initiatives and other strategies that don't usually take this possibility into account like in our country, for example, the Argentina connection plan that's installing fiber optics all over the country, they don't have a specific plan for very, very small towns where there is no local player, yes, there is no ISP, small ISP, nobody, and those are the specific situations where community networks are a really good option.

I just wanted to mention this and I would like it to be considered in the document.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much for these interventions, comments and for the questions.

I think I heard four questions from the audience. What I would suggest is that we redistribute to them to some panelists since they have been involved with this work very, very closely.

The first question, perhaps, is for me, whether or not this is a living document. Absolutely. The first thing when the MAG started this track of work on Connecting the Next Billion it was agreed that the document should stay open, should stay alive. This is intersessional work and the Policy Options need to adapt to the environment.

I also noted the very good suggestion to move from the terminology Best Practices to perhaps good practices. I thought that was very interesting and perhaps something we can take on board for intersessional work leading to IGF 2016.

I heard another question about I think how do you respect national specificities, how do you take into account the national local frameworks when you think about Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion. Here perhaps I would like to turn to my colleague Lee or Christine to highlight perhaps the importance, the chance we have at the IGF to have this coverage of national, regional IGFs and this is really the trick, we have substance that's really important, because we have the national, the local IGFs and then I'll bring the other panelists in.

>> CHRISTINE HOEPERS: Thank you, Constance.

I'd like to share my experience in trying to facilitate the contribution from EuroDIG to this exercise because -- further to the call to the MAG to participate in this exercise there was agreement to include a workshop in the EuroDIG, the European Regional Forum on Internet Governance, but of course we were immediately faced with the need to adopt the title -- adapt the title, to reframe it a bit, it had a very strong developmental focus and we needed to adapt it to the European local and regional context to make it also relevant for participants in EuroDIG.

We adjusted a bit the title, instead of Connecting the Next Billion we organized a workshop on Policy Option for Digital Access and Inclusion. This allowed us to enlarge the scope of the discussions and to address some of the challenges that we have in Europe, in particular beyond the mere physical coverage for Internet access which in Europe is relatively high and, therefore, we could extend the discussion to issues like how to increase usage when the infrastructure is already there. In this context, EuroDIG held this workshop with a number of panelists that address the various digital gaps that still exist in Europe. This is due to, you know, the variety of

the continents, so you have north, south, east, west, you have rural areas, urban areas, there are differences which relate also to the geographical realities. You have small countries, big countries, island countries, panelists trying to address solutions, how are solutions being implemented to address all of the different kind of challenges.

A lot of examples were mentioned also related to the different aspects that create digital ecosystems, not just the technical layer, the technical infrastructure, but also the logical layer. The role of the technical community in this sense, for instance IXPs, the importance of IPv6, all aspects that were mentioned and very specific examples of national, local and European level. What emerges is that indeed there are what we could call digital agendas for all the different layers with different solutions, different ingredients and for sure a lot is going on, a lot of attention is spread to these issues and everybody is trying to find the solutions that are best for their realities.

I think that also an important aspect to mention is that we had a wealth of data available. We really started from data, statistics, clear indicators also on broadband access, from there we could move to issues like how to include people with disabilities, vulnerable peoples, so on.

Of course I don't want to cover all of the aspects of that, of what was mentioned in the report. Maybe another point, the international organization, among the various parties that are necessary to facilitate the connection of an inclusion of everybody international organizations also on a national level, they show the benefits of investment and they can transfer expertise and technology and facilitate the development of public-private partnerships.

>> LEE HIBBARD: Just to add to that by saying that I think that the workshop was also discussing the context of access to, you know, being a catalyst for the exercise of Human Rights and freedom of expression in particular. That it informs the access parts of the service value of the Internet and now I think of the NETMundial statement, the Internet as a global resource, should be managed in the public interest, and we dealt with access to Internet but access to what actually, access for access sake, do you want to -- we talked about literacy, skills, and the importance of making sure that are giving access means democracy, censorship, critical thinking regarding content questions, et cetera.

U.K, there is a higher penetration rate in the north of Europe, rather than the south, and of course, rural, urban, it is distinct. It seems from terms of the infrastructure questions that it is different combinations of actors, it is a public-private partnership, led by the government, led by the private sector, but not one-size-fits-all, and therefore there is no silver bullet on how to do these things. We had good case studies from Slovenia on access to Internet on rural areas and Latvia, not disturbing the competition for the market, but there was sort of healthy competition between the push for fixed and mobile, access to the Internet and the same time they were introducing new public access points which was having an effect on the access to mobile 3G access. There are correlations between the push for public access points and fixed and mobile broadband.

Thank you very much.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Lee.

Before we weave in the discussions the results of the Best Practices that support the Connecting the Next Billion, I think that there were two other questions:

One, how do you define Connecting the Billion, it was a gentleman from APC, Tomas, you started your intervention with your definition, I think the question was oriented to you, with the Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion we tried to have a broad understanding of the issue. If you would like it share a few comments.

>> TOMAS LAMANAUSKAS: Thanks a lot.

Just that we should understand it is not a final goal, a moving target. So the connecting next billion, next billions, it is a process not -- that will never -- we'll never reach it. It is about not only connecting but about bringing better connectivity. We can see ten years ago, connectivity, now the connectivity talk, and in some ways, you know, we moved faster than we thought we would. Now everyone in the world has access or most of the people have access to mobile telephones, yeah, it is already connected, now again we say it is a new Digital Divide, Digital Divide, that's important to appreciate.

I don't think we'll reach the point in time where we say there is no Digital Divide. There will always be, just -- we'll always have to chase that point, that target. I think that's important from that regard.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you.

The other question I think from the audience was now that we have all of these Policy Options and thinking of the sense of urgency that Dr. Pepper conveyed well. How do we move to the national strategies.

Manu, can you share thoughts on moving from understanding the situation and actually moving to strategies?

>> MANU KHARDWAJ: Thank you, Constance.

I just also wanted to iterate we should have a national strategy, and the IGF community could even help with the international aspect of how to come together and build momentum for connectivity efforts everywhere. This is to encourage all countries to view the connectivity as central to their national development strategy and encourage them to think of the Internet and ICT not as a siloed aspect for their own country's economic growth and development but to consider the cross-cutting nature of it in terms of how its impacting all sectors of the economy. We look forward to partnering with organizations like the alliance for affordable Internet which we actually helped support four years ago when it was first launched and others in terms of showcasing the types of policies that are out there that can really spur economic growth and unlock digital development.

I wanted to also touch upon two things. One, I very much support the statement that was made from the floor that whether it is the multilateral development banks or national countries as they kind of do traditional infrastructure projects they should think about how to integrate the Internet connectivity within the elements.

I also heard and thought Ambassador Karlins' statements on how to share the work that you have done, Constance, and here, but with other companies, banks, other folks, spreading awareness on the IGF's work as well. I wanted to make those two observations.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you so much.

Dr. Pepper wanted to add a few suggestions.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Very briefly.

I talked about the Internet For All project at the World Economic Forum. The next phase of that, it is very, very pragmatic, it is to develop very specific multistakeholder country programs to work with specific countries that are -- that are in a work in gross to figure which ones, to work in country, with governments, with Civil Society, with the private sector to drive up Internet extension and access and adoption in the countries. It is a very wide open process and anybody who is here will have the ability to participate. That, again, pragmatically, a way to approach this, let's pick places, work together, make it happen, lessons learned, then, you know, really drive it in partnership with other countries.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

We would like to turn now to the second part of the session. One in which we'll hear from the leaders of the Best Practices streams, a report on the outcome of their work and making the link with the issue of Connecting the Next Billion and we would like, of course, to also reflect the next steps with regard to the work being undertaken by that particular stream of work.

I would like to start with Avri Doria from APC who led the Best Practice forum on the topic. You have the floor.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

I'll try to keep this brief.

Basically, this was two years that we were working on it. I think we early on accepted the notion that we weren't really talking Best Practices and in fact we're looking at what practices worked, what practices didn't work quite as well, and trying to understand that.

The first year -- and that was last year -- was basically mostly a theoretical year. People talked about multistakeholder approaches in a broad stroke. This year we started to look at cases of what would worked, what hadn't, what were some of the issues that you ran up against, and out of that, Brian basically put together a report of them. We came up with certain issues that provoked a lot of discussion.

For example, when we talk about multistakeholder processes we're constantly using consensus, rough consensus. What did we mean about those? Were there steady definitions of them? Was that something that really each group needed to find on its own, how it would determine, you know, we ran into concepts like people talking about bad actors. You know, what was meant by that? How do we not confuse being frustrated or not understanding and how do we avoid the accusations and avoid the situation. So we got into practical issues.

What came out of it, basically -- we had a session, I guess it was yesterday though time is stretching out it seems like much longer ago at this point, but basically there was very strong support I would say for the report and for doing something with it. How do we get this to other people? There were changes. There was a request to say this is not about multistakeholder practice at the IGF but more in general about multistakeholder practice. It would perhaps generalize it a bit more, that we have webinars, some such where we actually explain this, where we make this useful in some sense to many efforts national, regional, otherwise that are trying to build multistakeholder processes and how could we help with that. There was really a push to make this output go further, explain it, talk about it, and perhaps even to work further on coming up with detailing some of the options and how they could be used or built upon.

Hopefully that's a quick recap. It was quite satisfying to have the discussion. It was a very good meeting, a lot of people participated. Throughout the year, you had these meetings with good outputs.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for leading the Best Practice and discipline in conveying the important points in a very concise, short. It is really appreciated especially because we want to take this opportunity of this meeting to hear some comments and questions that could be addressed to the leader of this Best Practice forum.

I would like to open the floor for panelists that may wish to comment in the first place and then we'll take interventions from the audience.

Do any of the panelists -- yes, Dr. Vint Cerf.

>> VINT CERF: An interesting question that you and I, Avri, discussed in the past, capturing experiences in IGF and making an archive, making it accessible, something of such. Is that still something that's on the Agenda for improving the utility of the multistakeholder process as we experience it here?

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

It wasn't something discussed as part of this, but certainly the work being done by friends of IGF and bringing the stuff together in a searchable way, certainly we do have transcripts on everything, we do have a report on the multistakeholder processes just as there is a report on this. That was also going to remain a living report with continuing running commentary on it. The intent, I think, is of everything we're doing is to make it, but what ends up needing to happen, is to actually have good ways of searching on it, of finding things because we are really accumulating a mass of words.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

Do any of the panelists wish to make any comment or address questions to Avri? Otherwise I'll turn to the audience.

Jac.

>> JAC KEE: I'm wondering in the process as well if you examine the question of intersectionality? Did you look at gender, youth, not just between the stakeholders but also between the sectors within the stakeholder groups whether that was something that was examined?

>> AVRI DORIA: We had some discussion, not deep, not extended. We did have some discussion when we got into talking about stakeholders and the kinds of stakeholders and the fact of being multistakeholder all the way down. That it wasn't just a notion of Tunis Agenda, defining 3 plus 2, that was the end of it, in every one of the circumstances that were different groupings. We didn't talk about women as stakeholder, youth, others, but basically talking about the fact that stakeholder breakdown is really something that goes further deep than the top level.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

I would like to turn to the audience.

We have one participant who would like to make an intersection.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky from ICANN. You

say you have a mess of words, a lot. If you had to boil it down into either an elevator speech, 30 seconds of what are the most important things that you learned from this in terms of doing, not doing, understanding.

>> AVRI DORIA: Elevator pitch?

So basically the thing that I learned most about it is the variability, the flexibility in the process, the need to listen and the need to be able to adapt to the variety of stakeholder experience you run into.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

I don't see any further requests for the floor.

I would like to suggest -- I would like to thank Avri Doria for leading these Best Practice group, and I would like to turn now to Julia Cornwell McKean, eSafety Commission, Australia and leader on the mitigating spam forum.

>> JULIA CORNWELL KcKEAN: Thank you.

The 2015 Best Practice forum, it carried on work from the 2014 IGF which we identified 16 challenges and 11 recommendations.

The terms, they are referring to written unsolicited communications that are carried on in the Internet including and not limited to messages that spread malware or have other nefarious purpose, we have focused

on two streams: Statistical and numerical data scaling the problem, and current examples of multistakeholder cooperation attempting to resolve the problem and the future of the unsolicited communications, the next billion coming online, challenges for the developing world.

Rather than provide a new set of Best Practices that must be followed, the 2015 Forum has made use of established practices providing examples of where there have been successful so that others are encouraged to consider what may work in their own environments. An example is provided for the most part through a series of case studies. They represent contributions from the diverse array of participants and are annexed to the forum's report.

The forum is selected and presents data from a variety of sources regarding the scale and scope of spam, phishing, malware, infections around the globe. While some data was available indicating, for example, that the time of writing that the button related spam is decreasing and the reason for this is unclear and it may be a temporary respite, but what became clear is that despite spam being a global issue accurate quantification is a significant hurdle. No single dataset can reliably measure the scope nor the scale of the problem or the cost or the impact on economies for both industry and government to mitigate it. Further research is recommended by this BPF in that regard.

The BPF held the view that the problems likely to be encountered by the next billion are likely similar to those that came before. Spam, infections, malware, cybercrime will invariably be prevalent, perhaps more so in developing nations as measures that have been deployed over time to address the issues may not be implemented prior to the broader deployment or broader broadband connectivity.

The BPF wanted to learn about the needs and wants of those coming newly online, and solicited input from developing nations working with ITF Africa and sending a survey out and carried out. The results are detailed in the BPF report and were found by the participants as reflecting the real situation in Africa. The results indicated a desire of leadership to resolve the problem of unsolicited communications.

Training has been flagged as a particular need. In order to give more focus to the topic we organized a matchmaking session on Day 0 of this IGF. This session discussed many issues that have been highlighted in the forum's report and form recommendations, in particular, capacity building for developing nations coming online in the form of technical, consumer, regulatory, other learning needs are identified, as was the need for industry to fund the initiatives, there is willingness among many to collaborate and move the issues forward.

The forum session at the IGF yesterday focused on a discussion of its 11 draft recommendations. ID rating sheets were distributed for a clear view on the attending views on the recommendations and an opportunity to provide feedback without giving a formal intervention. The draft recommendations cover many topics including but not limited to the scope of future BPFs, training, education, the value of litigation centers, cybercrime reporting, desirability of further region specific surveys and the benefits of multistakeholder arrangements both public, private, private, private, exampling of which is mentioned above or in annex to the forums report. The recommendations were received and many will be nuanced in response to the productive, candid discussions that resulted.

There was much discussion at both the matchmaking session and at the forum's broader session about the future of this work. In particular, it was acknowledged that in order to facilitate the implementation of the recommendation there was a need for a regular check in or review. However, it was agreed and it is a key recommendation of the 2015 BPF that if the IGF decides to continue this work that there is more value in expanding the topic to encompass broader cybersecurity, including crime and safety issues. As communications are only one aspect of the many issues relating to the protection of infrastructure and citizens online unsolicited .

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your presentation, and similarly I would like then to open the floor first to panelists who wish to make interventions or ask questions to the lead of the Best Practice forum.

Yes, please.

>> VINT CERF: I was distracted a bit. I may be asking a question that you already answered.

With regard to spam in particular, one of the things that appears to be helpful is that if you are an aggregate server of e-mail, you can actually detect what is spam and what is not spam because you're seeing a lot of things and, you know, many copies of the same thing going to lots of people. It may turn out that identifying the mechanisms by which this stuff can be identified will be valuable because people who are on low-data rate services at the edges of the net, they're the ones that are most harmed by getting a bunch of spam mail chewing up the capacity and maybe costing a lot of money. The implication is that to mitigate that, since we can't really stop people from sending e-mail is that you need to go through some service that has the ability to process all of the incoming mail and filter it out before it reaches you, downloaded to you. I assume that must have been covered in the report, but if it wasn't, I would make a small footnote.

>> JULIA CORNWELL McKEAN: In fact, the report focused more on those things, the issue, we tried to look more at the partnerships, the practical solutions rather than getting into the nitty gritty. Certainly that's something to note.

>> VINT CERF: Most of the solutions that the problems involve a lot of nitty gritty.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

Are there any other interventions from the panelists? I see none.

From the audience, I don't see either.

I would suggest that we could move to the next Best Practice forum.

I call upon Christine Hoepers, General Manager of the Internet Steering Committee, you have the floor for talking about this.

>> CHRISTINE HOEPERS: The Best Practice for establishing, this is a forum running for two years now. Last year our focus was on getting the community together, to clarify what this is, talking about the level of service and what are the major topics CSIRTS work on. The work of 2015 was built on the recommendations of the 2014 report, especially for focusing on this year, to clarify the possible misconceptions that could have among different stakeholders about the roles and responsibilities of CSIRTS and on the topics of privacy and relationships of C. As a note of great outcome of the 2014 forum was that we -- that the report of the Best Practice forum was used by the Government of Serbia as a background for the definition of cybersecurity policy. This was not an intended use of the report, but was one of the examples of how IGF and Best Practice forums are having a real impact on policy shaping in the world.

The key outcomes of 2015 were on the basis of consensus. The first one is a consensus among the participants that of those CSIRTS there is a lot of sensitive data and a lot of potentially privacy issues when dealing with information. CSIRTS is one of the major custodians of privacy and CSIRTS contributes to add privacy and every time you add more security you add more privacy as some contributors have said.

Also another major consensus is that CSIRTS are only effective if there is trust, if there is trust among experts or security experts or from the community in general. Trust is the basis for any work of a CSIRTS work.

Another topic that was debated a lot was teams with national responsibility and the need for stacks when creating such teams to carefully looking at the impacts or the trade-offs resulting from where the CSIRTS is located.

And there is another point that was raised especially today in the session that we had and the feedback from the report, it is that to reinforce that CSIRTS, it is only one of the actors. It is not an organization and a team that will resolve all of the security problem. They have a special function. They have a lot of organization. There is a need to have everybody involved in the security and in improving security of the ecosystem.

There is also a lot of discussion on the similar care to be taken when CSIRTS cooperate with law enforcement, really not to be mistakes and not to have any issues with privacy. The group as a whole felt the need that we should continue to have a dialogue with all of the stakeholders, a dialogue here, it is still to be discussed how that would be best, if that would be a Best Practice forum or any other forum, but there is a great need for really keeping a dialect open about the roles of CSIRTS and how to improve the community with all the stakeholders.

As the major topic of this section here, it is Connecting the Next Billion and billions, and I think one of the major challenges for the next billion would be how to have then -- them more secure online. The learning curve is cheaper. We'll have people less aware of the problems that especially when we think about the digital literacy, how they know about the technology. One of the major challenges for security, it is really computer literacy and in our age now, it is any device literacy, how to deal with it, identify the threats.

Then there is another major issue that is technical capacity and how to have people that can recognize threats. We see instant response teams as a key point for having people there ready to help new people that will be connecting to the Internet and I also -- also helping to provide more technical capabilities for the next -- with new people connected, we have new technical people, new professionals that we need to form and that we need to bring in to the table.

Thank you very much. That was the report. Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you for your presentation.

I would like to turn first to the members of the panel for any questions or remarks in regard to that team?

Yes.

>> SUBI CHATUVERDI: Thank you for that excellent presentation.

I'm Subi Chatuverdi.

This is a valuable report. When we see any kind of crisis unfolding especially developing countries and emerging economies the first responses almost is always to block. I do want to know what is the kind of participation that you saw from law enforcement agencies and others and there is a proactive engagement that you're seeing in terms of recommendations with terms of crisis and if its traced back to content shared online. What is the kind of new approach that's developing?

>> CHRISTINE HOEPERS: This year we didn't have that many engagement from law enforcement. I couldn't report in every detail of our report. You see in the report that one of the points, one of the stakeholders that we need to talk more is law enforcement. One of the points that was really how to consider because some people think that instant response teams are part of law enforcement, they work with in some countries they work in a lot of discussion, especially the mailing list that's public, it was on how actually -- how close should this work be and what was the role. From the CSIRTS, from the teams participating in the forum, most reported that actually they provide technical assistance but don't do actually any policy work.

We didn't discuss in the forum specifically the issue of blocking. Today in the session there was discussion but then there was a lot of conversation also that blocking is not the answer for everything. We should all be working toward a more healthier system or Internet and a more reliable, not necessarily just adding barriers and

blockings and really working with all of the agencies and trying everyone to understand each other's roles and as a complimentary role I think is the way to go forward.

I hope I answered your question.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

Are there any more questions from the panel? Remarks?

Then we turn to the audience. Yes.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you.

George Sadowsky, ICANN.

This is clearly a work in progress, as is all of our work with regard to cybercrime no matter the form it appears in. It seems to me that the CSIRTS offer a major leverage on the ability to deal with cybercrime and to track down perpetrators, but it depends -- given the borderless nature of the Internet, they really have to be able to work together because a cyber event, a bad event hops from country to country and there has to be a way to establish that trail to find out who is doing what to whom.

The question is, really, what have you found with respect to CSIRTS being able to operate together across national boundaries through a chain of countries?

You mentioned the role of trust. I'm sure that that is really pivotal. What else can you say about what -- what does it take to make that work and work really well? To what extent are there things that get in the way, national politics, other things? I don't know. The question is to you.

>> CHRISTINE HOEPERS: Thank you for the question.

This I think was one of the major topics of debate in our conversations through the mailing list and on all of the conference calls.

In the report we note that most of the CSIRTS that are established for a long time, they work well together, they cooperate a lot. This is built on trust, and trust is built on knowing each other's capabilities and knowing that each other has the right, dealing with information, that you protect data, we talked about importance of sharing information and that we have to have the information flowing but we cannot have too many detailed information flowing. There is always a balance. All of the cooperation work -- and it works with teams that know each other and there are a lot of forums that are bringing this team together. We have in our Best Practice forum to thank the first community, that's the security teams, most of the teams, they had come to our mailing list, they participated in the calls and they provided a lot of input with real cases and scenarios on how cooperation works.

We have a case study submitted from Switzerland, Korea from the Netherlands. We had a lot of very good discussion, but there is not a recipe on how to cooperate cross-borders. What we're doing, to meet a lot, trying to get a common ground on what could be a better way to cooperate among the CSIRTS and for sure, a point, it is that depending on where a team is located, as I said in my report, that would help or hinder how much information can change, how much information others would change with a team. This is really one of the major points in the report that needs to be more conversations among policymakers and among CSIRTS for each other to understand the importance of sharing the information, to what extent the CSIRTS can help the policymakers and what extent that the policymaker also help CSIRTS be effective. This is why we say there needs to be more dialogue, needs to be I think more awareness of everyone and there is a lot to do, to be done in the future.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

You have the floor

>> KOSSI AMESSINOU: I'm Kossi Amessinou from Benin.

Thank you very much.

CSIRTS work, is it a formal type of work or informal? In the countries where we have no CSIRTS, how can we have cooperation? Are these countries left aside, is there an international structure that will work to ensure the safety or the security of the data. How does this take place?

For the countries that require CSIRTS, do we need a formal structure? Is it a structure of the public sector, the private sector? Are they technical players that have the ability to filter information and need to work with safety? In practice, how does this work? Can we have details on it?

Thank you.

>> CHRISTINE HOEPERS: This topic was discussed more in the first year, the first report.

One of the major points that we had in the report was exactly the difficulty from developing countries, the information that still don't have teams, that usually they also don't have the means to participate in the forums because as we said, CSIRTS work based on trust and trust is built from people that work together, that know each other and that are participating in forums.

This year we specifically reached to three organizations from Africa specifically. We had a participation of Africa cert as lead expert, participation of some input from OKOWIS from eastern -- western countries of Africa and we had feedback from the UN Economic Group from the region. We're trying to work with the teams. There are a lot of organizations that are doing first capacity building and I'm doing a lot of work in Latin America in going to the conferences, bringing the work, where people need and trying to provide training and material.

One of the calls from last year in the report, it was for even countries that don't have formal CSIRTS, they still don't have a cybersecurity strategy, you can still have a points of contact, what we call the CSIRTS of last resort, someone, a team, an organization that will be recognized or that would have a tradition of working with ICT that's a point of contact when someone needs help. A lot of -- every country is different on how the team is created. That will should be in the 2014 report. We have teams from governments, from private sector, from the international teams, not-for-profit, there is not, like, one model. There are several ways that a team can be created and can be effective.

I welcome everyone to read the reports, done tact me, any of the other leads of the CSIRTS Best Practice forum that we can provide more detailed information.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, please.

>> VINT CERF: If I could make a short intervention.

One thing I have found historically, the effectiveness of the CSIRTS is a consequence of informality and the issue of trust is important and a point taken. When you create a set of rules you have a situation where you're not effective anymore, everybody is checking the boxes. I'm not trying to be -- what's the right word for this -- you know, completely without any rule set at all.

The informal nature of many of the organizations has permitted many different players to participate in a useful way. I hope we don't lose that recognition, but again it only works because everybody recognizes the need for confidentiality and trust -- they trust each other to maintain that confidentiality.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

I think with this we have concluded the discussion on that particular Best Practice forum.

I would suggest that I invite you to turn to the next Best Practice on the topic of enabling IPv6. I will turn to Susan Chalmers for a presentation.

>> SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you.

In over the past 67 months our work grouped to develop a 9-part document on Best Practices for IPv6 adoption. We did this through discussion on our open mailing list, over four conference calls and collaborative drafting.

We were also able to collect experiences from all around the world through our Best Practices survey from Saudi Arabia, to Venezuela, Japan, Canada, from many, many countries.

So the topics we cover in the document include IPv6 task forces, Best Practices for content providers and ISPs for when they want to start deploying IPv6 and we examined the helpfulness of projects that are designed to measure IPv6 usage across the Internet.

The document is written for the non-technical reader. The importance of IPv6 adoption should be well-known not only to the technically minded but policymakers, end users as well. Now I'll turn it over -- turn this over to my colleague who will explain a bit more.

Marco.

>> MARCO HONEWONIG: Thank you.

I am a contributor. It is my pleasure to share the outcomes of the document.

Of course the most important and obvious conclusion to be drawn from this process is that we need IPv6 to connect the next billion. That said, we focused on elements that we think would create this environment of promoting the IPv6. A thing that we have identified and especially important, besides the international coordination is to cooperate at the national level as well. Local IPv6 task force provides an efficient way to exchange the experiences and distribute knowledge amongst the local operators. It is a great way to coordinate amongst different parties involved.

We have identified several things that exist. For example, between providers of access servicers and those that provide the content and coordination on the milestones, cooperation between the players to align efforts to greatly increase the effect of the IPv6 deployment in a local context.

That said, focusing on the topic of this afternoon's discussion, the policy options that contribute to IPv6. Our group identified two areas where governments specifically can contribute to create an environment that's a positive attitude to the IPv6.

The first thing would be to deploy the IPv6 yourself. Governments are a large user of Internet themselves and by employing IPv6 in their network and their services. They could provide an incentive for equipment manufacturers and service providers to deploy the IPv6. Showing leadership gives local markets as IPv6 is an option and stimulates them to adopt the IPv6 in their products and services as well.

A second policy option is to carefully evaluate existing policies and regulations for protocol and more importantly obstacles that would prevent or discourage people from deploying IPv6. A local IPv6 task force

could provide great venue to discuss, identify any issues and to discuss solutions that would be satisfactory to the objection for all stakeholders involved leading to a widespread adoption and use of IPv6.

Finally, we also discussed the continuation of the IPv6 Best Practice forum itself, and more importantly any area where is we think that this future work could focus on. We think that the intersessional work and tangible outcomes produced are a current contribution to the human institutional capacity building and the document we have the comments which were well received by the community and several stakeholders have submitted comments in support. We would like the IGF to continue this work to the 2016 session. More specifically we would like to suggest to focus on the economic decision making process that's behind the decision to deploy IPv6. We feel that the potential financial impact of IPv6 adoption is a key factor for the decision of many businesses and other stakeholders make and further studying and documenting this mechanism could be a great contribution to achieve the goals of the global deployment of IPv6 and finally in Connecting the Next Billion users.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much. This idea of exploring the economic incentives of IPv6 implementation for next year, it may be a way forward.

Before we open the floor for questions from the audience, are there any panelists that would like to react to this -- what a surprise! Please.

>> VINT CERF: First of all, it is really an important topic. We need IPv6. I hope that the report make it is clear that we need to have duel stack if we're going to have a fully connected network at least until we finally get everyone up and running on IPv6, you're saying yes, that's good to hear.

The second point, the Internet of Things is going to drive this demand, as that tidal wave hits that will drive incentive as well. That's important and this does not -- this is very important to understand.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you.

Another question from Dr. Pepper.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: A quick comment.

If we think of the IPv6 deployment and adoption, three legs to the stool, right, one is that the devices, and as pointed out, there is no new devices or machine to machine things that are being deployed that don't have -- they're not V6 capable.

The second though, it is the networks, right? It is not just the public networks but it absolutely is -- it is the private networks, government networks, enterprise networks, the incentives and the point of getting governments to do it themselves first can be a huge driver. It is not until those two things underway, that really it is the third leg of the stool that will pull and drive the broader adoption and that's the applications and the things up the stack that have to convert.

Some of the application providers have already done that. Many, many have not. It's the chicken and egg issue. Crack the first two, then pull through, have compelling content providers and application providers convert, that will create sort of the critical mass that's going to accelerate further.

I'm optimistic, but I'm very impatient. I call -- I call myself an impatient optimist on this one.

>> (Laughter).

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

Any other reactions from the panel before we move to the audience?

We have a question from the floor, please, start by introducing yourself.

>> XIAODONG LI: I'm Xiaodong Li. I'm a professor for Chinese Academy.

I want to add a comment for that IPv6 deployment, of course the IPv6 deployment is important for the next billion users. It is very important of how to deploy that IPv6. The first comment, it is, you know, I can remember the mystery of four years ago, the allocation, the work, now there is still some IPv4 addressed for the IPV, before the transition, but maybe it will be out next year. It is a very good time to evaluate if that IPv6 should be deployed next year.

The second comment, you know, now the price for IP is expensive, it is $10 to $12 U.S.A. It is higher than the minimum price.

Even with .com, it is about $10 U.S. dollars. How expensive for the users can be accepted? 10, 20, 30? If that cannot buy an address in $50 U.S. dollars, I cannot accept it. It would be an important thing for us to deploy the IPv6.

Another common issue, I don't think that IPv6 is unique factors for the next billion users. But it is a very important thing, but not a unique one.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

Would you like to react to that?

>> MARCO HONEWONIG: A response to Dr. Pepper, we put such focus on the coordination, to align the effort between the players.

And in the response to the gentleman, I think that you raise a very important point regarding the price of IPv4 which is why we suggest the further work on the economic aspects that drive the decision.

To your comment, to clarify the status of the small pool that's left of the IPv4, it has ran out, there is no others available. Like I said, we hope next year that we are allowed to look into the economics of IPv6.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you.

We have another question from the gentleman on the left.

Please introduce yourself

>> AUDIENCE: I'm a consultant for German Government to introduce IPv6. One of the governments which do it for themselves.

I have a comment, perhaps it is not a key factor to bring people in the Internet, the IPv6, it is important but not key factor. From my perspective, it will be the key factor to a huge part of economic sectors in the countries to provide machine to machine connection in the next decade.

The question is somehow should we change the title of this to connecting that next 100 billion machines?

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

We'll take the following question and perhaps close the queue for now and then redistribute the questions before we move to the next Best Practice.

Please, introduce yourself.

>> DAWIT BEKELE SERBESSA: I'm a director of the Africa Bureau of The Internet Society.

My comment is with regards to what Marco said, I think there was recommendation on what governments should do. What about the other stakeholders? I know for example the Internet Society led an initiative a few years back to promote content, that content within IPv6 with the IPv6 and what are the next things that are recommended for other stakeholders to have more content available on IPv6?

Thank you

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

I think -- -- I think Dr. Pepper wanted to react.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Sorry. It is the Pepper and Vint thing.

>> (Laughter)

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I mentioned the forecast, it goes to the point of machine to machine and relates to something earlier about the Digital Divide.

With the forecast, what we're seeing, it is that by 2019 there is 10.5 billion IP-enabled devices connected to the Internet and billions more in addition that won't necessarily, you know, like the chips with no IP addresses, but what's important here, it relates to the broader session of Connecting the Next Billions 43% of all IP addresses in 2019, that's the global average, some countries it will be like Korea 72%, Europe on average, 50%, U.S., 58%.

There is, I fear, an emerging new Digital Divide in machine-to-machine devices being connected.

What we're forecasting is that in Latin America it is only 31% of things connected and Africa 17%, India, 13%. If indeed these new types of devices will add real value because of the positive sides of the Internet of Things with all kinds of applications for things like food security, water security, disease detection, we can't afford a new emerging third version of the Digital Divide in the Internet of Things and machine-to-machine devices.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: You wanted to react, please.

>> VINT CERF: I want to reinforce this observation.

It may be that you will end up with -- with skipping over the history that other countries have lived through with regard to Internet. This is kind of happening when you watch people getting online with the mobile and a smartphone, they're passing over 30 years of history in other parts of the world.

One possible scenario in response to what Dr. Pepper mentioned, it is that the devices that are available on the market may come with IPv6 built in because you can't get one that doesn't have that capability. Then the question will be whether it has any utility at all. If there is no network capacity to make use of that kind of protocol it won't serve in the same way as it would when fully connected to the rest of the net. It may be that we'll see a more uniform adoption of this set of enabled devices simply because they're the only things available.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

Susan, then we'll move to the next Best Practice theme, please.

>> SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you.

Briefly to respond to the audience's question.

In the paper we not only provide the Best Practices that were mentioned for governments but we also canvassed Best Practices per stakeholder group. So I would encourage you to check the document out because it is a pretty robust document. We do cover all groups, including businesses as well.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

It was a very good discussion following the presentation on Best Practices.

I would like to move to the next theme, Best Practices for establishing successful IXPs. A small team worked on these Best Practices, and here today we have Malcom Hutty from Lynx and Jane Coffin.

>> JANE COFFIN: Thank you. Thank you.

You mentioned our small, capable team, not sitting with me here today are Guy Hernandes, Kyle Smith and others who were core to that team, and Malcolm, of course.

The intersessional work that we undertook formed a strong team of people, very important to this human aspect, yes, who spent time discussing the issues and more importantly listening to each other over six months on monthly, almost weekly calls over the last two months and through a survey done by the IX federation which was very helpful.

These Best Practices should be viewed as setting the stage for establishing enabling environments, to establish successful IXPs, Internet exchange points. Like the IPv6 team, our Best Practice report is not meant as a how-to on the technology, not a how-to to build an IXP, but they're a baseline and a foundation related to enabling environments to establish IXPs. These Best Practices complement the excellent IGF workshops that have been held since 2007 by colleagues like Bill Woodcock and others. The successful work is done around the world to establish the IXPs and level them up. This is a framework to look at those environments. Simply to summarize our Best Practice report focuses on the role and benefits of IXPs, lowering costs, increasing quality of service, increasing competition, building local technical communities and forming partnerships.

Identification of main stakeholders and roles, IXP operators, coordinator, technical community, government, regional associations and experts, environmental constraints, challenges and opportunities, power, human capacity, policy and regulatory challenges, how to shift those challenges into opportunities to build out Internet exchange points and a robust Internet ecosystem. Indicators of successful IXPs, growth, peer, locally relevant content being built and the development of more local technical experts.

Case studies and reference documents and links to helpful materials are contained in the report, and we know that during the Best Practices forum session yesterday we had excellent questions from colleagues from Afghanistan, from -- with remote, local experts who helped amplify questions that developing countries and emerging markets do have. How to develop that community of interest and those IXPs.

Key policy messages articulated in the report. This is not by any means final. There are a lot more that could be articulated.

IXPs do not provide international transit connectivity directly. A need for an IXP is driven by local and market conditions. No IXP is the same around the world, the communities are similar but different.

IXPs need time to mature. It can take two to six to seven years to develop one just depending on the local circumstances.

Neutrality is essential. Location management of that particular aspect on neutrality, that's super critical.

IXPs are a piece of the puzzle, not a single solution. Internet traffic is not an accurate measure of success in an IXP.

There are licensing and policy issues as well that we articulated and we know that there is more work that can be done on the issues.

To summarize, IXPs are not a Panacea, a magic solution, but they're part of the value chain. What's the nexus between the best or good practices as Dr. Pepper said in Sustainable Development and in Connecting the Next

Billion, how do we accelerate, speed up that connection? We have seen a formula that's worked for targeted development and that formula is building connectivity, the infrastructure. Building communities, the people, the stakeholders, the capacity development, the training, the face-to-face, online training and the policies that enable them, bottom-up governance, local and national government and other factor. This works through partnerships with people.

We have seen that through the Sustainable Development process, the Sustainable Development Goals process in the United Nations and this is a way that we can enable that process for development and through building human trust networks, it takes people, seeing each other eye to eye, our colleagues on the CSIRTS team articulated that well. This is critical, building the human trust networks. We have an opportunity to strengthen and amplify and accelerate Connecting the Next Billion and the final billions.

With respect to IXP good practices, what's next? We offer a caveat that, again, all countries are different, but we think there is a lot more to do with focus on some of the key challenges that have been articulated, questions raised, for example, landlocked countries, small island developing states, countries that have satellite connectivity almost solely, how do we reboot the IXPs that are dormant.

Thank you very much. We'll keep it short. Those are some of the aspects of our report, the issues we have identified and a formula we think is helpful for Sustainable Development.

Thank you very much.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Jane.

Now I would like to open it for questions from the panel or from the audience.

We're a little late on schedule, and you have to leave, please.

>> VINT CERF: I'm hurting myself, I understand.

Just a question about -- IXPs and the content distribution networks, the two have some relationship and in some cases an IXP is useful as a CDN and that also has benefits.

>> JANE COFFIN: Thank you. That was in the report and articulated in the Best Practice forum and in a workshop today, very important factor, CDNs are attracted by IXPs and it starts this visitor virtual cycle of the Internet economic ecosystem, more CDNs, content, up take, more use, lower prices, more user, more up take, more use.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

Since we're a little late on the schedule, apologies, but then we'll move directly to the last Best Practice absolutely on countering abuse women online.

Please, first.

>> WIM DEGEZEUE: Thank you. I'm a consultant with the IGF Secretariat, specifically to help the Best Practice forum only IXPs and IPv6.

An observation, a personal observation, that's accounting for the two ones I have been working with, but I think it is for all, this discussion, it is here around the table, we're focusing very much on the Best Practice document, the Best Practices we have collected. I think something very important also is to look at the process that went before that. My personal feeling is that during those six months we -- when I say we, me as a consultant and colleague consultants together with the coordinator, we were obliged to reach out to people, experts, that are normally not attending IGF meetings, that are normally not involved in the IGF process and I think that's been valuable, that's a valuable part of the end document that's there, that's based on people that now cooperate on something that's produced by the IGF that normally are not involved. I think that Susan,

Michael said it -- Marco said it clearly, we had discussions on the list, we were obliged to say it to the technical people, normally, they're so happy to discuss hours and hours on IPv6 in the technical meetings and communities to say again we have to say the same thing but in a language that those people of IGF that will understand. Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

We have one additional question from George Sadowsky.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: A comment more than a question: I didn't think of the CDN complement but I thought of root servers, shadows and root servers and other commercial issues that may come up and may benefit from the colocation. Are you finding do you have any evidence on the IXPs, the nature of the organizations of the IXPs that are formed public, private, for profit, not-for-profit, governmental, non-governmental, et cetera?

>> JANE COFFIN: Yes. Non-profit bottom up IXPs from a non-commercial nature, commercial, governmental, others. There is a mix across the board we have found, and this was articulated well today in a workshop. Bottom-up are the most sustainable and most successful; top-down, it is difficult. It doesn't mean when there is a partnership with a government saying that is important for our economy, let's do it, it is the partnerships that are critical, working together with the technical community and the stakeholders.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Jane.

Now I would like to turn to Jac Kee who led the Best Practice Forum on Countering Abuse Against Women Online, a very successful session this morning. It was absolutely on fire.

If you could share a few thoughts, a few findings from the groups and ideas for the future before we move to the conclusion with Vint.

Please.

>> JAC KEE: This is the first year of the BPF. We spent nine months gathering a community of stakeholders through a mix methodology of talking about the issue of online abuse and gender based violence.

We had virtual meetings, we had used open and digital platforms, survey, receiving input from 56 respondents from 25 countries, case studies from different countries, from individuals, multistakeholder communities and a contention multimedia campaign.

We produced a document. I won't go into it, but I want to look at some things specific in the production of the document covering the topic of the definition, the underlying factor, the impact, the consequences to individuals, communities, some emerging responses, solutions, strategies, we're not good or best yet, we're at the moment of emerging. Looking at public sector, private sector, community led initiatives and intergovernmental initiatives facilitating multistakeholder participation. I want to share some of the related insights, the question of access, because of the focus there.

If you can just bear with me, I'll have to read, I hope that's okay.

Although great strides were made to improve around the world, this has resulted in the increased use of technology to infringe Human Rights online, reducing the Internet's potential for development. This includes the increasingly recognized and documented issue of online abuse and gender based violence which is the focus of this work.

Online abuse and gender based violence is understand as linked to Human Rights and the violence broadly which is a manifestation of correlations between inequality between women and men leading to discrimination

again women by men and the prevention of the full advancement of the women rides. This is from the declaration.

In addition to existing structural inequality and nondiscriminatory and the decision making over the technology development are all factors that are playing a part in the manifest takings online and through the use of ICTs, this is disproportionately affect women on online interactions. Online abuse and gender-based violence can limit women's ability to take advantage of the opportunities that ICTs provide for the full realization of the women's Human Rights and access to exacerbate the gender digital gap and violate Human Rights and reproduce and reconfirm gender stereotype. It prevents women to access justice and online and off line and lack of effective, timely remedies to address the issue and obstacles faced in collecting evidence related to them.

It also effected and impacted women in different ways depending on the context and intersectional factor, age, income, sexuality, this is where access gaps play a role. For example, women in rural contexts face multiple challenges in terms of access to the Internet, including access to available, affordable infrastructure, importantly different gender norms applying with who is prioritized for using the technology and the existing disparity on income and neutrality.

As a result, digital device effect women more than men in rural context and further women in rural context may be subjected to greater social and cultural surveillance that can result in far greater impact and harm in incidents of online abuse and violence.

When compounded with existing gap in access to and control over technology, in also significantly impacts the capacity to take action and to access redress.

Because the root cause of online abuse and gender based violence is discrimination and inequality it is impossible to address this without also addressing the access gap on the basis of gender. It begins by locating the gap within social, cultural, economic and political context.

Conversely, it is impossible to address gender disparity in access to participation in and decision making over Internet development and governance without addressing the issue of online violence.

Online abuse and gender based violence. We had a good discussion in the workshop this morning. We looked at in terms of the challenge of the definitions, how do you actually pin this down, we looked at the tensions between freedom of expression, anonymity with the need to look at this issue and the measures needed and the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders and this included a range of practices from digital literacy and awareness raising to better understanding and balling of the different rights and interests to utilizing the existing law and more effective ways to greater commitment by Human Rights standards and the collective creation of better standards and behavior and communication ethics. There is no simple solution to this complex and changing issue. Different sectors, actor, stakeholders, they need to come together to understand, conduct more research, collect data and develop solutions in a way that's transparent, that's consul active of users, including the Civil Society and participatory that could respond to the issue to provide access to justice, redress, remedy to those that face them. As well as to develop a free, open Internet that enables, promotes, respects the Human Rights of all, including the Human Rights of women.

So, some recommendations specifically to the BPF is that there was really a recognition in seeing the value of the BPF, the facilitating of the multistakeholder conversations, this topic is key, we're seeing a lot more interest and recognition that we really need to look at this now and it requires the kind of participation, various different stakeholders and the BPF is a good vehicle to kind of -- good and timely to facilitate this to some extent, there was a need to continue the work, but the focus on looking at good practices in solutions and responses.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much. Thank you for offering as well some options for the future for the way forward.

You wanted to add a few words, please.

>> SUBI CHATUVERDI: Thank you.

Thank you jack, Andre, the entire community to make sure that this BPF actualized. When we started out two years ago it was a response to paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda to look at IGF and to look at intersessional work and how it is that we can create value for all stakeholders, be it women and youth. I want to briefly respond to the question first that was raised earlier about how we can amplify youth participation by this young gentleman behind me.

It is important that you are here. It is important that you are speaking with us at this table and it is important that you are asking the questions. Both when it comes to women pain youth and marginalized communities, being there at the decision making table, so when we're Connecting the Next Billion, connecting them is the first step, when we started out with the BFF, as key issue to look at, problem definition and was to look at violence and what happens when you bring young girls, young women online and then they are in an environment where there is a lot of online violence and abuse. Do they come back to that environment? What is it that we can do in terms of affirmative action as a community? Why is it that this is not just a gender based issue, why is this not just a Human Rights, a women issue, when we talk about the robustness of the Internet, the first thing we try to do was also to bring in stakeholders from across communities to look at how is it that each of them could contribute, whether access to legal recourse, whether it is access to technology, and what is it that we could do in each of our country experiences.

Jack mentioned that there were examples taken from state interventions, examples from different countries where they had different experiences. I strongly urge all of you to go back and visit the BPF website and to look at the fantastic document that's been produced and with the hope that we'll be able to make this document a constant, where we will look at more Best Practices, good practices, and to keep adding to the work that's already happened.

Also to afflict the complacent who believe that there is no issue, there is no problem. One of the biggest successes is to mainstream the issue and to clearly create more awareness about the challenges that occur when we bring young people online, whether it is bad, legally framed laws which look at mitigating unsolicited communication but end up sending young women to jail for posting content which is constitutionally valid.

The kind of challenges that you would not imagine that are keeping people from getting connected and this is also with what happens off line in developing countries and emerging economies, the same kind of behavior exerts online.

The kind of way forward we're looking at is constant engagement and more solutions and also engagement from across stakeholder groups.

Thank you for your participation.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

Do we have questions from panelists, from the floor? Any reactions? Comments?

Please.

>> WOUT DENATRIS: I wanted to talk about the process. I think we had six excellent examples of how BPFs can work, but I would like to stress that instead what happened last year, is that we -- I think I speak for many, that we have an evaluation of the internal process also. I think there are a few points that could be better and we all agree on that sort of. That's not to discuss here, but not to forget it when the MAG comes together again and we have the chance to discuss the process of the whole BPF.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

I think definitely the question of the methodology, the continuously fine-tuning it year after year, it is critical, a related issue, of course, is the resources, the resources of the IGF Secretariat, the experts such as those that have contributed, making this possible, that we have the resources to continue intersessional activities.

Any -- yes, please, on the right. Introduce yourself.

>> JAN: Thank you. I'm Jan, and I work with APC.

I'd like to commend the IGF for undertaking the process of this particular Best Practice forum. I think six years ago when trying to have these conversations they really didn't happen at all. It is great to see not only within the space here, but the number of workshops which are really addressing this issue, not narrowly looking at online abuse but also looking at the intersections with other kinds of issues.

Just the last point in terms of the process, I think it also will be important to look to see at how intersessional work can be more permanent within regional IGFs because that's a value of this kind of work to bring regional specificity so that we can all develop regional specific responses.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you.

Another question?

>> ARSENE TUNGALI BAGUMA: Thank you so much.

I'm an IGF ISOC member to the IGF. I'm glad to be here today.

A quick comment on the Best Practice forum on women and online violences. I would like to just say there is a lot going on in Africa especially from where I am from, from the Democratic Republic of Congo, the same issue of women's participation and women's access to the same privileges as men, it is still going on in Africa. When talking about object line abuse, there is an issue for women to access first education and women are not accessing the education, they're not able to access or to even think of being digitally literate. Those are the things that I keep on -- that women are facing violences.

If your organizations, if the people, if they can keep on encouraging women to have access to education women participating as well on all of those heavy access to everything that's men not having access to, that can help to reduce the violences offline and online.

Thank you.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you.

I think we'll have the leaders perhaps react to that very quickly and then Vint will kindly conclude the session before he has to disappear unfortunately.

Would you like to react to the comments?

>> JAC KEE: I couldn't agree with you more.

I think that's exactly what we were also finding, that you really need to locate it within existing inequalities and how technology play as role. It really is looking at the interrelation between how technology can actually empower or disempower and either address discrimination or sort of exacerbate them.

Different contexts, I think -- I could go on and talk about about -- I guess a lot of different cases and experiences. Yeah. I really appreciate you bringing that point up.

Thank you very much.

>> CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much.

Jack, Subi, all of you, all that have worked on this very important piece.

I would like to ask -- we really have -- I'm very sorry. We have to wrap up.

I would ask Vint to help us conclude the session with a few thoughts about Connecting the Next Billion, of course. The different themes we heard about that feed into the priority Connecting the Next Billion and also the role of the IGF in reaching the targets. Please.

>> VINT CERF: Thank you. I do have very little time.

Let me try to summarize a few things.

I'm getting feedback. Sorry.

I need to -- yeah.

All right. Now I'm back online.

First of all, the discussion leads me to think that we have mislabeled this forum, it should be the Internet stewardship forum, everything you talked about it seems to me has a great deal to with stewardship and making the Internet continue to be a constructive environment for everyone.

Second, I want to observe that this notion of Connecting the Next Billion is really a funny concept. It is as if you were saying we're only going to connect the next billion in a certain location or something. This is a distributed connection and it means that the next billion will be coming from many, many different parts of the world and they'll be connected by many different means. So none of this is uniform, and it is a continuous kind of process. We're aided in this effort by the fact that technology keeps changing and costs keep coming down, the speeds keep going up. The consequence of that, it is that everyone, not just the next billion but all of the billions that are already online should encounter an extremely useful experience in the Internet environment.

The question on emerging trends, it should be obvious by now that we're seeing more wireless availability, more speed, more frequencies available, satellites and the like. In fact, outside, I hope you'll visit the O3B Networks tent to see what's possible with the lower cost and satellites, we have 400 megabits down.

The point of literacy, it is vital. When we talk about infrastructure, it is not about the technology, but all of the things that make the Internet useful, which includes access to electricity among other things.

The problem of illiteracy must be overcome, and only will be overcome by education as will many other deficiencies.

Accessibility, it was what brought up many times, it is a broad topic. Getting access to the Internet if you have a disability is a big challenge and that's partly a technological problem. Some of what we heard about particularly the last item on violence against women, this is a societal problem, this is not a technology problem. This is a societal problem and changing societies is something that's hard to do, it is vital, but it is not just a matter of throwing a switch or adding a new piece of software somewhere.

In terms of catalyzing the effort that's already gone on, the notion of intersessional work is fundamental, it is vital. We can't get enough done if we only meet once a year. I want to congratulate the groups that have been making it possible to make progress in between these annual meetings. I think we should be thinking also about the regional and national IGF meetings which have sprung up on their own as another source of energy and ideas and initiative.

In terms of what the IGF can do, in this particular group, what they can do, in helping to move forward on making Internet available and useful for everyone, one is to work on framing the issues, the challenges which

you have done admirably with these six topics. Let me ask to you do one more thing, you cannot understand the problems and you cannot understand the solutions until you understand the incentives of the parties who must act in order to solve the problems.

So spend some time analyzing the incentives, the lack thereof for parties who have to decide to do something whether it is deploying IPv6, finding business model for deploying new technology for access, whether it is tackling the societal issues that have already been alluded to, analyze the incentives and find ways to create incentives to get the outcomes that you're looking for.

Reporting, this is something that's vital. What works and why? You must not skip the why part. If you report to someone this worked here it may not work there unless the conditions happened to be conducive. We must understand why things work so that we know when to adopt these suggestions and when to consider alternatives.

There is something that I had been told about today having to do with legal frameworks to allow various things to happen, specifically with regard to law enforcement and for improving electronic commerce and the like, there are so many different rules and so many different countries that all of us are faced with, there is nothing uniform about the world that we live in, nothing uniform about the Internet's environment, understanding what the variations are in legal frameworks all around the world can turn out to be a very, very useful tool for figuring out what each company, for example, can do in each country in order to forward the objective of making the Internet useful.

The idea of codifying what the rules are in various places, just so people can know what is allowed, what's not, it is another example of useful data gathering.

Let me just finish up by saying that this particular effort is possibly the most constructive one I have seen come out of the IGF in the ten years of IGF's existence. I hope that you will continue this work between now and the next time we meet in Mexico and that you will let all of us know what we can do to contribute to this effort.

Thank you.

>> H.E. BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you.

I would like to thank all of you, particularly Robert, Vint, the leaders of the Best Practice forum, all that contributed to this document. This is a collective work, one that should continue and we're encouraged and challenged by the presentations that were made and I think one of the topics to be discussed in preparation for Mexico, for the Mexico meeting. It is the streams of work that should be continued, that's strengthened and to identify other streams of work that should also be embedded in order to improve the output that we're assigning to the world out of this IGF.

Thank you very much.

I declare this session closed.

Thank you.

Enhancing Cybersecurity and Building Digital Trust

The following are the outputs of the real-time captioning taken during the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in João Pessoa, Brazil, from 10 to 13 November 2015. 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 event, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

***

>> SUBI CHATURVEDI: Good morning, everyone. Thank you so much for joining us today. We should be ready to start in about five minutes. Please take your seats. Thank you.

Good morning, everyone. Once again, a very warm welcome. Welcome to this city and very important session, Cybersecurity and digital trust. We think this team speaks to the heart of everything Internet, everything that we hold dear and for the future of the Internet. We have a fantastic panel of speakers today. And we hope to have vigorous sustained consistent engagement from all the in-room participants, and those of us who are going to be joined online. We don't think -- there are online virtual participants, so hold on to your questions and comments.

I'm delighted to have my colleague Dominique Lazanski, and together, we are going to be joined, guided, shepherded by two excellent moderators. May I call upon our chair from the host country, Paulo Sergio Carvalho, who heads the cyber defense center to open the panel. Over to you, sir.

>> PAULO SERGIO CARVALHO: Good morning.

(no English interpretation).

Which will approach the following topics, enhancement of Cybersecurity and building digital trust. I'd like to greet all those here, and I'd like to thank for the invitation to open this main session. I'd like to say it's an honor and a pleasure to be here, and take part in this relevant discussion, relevant for all the countries in the world. Thank you very much.

From now on, I declare open the session this morning.

As the cyberspace expands itself, adding ever more networks, we also have an increase in the risks inherent to the use of this space. Consequently, an increase in an improvement of Cybersecurity is required, in order to protect the space, and to contribute to its use with freedom and ethics.

At the same time, Cybersecurity shows very clearly that the success of this process depends basically on an intense collaborative action. It requires building and maintaining trust relationships among all the parties involved. And like in any other trust relationship, we need initiatives to bring people closer, mutual knowledge and convincing demonstrations of respect to people's values and rights.

This takes time. Cybersecurity is sustained by technological devices, supported by exact concepts. On the other hand, this trust is based on subjective values.

At first these concepts may seem incompatible, but based on the lessons learned resulting from the work from the several institutions that operate in this area, I think that these concepts are inexorably linked when it comes to cyberspace.

There is an attempt to make these concepts compatible, and this leads us to many questions. Many of these questions are open and will be discussed here.

This panel is no trivial matter. I say this based on the day-to-day results conducted by the Ministry of Defense, side by side with representatives from all sectors we collaborate with in order to improve cyberspace security. With all representatives of this sector, Brazilians and people from other nations, we are building and improving the trust relationships. This morning's discussions therefore will be extremely valuable not only for the people who are here in this audience with us, for people who are anywhere in the world, and for people who will see the files of IGF 15 in the future.

Now, you are invited to moderate the panel, Mr. Wout de Natris, and Mr. Blaker, you have the floor.

>> PAUL BLAKER: My name is Paul Blaker, from the Government of the United Kingdom. And throughout this morning, with my colleague Wout de Natris, we will be moderating the conversation up until

lunchtime. We are both sure it is going to be an interesting, informative and valuable discussion on enhancing Cybersecurity and building digital trust.

Before we get into the conversation, let me say a few words about how we plan to manage the agenda this morning.

So we have divided the conversation into five sections. First, we would like to try to identify the issues. Second, we will talk about the kinds of capacities that we need. Then we will talk about capacity-building. Then we will go to multistakeholder collaboration, and finally we will like to look at the next steps.

We are very fortunate to have a really great range of speakers here from many different backgrounds, bringing many different perspectives to the conversation. And just looking around the table, I feel very privileged to see so much expertise and experience in the room. I think it's going to be a really good and rich conversation. Some of our panelists may have to leave a little early, and there may be one or two who are not able to join us until later.

So the approach we will be taking is that for each of the five agenda items, we will be asking four or five panelists to make contributions of around two to three minutes.

After each of the agenda items, we will invite comments from the floor, and any comments or questions from the remote participants.

But to start with then, let's move on to the first question, which is around identifying the issues. There are two questions which have been posed. First of all, what are the critical challenges in establishing resiliency and trust from the different stakeholders' perspectives? What are the key issues and challenges for a secure and sustainable, free and open cyberspace, and how can international cooperation be enhanced?

I'd like first of all to invite David van Duren from the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise to speak for a couple minutes on those questions. Thank you, David. The floor is yours.

>> DAVID VAN DUREN: Thank you. So the question is, what are the key issues? And speaking from the perspective of the Netherlands, I'm also from the Netherlands, the key issue is we are vulnerable. In the Netherlands, for example, 80 percent of the people is doing online banking, 60 percent Internet shopping, 95 percent use social media. 94 percent use more than one PC. So we are very dependent on ICT in our daily lives these days.

What are challenges, what challenges do we face? I think if you look at the past years, the scope of cyber has been broadening from Cybercrime to Cybersecurity to cyberspace. Also, actors involved are increasing. This means we need a comprehensive approach. This comprehensive approach should include resilience, response, recovery, and all kind of elements like knowledge, awareness-raising, detection, prosecution, crisis management, etcetera, etcetera.

This is very important, this broad approach should not only have a national dimension but a strong international dimension as well.

Also, because what we do on a national level gets more and more integrated with what is happening on the international level or to say differently, national is international per se.

I think the main challenge is building, is to building trust between the relevant multistakeholder parties. And yes, it's hard building trust. Like one person once said, trust takes years to develop and can be destroyed in seconds.

Conditions of public/private cooperation, public/private partnerships, are having a shared interest, trust, a base of equality and getting results.

Within the Netherlands, the partnerships were pretty good I think, and what helps is that, for example, critical infrastructure is very important, it's an end to private organization, but also there is a culture of dialogue. There is not a top/down management approach, and that helps in the multistakeholder setting.

For the Netherlands, it's a challenge to make the next step to secure free, open and secure cyberspace. This means we need a movement, movement from public/private partnership to public/private participations. And challenges for public-private participation are finding this mutual and individual interests, finding the right balance between regulation and self-regulation, cooperation and also information sharing. This means having a common understanding of how and under what circumstances to share information.

The second movement is moving from structures to networks and Coalitions. Like five years ago, in the Netherlands we started with all kind of building up all kind of structures. Now they are in place and now it's about working together. And the step is not only working together but building a Coalition of certain topics or certain problems.

It's also the movement from being aware to becoming skillful, and from having a national focus to being internationally focused; national is international.

And last, having a risk-based approach. Then last, if we talk about international cooperation, like I said, actually we should also, we should talk about international participation. Public/private participation works if people really work together. So this is what we do for example at the GCE. The Global Forum of Cyber Expertise is about capacity-building on a worldwide scale. It is about working together. It is an informal Forum that was launched at GCCS in April 2015. The core concept is initiatives for parties within the multistakeholder setting to work together on specific topics, to share best practices. Examples of topics are awareness-raising, responsible disclosure, Cybercrime, etcetera.

On these topics, practical results, best practices are achieved and shared with the global community. So again, to conclude, the key of international cooperation is participation. Again, key elements are identifying shared interests, bring transparence, trust, work together on the base of equality and most important get results. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. I invite Willian Check, Vice-President of NCTA to speak. Thank you.

>> WILLIAN CHECK: Thank you. Good morning. I'm speaking from the perspective of ISPs and private industry, and a key challenge is the fact that Cybercrime doesn't have any borders. This makes it difficult for law enforcement to be able to address cyber crimes. A second issue is something I call economic asymmetry of Cybercrime.

The cost to defend against Cybercrime is disproportionately larger than the cost of performing the Cybercrime or attack. For example, for little money, you can get into the Cybercrime business, but to defend against it is much more costly.

Often, economic incentives for implementing the necessary security are misaligned. For example, some technical approaches to reduce cyber attacks will benefit traffic flowing out of a network, but not on your own network.

Because of that, the financials of Cybersecurity are often difficult to justify within an organization. That is a challenge. Another issue is education. It's critical that people, companies, countries, have the tools and understanding needed to address Cybersecurity issues. Education is one of the most significant challenges.

In the U.S., with a partnership between private sector and the Government, something called a Cybersecurity framework was developed. Notably, it's a voluntary framework for private industry, based on existing cyber standards, guidelines and practices for reducing cyber risk to critical infrastructure.

It's applicable to telecommunications networks, but also other critical infrastructure systems, and it's not one size fits all, but the ability to tailor it to fit the need.

We also recognize that Cybersecurity is everyone's problem and there is no silver bullet. Cybersecurity is no different than any other security problem, other than it happens in the cyber world.

The entry point for cyber threats is still at the intersection between the cyber world and the physical world. So we need to do a few things to address that. One, raise everyone's awareness that they need to take preventative measures when interacting with the cyber world. That is no different than making sure that, for example, someone doesn't sneak in behind you into a secured building.

Second, we need the designers and developers of cyber products and services to think about security from the beginning. Thirdly, we need everyone to understand that the Internet and the cyber world are potentially dangerous places and that no one is policing all of the traffic all the time; therefore, not to connect a critical system to the Internet in an insecure way.

This is where I think organizations that promote developing cyber best practices and collaboration are critical. We will be talking about multistakeholder organizations later. But I did want to raise one multistakeholder organization, M3AAWG, which stands for messaging malware and mobile anti abuse working group. It's a group of ISPs, E-mail service providers, mobile network operators, telecommunications companies and infrastructure vendors, and anti-spam vendors, basically a group of security experts that get together on a global basis to talk about best practices, Whitepapers, and really an opportunity for professionals to share abuse informations and their experience with peers.

There is a lot of challenges with Cybersecurity. But by talking in this Forum is a great first step for global cooperation. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. The next panelist is Mr. Bob Hindon of ISOC. The floor is yours.

>> BOB HINDON: Thank you very much. I think so far I'm pretty much agreeing with what has been said. But I think I have a slightly different cut at it. I've been involved in the Internet since the very early days, and even did some early security work.

This is a topic that many people have opinions on, and but there are a few comprehensive solutions. There is no simple solutions. There is not one solution that will do everything. Of course, the Internet is not static. It's not like the phone network that hasn't changed a lot.

It evolves every day. So, the security challenges, Cybersecurity challenges are going to, it's a moving target, both the good guys trying to protect individuals and the bad guys. It's not, you know, it requires I think a new kind of thinking. We don't have, we don't, I don't know that we have much a really good model for this based on our previous experiences.

I'll go through some specific topics, because all of the parts have pluses and minuses. We have encryption. It's a very good technology to keep your data private. Other people can't read it. If you are worried about pervasive monitoring, then encrypt your data. But there is also, there is legitimate reasons why, like the work that he mentioned about doing spam filtering. How would you look at the inside of the E-mail, if it's encrypted?

We all know the risks of trying to share keys or having back doors, that's not the way to have real security.

We have identity and trust. How do you know who you are talking to? Can you trust the other side? I think this is not, I don't think we need to go as far as knowing who the person is, but I think it's more important to know that you are talking to the same entity or person that you talked to before, so you have some assurance that it's consistent.

We want to be private, we want to be anonymous, but we have seen recently with some of the gamer gate stuff, how attacks on women largely, you know, if you can do this in a anonymous way, it's very hard to stop it.

And I don't know what the, where the trade-off is there, but it's like many of these, it's a difficult solution. We have a variety of bad actors. We have some states sponsored. We have individuals, we are seeing large scale denial of service attacks for political reasons, for commercial reasons, for I guess just being disruptive. They don't like the policy of the person or organization they are attacking.

We heard about spam. I think about this in two different categories. One is, it started with getting advertisements for stuff you don't care about. But now it's turned into a way of spreading malware doing phishing attacks.

I actually, getting an ad I didn't request is annoying, but carrying a phishing attack and clicking on some link that you thought was from your friend and having it get your computer infected, that is a more serious problem.

I think, and there is not a single entity or Government or company who is going to solve this problem. I think there are roles for governments, for network operators, for companies, but also for individuals. I think we all need to be more responsible about this. We need to be careful, when we use our systems, that they are the latest ones, have the latest patches and running, having security built in them, not keeping old unsupported things around that easily get infected.

One thing that I think is the best sort of structure is for more collaboration between people to really talk about attacks, talk about solutions, talk about what works today, and continuing to evolve that. ISOC has a program called collaborative security which is that sort of thinking, and I think we will need to do a lot more of that before this is done.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. Now I'd like to move to our next panelist, Ambassador David Gross.

>> DAVID GROSS: Thank you for the honor and privilege of being here. I'm impressed we have such a large audience. There is obviously a lot of excellent programs going on here at IGF this morning, but obviously large numbers of people understood this is the place to be because this is the most interesting of all of the sessions this morning. I appreciate that very much.

I'm also privileged and honored to be following Bob. It's great to be on the same panel with someone who has given so much and participated so widely in the Internet, and certainly the organization that he now chairs, ISOC has been an extraordinarily important part of the Internet ecosystem and working on the many of the problems we are talking about this morning.

There are some things that are easy when it comes to the issues we are talking about this morning. There are some things that are hard. Some things are so hard that I don't think they are going to be solved until we have a new technology that replaces the Internet. But that should not keep us from focusing on those things that we can and should be doing.

One of the things that I think is often overlooked and may arguably be easy, but I recognize that there are barriers, are things that individuals can do. It is extraordinary to me, and I have to say that often I'm involved in this as well, we are all human, there are so many things that we can do in enabling the technology we use both individually and in the organizations we are, to enhance our own security. There are security functions in the software. There is security things that you can do in your own home, in your own organizations that are often not done.

In so doing that, you can live a much more secure cyber life. Those are things individuals can do. They are empowered, and they are not particularly difficult. The area of cloud computing is extraordinarily important in this area.

It used to be just a few years ago, when everyone just lived on their desktop, or your PC, and you interconnected with the Internet, that you had to have all your own security. The cloud allows people to have security of the world class type, regardless of where you live, regardless of your economic circumstances. I think those proposals that would inhibit the growth of the cloud through data localization and otherwise are greatly going to have an impact on what could be a much safer cyber world.

Similarly, those who seek to have uniform technology I think often undercut Cybersecurity. The diversity of operating systems, the diversity of technologies, often are a way in which we live a safer cyber life.

The importance of this is obvious, but I would also point out that for those who are committed to Connecting the Next Billion, the next billion are not necessarily just the poor people. Rather, in all the world, including the developing, developed world, there are millions and millions of people who choose not to get online, and part of the reason they choose not to get online is their fear because of Cybersecurity. Taking these steps, making the availability, new technologies in new ways, will enhance the ability of people to get online, even those who can afford it, even those who have technically access, but who are too afraid because of what they read in the paper every day. Thank you very much.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Before we open up questions to the floor, I'd like to invite one final speaker on this agenda item, that is Mr. Rahul Gosain, Director of Data from the Government of India.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: Good morning, Excellencies and my dear friends here. Taking off from what Bob said, he made an important point that Cybersecurity is a key area where multistakeholder cooperation is required. It is not like one agency or one set of people can solve the problem.

Given that practically all of the important online services that most of us access, and the services which most of us use are provided by identities, no one stakeholder holds all the answers to all the problems. That is an important point I think.

Given that governments are ultimately held responsible by the public and are indeed accountable to the public for all security related issues, so one cannot but help underscore the central role of governments in this area. That is the constituency from which I come from, I come from the Government of India. That is why I speak from that perspective.

But given the segregated nature of the Internet, trust is central to the operation and continued growth of the Internet. Each of us must have faith that the data stored in the cloud will remain secure, and that common status transacted on line is based on enforceable contracts.

That is a very vital point. Trust is the currency of today. Digital trust is the currency of the digital world. Evidence based critical assessment of systems, institution and threats is essential to devising effective Cybersecurity strategies, and nation states could think of conducting stress tests that assess the performance of systems and processes, under various scenarios. This would be a effective way of assessing strengths and weaknesses and help determine where efforts would need to be made to move forward.

This is not saying that this is not already being done, but this could be possibly planned to be done more effectively. This is particularly crucial in assessing the resiliency of critical network infrastructure and the continued growth of Internet, if I may say so.

Such stress should be conducted at many levels beginning from the local to the national and even international levels. The interdependencies of computer networks means that the effects of Cybersecurity related event can easily percolate both upstream and downstream, meaning that broad-based tests are essential.

Effective tools to share learning from such tests has already been brought up in the discussions today. Cooperative action to implement corrective actions would go along with building trust in the digital economy.

Apart from that, I would also like to emphasize that Cybersecurity is a very important focus area for India, given our flagship based India program which depends heavily on Cybersecurity, and there is a lot of emphasis on training in Cybersecurity professionals to meet not only the current but future needs for India.

Apart from this, possibly some of the key challenges which we are facing is the rapid advancement in technology has made the world smaller, but not necessarily, the physical and political boundaries between states have sort of been blurred.

It has thrown up key legal challenges, such as determining jurisdiction, ambiguity in whether the sovereigns have power to exercise their will beyond the territorial jurisdiction, and each nation having their own set of rules; crossborder issues dealing with regard to Cybercrime has gained paramount importance.

We need to go a long way in this direction. We need to create capacity and build capacity so that there is greater awareness, number one, and then there is data preparedness to tackle these issues. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. I'd now like to open up the discussion to questions and comments from the floor. If you would like to make a contribution, please line up at the microphone in the traditional way, not the microwave unless you are hungry (chuckles).

I think while people are thinking of questions, I'd like to thank our panelists for setting a broad agenda of key issues. We heard about the importance of building trust between stakeholders, about moving from public/private partnership toward public/private participation. I find that idea very interesting.

We heard about the economic asymmetry that there is in Cybercrime, about the importance of education, a range of issues around encryption that we can talk about.

We heard about, a number of panelists speaking about individual responsibilities in this area, and also about the role of governments, importance of stress testing, the importance of crossborder cooperation. There is already a very rich and full agenda for us to think about this morning and other issues as well which I haven't mentioned.

If there are any comments from the floor, either questions to our panelists, or additional issues that you would like to put on the agenda, now is the time. Please, could you keep your interventions to one minute and please, could you make sure that you say who you are and where you come from. Thank you. Our first question. Maybe technical help with the microphone, please.

>> AUDIENCE: Can you hear me? Yeah, okay. I'm Mohit Saraswat, Internet Society Ambassador. I think first of all, I want to commend all the speakers who have raised these important points. It's important that we get into this dialogue, and ensure that those are raised. But if I interpreted correctly, there is one key issue which has been missing, is the data transfer between the consumer and the organization who are building a lot of platforms and apps.

There is too much of data transfer which is happening. While there might be a good reason for economy, for example, to position the ads better, position the product better, but at the end what happens is, I mean these data which is not required can also be used for wrong reasons.

So it is also important that we have a control on the data transfer between the consumer and the app provider, particularly when the mobile is on, and I'm not in for regulations because informed consent becomes a challenge in itself, but it's important that the multistakeholder comes together and ensure to come with a standards which has security by design in it.

That has to be enforced on the new generations of app developer. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Any further questions from the floor? Yes, sir.

>> AUDIENCE: Can I speak in Portuguese? Okay.

My name is Luccas Augusto da Cunna Silva. I study engineering at the Federal University of Alagoas, part of IGF's youth program. In keeping on with what's been said, I think the panel has brought some very important issues.

But now, we are dealing with software vulnerability. And in the databases where we see the level of vulnerability of some systems, some systems have shown a very high vulnerability system. So hackers can just access these systems' Administrator, thereby they can have access to the microphone, to the camera, to all the data and everything that you have inside a computer, notebook, for example.

So in this environment, we have to think that we need to develop a system, you are developing something like a car. When you design a car, you need to resort to technical standards, safety standards, so people can drive safely and survive.

We know that information and the virtual environment that we live in, in the Internet, leads to real damages. How far can the companies go or how far do they have a responsibility regarding information responsibility.

(no audio).

>> PAUL BLAKER: I will ask if there is any remote participation, contributions. You have the floor.

>> AUDIENCE: Hi, Mubashir Sargana from Pakistan. And my question, but I think it's a comment, I think Google, Yahoo!, Bing, they also make people vulnerable, like indexing and archiving their public data as well as private data, without even their consent. For example, if someone's data gets leaked, is posted on a Web site, someone else can easily search it out to any search engine. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. Could I ask, are there any questions or points from remote participants? (pause).

Okay. I think that is a no for now. But there will be later stages during the conversation where remote participants are welcome to make contributions.

There are three questions there, thank you, one around data transfer, one around the vulnerability of systems, and another about consent and the use of data.

Before we move on to our next topic, I wonder if any of our panelists would like to respond to any of those questions. Bob.

>> BOB HINDON: Yeah, two of the questions, comments. So, regarding data location, so my view on this, it's not very important where the data is. But it's really what happens to it, who has access to it, the controls to it, because the Internet is supposed to allow things to be in different locations. There is some delay reasons why it's good to keep it close to you, but it's not, just keeping it close to you will not make it more secure. The security problems are location independent. The bad guys know how to access stuff in any location.

The other thing about Google, Yahoo!, basically, I guess I'd say sometimes free is too expensive. When you use a free service, you are definitely, you are paying for it by your own, by sharing your own information. And if you don't, if you are not willing to do that, then don't use free services. Use a private E-mail server, where you pay money, or whatever it is, and so it's the business model of these companies who provide these free services to look at your information.

I think you can't expect them to do much more than that.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thanks.

>> WILLIAN CHECK: I think a couple interesting points here were made from some of the speakers.

Again when you look at cyber systems, it's the entry point of how attacks take place.

And the attacks take place between the cyber world and physical world. There are specific areas within the cyber environment that you will see specific areas of ingress.

And because of that, I think the point that the one question came up on security by design is terribly important. I think security by design cannot be overemphasized. It is critical for future design in software systems.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Please.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: To reinforce the point Bob made regarding free services, I saw a line outside which said succinctly, it says if you are getting it for free, then you are the product.

So, that I think says it. Apart from that, the point made regarding how a car is developed and safety standards need to be developed, and technical standards need to be developed, I would like to inform that as our colleague David had pointed out in the initiative of the Dutch in which they have a global security, Cybersecurity related conference, or like the M3AAWG, I think a lot of work has already been done in that direction.

I'm sure much more needs to be done. But the point is very well-taken, and we need to arrive at some kind of globally accepted standards of Cybersecurity, which can sort of deter any cyber attacks or any problem from the bad guys, you know, so that the products which we make to produce a more cyber secure world should be consistent and should conform to certain set of standards which are mutually agreed upon.

Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Intel.

>> AUDREY PLONK: To follow up on the standards point my colleague made, I agree on the global standards front. I would take it further to say that as has been pointed out already in the panel, Cybersecurity is a broad chapeau of issues. So having one single standard or a small set of standards that's going to cover all these issues is both impossible and unreasonable. And so you have to look across the global standards organizations that are working on technologies, horizontally, and how they are incorporating security into the standardization process.

I think it's evident that is happening with the encryption work within the ITF, it's happening within various industry-led cloud security efforts in standardization, same in the mobile space.

Because all of those platforms are different and the way that security gets built in both technically, from a feature perspective, also from a design perspective is just different across platforms, I agree they need to be globally accepted and they need to be industry-led and recognized by the broadest community possible. But we also need to recognize that there is no one-stop shopping for standards.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Very short intervention, please. Thank you.

>> CAROLYN NGUYEN: To the point of security by design, I want to add that it's not just at the part of the deployment stage, but it has to be security throughout the entire life cycle. In addition to security by design, there is also operational security and maintenance. It is important to keep that mind-set throughout the entire life cycle.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. One final intervention from Chris Painter, U.S. State Department.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: I wanted to comment on some of the larger issues too. This is not, governments do have an important role here, but governments certainly don't have the exclusive role.

I think as we, not just in standards but as we think about policies, and one transition I've seen over the last 20 years, in the last five years especially, is this issue has migrated from the technical community alone to one that is now a major policy issue for governments around the world. And what that really means is there needs to be, and there is, much more collaboration not just between governments but other stakeholders.

We very much endorse, as we did with the NIST framework which was referenced, a collaborative approach between Government, private sector and other stakeholders; in fact, a collaborative approach within governments because not all governments within their own governments talk to each other that well sometimes. It's good to have all the discussions taking place, and I've seen a real improvement in that.

That strengthens this area in a large way, because if it's just a technical community who have the expertise leading it, they don't make as much headway unless they get the political impetus, and it's happening now.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. At this point we will move on to our next agenda item, and I will hand over to my co-moderator.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Paul. My name is Wout de Natris. I'm co-moderating this session, as you heard.

We are going to move to the SS movement of the capacities, and as we all know, there are many, many initiatives, measures, best practices, standards being introduced, but do they actually do what they do, do people adopt them, and is it ever checked and ever made known?

The good example of that is that one of the participants in one of the sessions I moderated before here said we are going to boot up a wall of shame: Everybody who does not do what by now they are supposed to do, we as Government are going to publish it.

That may be a good thing or not a good thing. But notice that some people are starting to think differently about when measures should be taken or not.

We are going to do that, this discussion on the basis of a few questions just like before. The main thing is that we are going to assess the capacity, so what capabilities are essential to addressing Cybersecurity challenges and how can they be measured. That is the main theme.

We are going to do that around three questions. The first one is how do we strike the right balance between Cybersecurity and human rights including free speech. How can we create a cyberspace for start-ups, governments, without thwarting innovation, and how do we engage diversity and regional, national, linguistic and forensic challenges. The first speaker is the Minister of Information of the Government of Bangladesh.

>> H.E. JUNAID AHMED PALAK: Thank you, the host, Mr. Paulo Sergio Carvalho and the two moderators, ladies and gentlemen. I beg your pardon that I go off on my deliberations. I cannot answer all the questions because I'm leaving, sorry. Well, as you know, I'm in politics. And I'm the President of the Government of Bangladesh, but I'm not looking from the Government perspective only.

I'm looking at this only from the general point of view.

Well, to us all the Internet is like air, we breathe in and breathe out. Without that, you are not going to survive. So it probably means you need to have clean air every time.

So in terms of technology, and that technologies is already part of our daily life, and when you build the technology, trust is very important.

The agenda is well set. And here what are the problems we are facing at this moment, at this juncture of this history, there is a tendency, number one, tendency to use the cyberspace neutrally; two, encroachment beyond borders by states and individuals, also by persons.

And within the national borders, there is cyber attacks on individuals, associations, state institutions, hijacking syndrome, attacks and piracy problem. These are the other problems. Many can add more problems also.

So problems are there. So every problem has a solution, if there is a political will to.

Here if you look at the problems, then we need to have a dual approach, the approach from the international level and at the national level. So the important thing is, there is a, what somebody said, that the transfer of data to the consumers, that it's very important how you assure protection of the data. Transition from IPv4 to IPv6, this transition period, intermediary period, you have to ensure the security of the data transferred from one to another. The reliability of the hardwares and softwares is very important.

Having said that, let me come up with certain proposals. One is that we have a technological problem, how technologically we can assure that the hardware, software, these two are safe to handle. That is a technological problem.

Another is a political and legal problem, how to develop a legal social network or framework which will assure the safety of the Internet. Here, so number one, I said that to, politically we need at the global level Cybersecurity treaty to ensure safe cyberspace. Number two, we will have to agree on setting up technological standards that ensures reliability. Third, data protection technologies, solutions, it has two aspects, one is technological solutions and another, legal solutions.

Four, I want to bring on board the mass media. Mass media can come here as a watchdog, so that the cyber attacks or terrorists do not cross the fine line of human rights. So when we are looking for technological solutions and legal solutions, we have to keep in mind that we have to agree on the basics of human rights and freedom of speech, and etcetera, etcetera.

Agreeing on that, we can move forward. But if we agree on this legal and political solutions, or technological solutions, what we need is to develop a cyber literacy. Without cyber literacy, you cannot just execute the whole things. Cyber lawyers and cyber courts have to be set up and training on cyber problems should be there.

So let me conclude by saying that, well, so I stand for safe Internet. Safe Internet will be assured by legal, social solutions, technological solutions, ensuring human rights, and let us find out the cyber criminals collectively. It is not an individual fight. It is a global fight. I stand by safe Internet. Stand jointly against cyber criminals and terrorists. Let us unite to develop a global approach to ensure trust, secure cyberspace. Thank you very much.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you very much, Minister. Next we move to Marco Hogewonig, External Relations Officer at RIPE NCC in the Netherlands.

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: Thank you. One of the key challenges we see with enhancing Cybersecurity is keeping up with technology. The Internet and users that use it are continuously changing from a security perspective. The biggest risk is to fall behind. We need everybody to involve to stay firm and have an understanding of what is going on, and this works both ways.

We need policy frameworks that take into account the technical capabilities of the network, but we also need innovations and technical designs to take public policy objectives into account.

Cooperation between stakeholders and between public and private sector is key here. Not only do we have to be able to make huge reach out as expertise but more importantly to learn from each other.

The advances in the Internet of Things mean that we see nontraditional access to the Internet space. This is no longer the domain of telecoms and Internet service providers alone, but we are also working with other industries closely. Getting these people up to speed with the work that we have been doing in the past decades to improve security and trust is crucial.

Likewise, we need to be aware of their needs and challenges, and be ready to adopt our policies and methods to accommodate those needs.

Finally, we have to be aware that not all solutions lie in technical designs or technical capability of the system. One of the key capacities we think to be developed is to be able to judge where to apply specific technology and make an informed choice about which protocols and designs to use.

All stakeholders need to do risk assessment, and understanding of the underlying mechanisms and fundamental design choices I think are key to improve security and enhance the overall trust in the Internet and those that use it.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Congratulations, you are the first one that is within the time. (chuckles).

Very well-done. Next I'd like to call on Mr. Jeremy Malcolm from the Electronic Frontier Foundation.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I didn't have any prepared remarks, but I'm responding to what I've heard. A quote that comes back to me is one from Dwight Eisenhower, who said that if you want total security, go to prison. That is true on the Internet. If we want the Internet to be totally secure, we have to lock it down and turn it into something that is no longer the Internet.

That is why the application of human rights to Cybersecurity is of vital importance, because it is the only check that we have on a run away Cybersecurity response.

This has been recognized globally. I think that, although there is no treaty on Cybersecurity and human rights, there are enough other instruments that we can say that there is an international consensus on this point, both intergovernmental documents as well as multistakeholder or Civil Society documents. So the cyber, in terms of intergovernmental documents, you can look at the Cybersecurity strategy of the EU. You can look at the UN resolution on the right to privacy in the digital age. These are both documents about balancing the need for Cybersecurity with the need for privacy and freedom of expression.

Whereas, in terms of multistakeholder documents, I guess the NETMundial statement jumps out, as do the necessary and proportionate principles on the application of human rights to communication surveillance.

I am interested in interjecting more as this session proceeds. But I think I want to make sure that the starting point is that Cybersecurity is never an end in itself. It is a means to securing the peaceful existence of our human rights. And if we forget that, then we are in danger of the Internet turning into a giant prison. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Next I'd like to call on External Relations Center in Oxford.

>> LARA PACE: Hi, I thought I was talking in the next one, but I'm happy to speak now; whatever you prefer.

I move to the next one? Yeah.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Then nobody talking, but it doesn't matter (chuckles).

So, I'm up to speed also. You will be called on again at a later point. Next I go to Mr. Ang Peng Hwa, Director in Singapore of the Institute of Research Center.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Hi, good morning. I have Power Point slides. I'm going to ask you guys to imagine the Power Point slide at some point.

The talk is supposed to be about enhancing Cybersecurity and building digital trust. I find it there is a lot of emphasis on Cybersecurity, but actually it could undermine digital trust.

There is a paper, this is where the slide comes in, trust the Internet and digital divide. If you Google IBM trust, Duke, you locate a paper, it shows correlation of Internet penetration is highest with trust, not even with income.

If you want to get people on line for various reasons, you should build trust, not, believe it or not, not Cybersecurity. The question is, what is the secret to gaining trust? Of course I have the answer and you would know that, right?

There is one secret to getting trust, simple, all philosophers tell you that, act against your own self-interest. Demonstrate an act against your own self-interest.

How easy is that, to act against your own self-interest? From what I've heard, and a lot from Government agencies and Government, governments want sovereignty. They want the power to act. They want to be able to have sovereignty over subjects, Internet, and data. Right?

This is to build Cybersecurity. Next slide.

Second last slide. There is a problem with sovereignty. There is, for us to be here in this global environment, we need three things, I want to call a trilemma. I have a paper on this, again citations and all that. It is a Portuguese translation of the paper actually.

Sovereignty, globalization and democracy. My next click, there is a red line going over crossing on democracy, because in a trilemma you can only have two out of three. Take your pick. Sovereignty, for Cybersecurity, obviously a good thing, globalization, and democracy. Pick only two out of the three. You want sovereignty? We need globalization. That leaves democracy out. How much trust will you have in a system that doesn't have democracy?

Final slide, what do I suggest as a solution to giving up sovereignty? Three points. Data protection laws, we have heard this. Mohit talked about data transfers apps. Data protection laws strengthen the rights of the individual versus governments, collecting of data as well as surveillance. Second, point about checks and balances on surveillance, we discussed that a long time in Bali. The third one is governance. It is not about checks on Government, not about checks on governing. The goal of governance is create trust in the system. When you have a better governance system, you are going to have better trust in a system. When you have better trust in a system, go back to my first slide, you are going to have better penetration of Internet, greater use of the Internet.

Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Finally, I turn to Professor Milton Mueller, School of Public Policy, Institute of Technology.

>> MILTON MUELLER: All right. I'll go now. I think that we are kind of avoiding some of the really important issues, and I know it's probably making some people uncomfortable to talk about them, but that is my job here. So I will do that.

Number one, encryption. We all know that that's one of the key ways of making your online communications more secure.

However, we also know that law enforcement and intelligence agencies are interested in limiting the use of encryptions so that they will have access to the data.

If we are not talking about how to reconcile that problem, we are not talking about one of the most serious issues. I would suggest that the use of encryption, like many technologies, is an irreversible aspect of the growth of information technology, and that we need to accept the fact that citizens have a right to encrypt their communications, and governments have to find a way to work around their limited access to encrypted

communications, and find a new means of dealing with lawbreakers and bad actors on the Internet, rather than trying to insert themselves into the key management process.

Jurisdiction. We have Carolyn from Microsoft over there, and Microsoft is engaged in a very important legal battle with the U.S. Government over access to data, to the Ireland case in which the U.S. Government is essentially asserting a global jurisdiction. They are saying even though the data is in Ireland, it's controlled by Microsoft, and so we can issue not even a warrant. It is something I guess between a warrant and a subpoena.

We can get access to that data, which means that they could, regardless of where they put that data, they could get access to it. This is an issue, this is a Cybersecurity issue. It contributes to the data localization efforts, because if the U.S. Government is successful, that means that globalized services will be possibly more difficult. People will be more willing or less willing to use a global provider, and we may be sacrificing the massive economies of scale that can come with cloud services.

The issue of the treaty, the Bangladeshi Minister mentioned that we need a treaty. I think someone else did. That is a controversial issue. Can we achieve what we want for Cybersecurity through governmental treaties or rely more on network cooperation among the providers. If you do the latter, which generally I tend to favor as being more effective, but then again you have issues about procedures and due process which can sometimes get sacrificed in these more private sector oriented mechanisms.

So, one other point related to something Mr. Hindon said, you mentioned gamer gate in the context of Cybersecurity. I want to make it clear that gamer gate is about content. There was a hostile content, and I would like to assert a clear distinction between Cybersecurity issues which have to do with the technical integrity, availability and resilience of the actual Internet, and content regulation issues.

I don't want those two things to ever be confused, because then if you say that certain kind of content is subversive or destabilizing, then you are paving the way for giving the Cybersecurity rationale for censorship or content regulation.

There may be legitimate reasons for certain countries to want to regulate content, but let's not call it a Cybersecurity issue.

Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Milton.

We heard more dissenting points of view in this session than in the first one, I think, which makes it a lot more interesting to listen to different points of view.

I'm opening up to the room for any questions, and we have remote participation. As nobody is standing yet, I'll call upon a remote participant to ask a question first.

>> Remote participant:

(there was no English interpretation).

>> REMOTE MODERATOR: We have two questions from Nigeria. The first question is who is responsible for deciding the value of trust online, and demographic trends. For regions with less zero threat, why should global providers not consider openness and access to developing countries?

Can the standard be set at the same speed with advanced organization or governments? That was the first question.

The second one is, we believe the IGF should develop measures that encourage profiling of the various cyber attackers that exist in the cyber world in order to understand motives, psychological drives, and compelling urges to create fear in cyberspace for cyber crimes.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Who would like to take the first question? I have to admit that I did not really get them from the English, but if somebody got the first question, please take the floor. No?

Somebody on the second question? Jeremy.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: So, the suggestion that the IGF should develop measures to profile attackers is probably not the best use of the IGF's resources.

I am all in favor of the IGF expanding what it does, but maybe not in that direction.

But I think there are a number of other institutions that would be well suited to that task, and that there are links to those institutions here at the IGF.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. We have a question in the room. Then I'll go to Marco.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you. Matthew Shears with the Center for Democracy and Technology. We seem to be having the same conversation. Let me put something to you. In the Chair's statement at the global conference on Cybersecurity in the Hague, the following statements were made, and I'd like to understand what the panelists are going to suggest in terms of how we actually implement those, realize those statements.

The first statement was, governments were urged, are urged to ensure that cyber policy at national, regional and international level is developed through multistakeholder approaches including Civil Society, technical community, businesses and governments across the globe. That is the first thing I'd like the panelists to comment on. How do we make that actually happen?

The second point, the conference urged all stakeholders to work together proactively to ensure that Cybersecurity policies are, from their inception, rights respecting and consistent with international law and international human rights instruments.

From their inception means that human rights are not appended onto a document in a paragraph or something like that. I'd appreciate the panelists' thoughts on that. If you are interested in the issue of Cybersecurity and human rights, we have a panel at 11 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. That comes together with my introduction of the session. If anybody would like to respond on that, how actually we are going to go from policy to practice, if I remember correctly that that was the motto of the GFCC in the Hague this spring. Mr. Hwa.

>> ANG PENG HWA: To Matthew's question on cyber policy through multistakeholder model, what it would mean is that governments shouldn't decide policy by itself. Often governments feel that they have expertise, especially developing countries, they have the best knowledge, best information, best people. Therefore, they are the best people to decide policy. What the statement is saying is that you shouldn't do that. You should look at other issues, and this way you get human rights by design into the policy.

This needs to be done at the local and national level and high up in the scale, when you can scale it to the national level. You need to bring in all the stakeholders into deciding the policy.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Michael.

>> MICHAEL KAISER: I'd like to address the multistakeholder question for a second. From our experience, and I'll talk about this later, too, multistakeholder starts best when you are trying to solve a specific problem. When you see things like M3AAWG, working in that space, or the anti-phishing working group working in that space, or you see the NCFTA in Pittsburgh working on Cybercrime issues and financial crimes and other things, where people can come together to focus on a problem that is solvable, if we work together as opposed to solving everything at once through a multistakeholder process, that is where you are going to see progress in multistakeholder. How you connect all those multistakeholder processes together is a challenge.

A lot of people sit in all of them. Some sit only in others. That is part of the issue. Focus in multistakeholder is a key and gets lost in the discussion when we start talking about it, because that is where you come together to solve a specific problem first.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Due to time constraints we are going to go to two final reactions and responses to what we have. Chris, you go first.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: This is a combination of response to the questions and the comment I was going to make before. First it's important to know that, we have said this, Cybersecurity and human rights are not contradictory concepts. They should be complementary.

I think to the question of, one of the concerns I've heard expressed by some folks is that as governments are paying more attention to Cybersecurity, sometimes that is being used as a proxy to infringe human rights.

And that shouldn't happen. We should work across the board to make sure that those are taken into account as we go forward.

Indeed a lot of the work we have done in terms of capacity-building, which we will talk about in the next session, is trying to model that multistakeholder approach of consultations with Civil Society, industry and others and doing these provisions.

I also wanted to call attention to the working group that the freedom online Coalition has that was just referenced that is going to be presenting its results tomorrow. They have a working group on, that focuses on multistakeholder and rights respecting approaches to Cybersecurity.

This is a very important presentation tomorrow at 11. I recommend everyone to see it.

Finally, I want to comment on the comment made by our Bangladesh Minister calling for a global treaty for Cybersecurity, which I think is just a very bad idea. In fact, I think it's an unworkable idea. I don't even know what a global convention for Cybersecurity is. I don't know what that means.

I don't know what concepts that holds. Indeed, that in itself is probably not going to be a multistakeholder approach to the problem. There are lots of activities, there is many things around the world, there is many, both statements in the UN about culture of Cybersecurity and action plans. There is the Budapest convention, there are many things out there that are good models for countries to look at or to participate in.

I think trying to do one, bring the rule from all, is not going to help us solve the problem.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Marco.

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: Thank you. I'll be brief. In response to some of the questions raised in multistakeholder, yes, as I mentioned in my intervention, we have to raise awareness and be aware of each other's objectives and needs and take this into account, and also be able to trust each other's expertise when it comes to finding solutions, and the multistakeholder model would definitely be the key to solving part of the puzzle.

The reason I asked for the floor was to respond to something the Minister said regarding IPv6 which is the topic we take close to our heart.

I think especially at this level and security in digital awareness, we have to be aware that there isn't that much difference between IPv6 and IPv 4, and everything you do in this space should be agnostic to that level. Security measures should take into account these two protocols, access to these protocols exist simultaneously, and that is something to be aware of. Police all policy regulation, but also the work we are doing together should be IPv agnostic as much as possible.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Milton.

>> MILTON MUELLER: I'd like to address what I think Matt Shears of CDT was asking. The conversations about Cybersecurity do get a little bit repetitive, and the question is, what can we make happen?

I think the thing we have to understand is that Cybersecurity takes place at various levels, and a very large part of the responsibility is with the private actor, whose systems need to be secured, and that distributed responsibility is a key feature. So the idea that when you talk about the multistakeholder model, too many people have in mind the idea that you are getting a bunch of people in a single room and they are negotiating about something, or making trade-offs.

In fact, all kinds of so-called multistakeholder cooperation takes place at various levels, you know, industry associations, national levels, and more importantly, across industry sectors. And that's, you know, I think Audrey was making the point earlier, the standards environment is incredibly diverse. There is no single spot where you can go to.

We have to understand networks governance, distributed governance, as our basic mechanism for dealing with Cybersecurity. What can the IGF do to advance that agenda. How can we bring people together in ways that constructively get them working on problems that they are not able to work on in any other environment.

It's not clear to me that there is a role for the IGF per se, other than perhaps an educational one, but we might be able if we try to be a little more aggressive or ambitious, I should say, rather than aggressive, ambitious in what we achieve here, and we don't avoid the controversial issues but actually embrace them, I think we could maybe make some progress here.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: Thank you, honestly spoken by Milton. Just to tie in that point what the moderator made regarding dissenting opinions, being raised in this session, it's beautiful to see how the comments made by Peter and by Ang tie up beautifully in terms of the real challenge that confronts governments. The real challenge is not per se providing Cybersecurity solutions, but how to provide Cybersecurity to the citizens in a way, in a discrete way, that does not restrict freedom of expression and the growth of the Internet, so that the Internet does not become sort of unrecognizable from the way we know it.

That is the real challenge, I think. That is the beauty of it all in how the comments tie up beautifully. Thanks a lot.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I've heard yesterday in discussion also, is about finding the right incentives for private industry to act on all the things we discuss about. Are there some views on that from the room? Or in the panel? What could be initiative, incentives?

>> AUDREY PLONK: I'm not sure I remember exactly where the incentives question came up. But I think there is various incentives for various actors in the ecosystem. The private sector is mostly incentivized by what the customers want and what the user wants, to deliver a product that is trustworthy and stable for the user. I can't speak for the whole private sector. But as a general matter, the standards that are followed and processes that are followed to achieve that are open and transparent and collaborative in terms of how they are built, and they are fairly standardized across the industry.

There is obviously business incentives in terms of how the private sector builds product and there is consumer goals. I don't know if that is really the question. But there are other discussions in the ecosystem around different kinds of incentive structures, more from the operator side or end user side of how we get people to deploy product, more security related products or features, or how do we get people to update their systems more. That is a different set of incentives.

I think it's, just saying how do we incentivize the private sector to go solve this problem is a little bit superficial in terms of the depth of the actors that are required to actually be involved in making a more trustworthy environment.

I also think it's useful for us to step away from this notion that there is some end game state of secure, and it keeps getting repeated. It gets repeated in every set of documents that comes out on security. We want a secure, stable, trustworthy, of course we want that. I think it's fine to say that we want it.

I think it's more difficult to set that standard and then expect, to Matthew's point, for Governments not to then come in and say it's not secure, so we are going to do something about that. We have to change how we think about that. We have to think of it as a continuum of risk and of productivity and of trustworthiness, and not a black or white secure or insecure, because it's never that way.

>> WILLIAN CHECK: One of the interesting things that came up in terms in the U.S. with the new Cybersecurity framework that was developed is one of the very important things that was established was that you had to have a top-down approach within organizations.

This would apply certainly within nationalities and regions too. You can't expect Cybersecurity to happen just at the engineer level. It has to be at the CEO level, and be at the board level, to be stressing the importance of cyber within an organization.

>> I think there is a lot of private companies -- at my day job, I work for one -- who know a lot about what is going on regarding attacks and malware and whatever, denial of service attacks. It would be very good if that information could be shared by -- there needs to be cooperation between the private and public sector. But the other part of this is, customers of those companies who build these products that we want to be secure need to actually insist that they are secure, and not buy products that aren't.

That is for individuals and for companies and governments. It has to be high on the priority list that security is taken seriously, that you get frequent updates.

One anecdote, this recent thing, about a car manufacturer, being hacked, you can take over the car, and their solution to fixing this was you have to bring the car back and get a service appointment. They would put new firmware on it. But by comparison, the electric carmaker Tesla just downloaded new software when they had a vulnerability. We need more thinking like that.

We are not going to make products that are perfect. But we need to be able to fix the problems, as soon as we find out, and they need to be updateable quickly.

>> One of the things I think that is perhaps being overlooked is the issue of incentives. This is not an intellectual exercise, not an academic exercise. This is a real part of our world. One of the things I think that bewilders many of us, maybe all of us, is that obviously vulnerabilities have economic and personal cost, and yet we still seem to fall into the same traps over and over again.

One of the areas, and picking up on one of the excellent things Milton talked about, in terms of what individuals and organizations can be doing and how those incentives can work, that is starting to emerge after many years, is the issue of insurance.

I don't mean insurance as a way of just covering up for problems that have been created, but one of the benefits that insurance often provides is a way of disseminating helpful useful consumer-friendly information of what can be done to create a lower risk environment, as a way of giving people incentives to save money, something that most organizations and individuals would like to do.

With the starting to see a emergence of insurance in this area, I'm becoming more optimistic that at least some of the low-hanging fruit that's often been there will start to be addressed as a way of being dealt with that will help to inform people in ways that are accessible, easy to digest, and perhaps give individuals economic incentives to do the right thing.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I'm going to go to the room first? Ask them if they step up. I'll give you the floor. If there is another question from the room, please queue up to the microphone. I'll give Mr. Hwa the chance to speak first and I go to you. Mr. Hwa.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Just in case I've not been well-understood, with my accent or whatever, it's the issue of black and white, in this space, and nothing is black and white. What I'm saying is that you do need to be aware that over decision of Cybersecurity can lead to degradation of trust. Take an example of Microsoft being compelled to get information to the U.S. Government. What is the problem of cloud computing there? It is not security. It is the issue of trust in the information that I've stored in Microsoft. Who will access it? Now there is a policy that say that U.S. Government can access it. My trust is reduced. I'll be less likely to use the product or service.

Is it a problem of security again? No. Wherever I go, I will go to small outfits, probably less secure outfits, that I believe, I believe Microsoft would have better security. So you can see how this undermines the trust, and undermines the penetration of use of even cloud computing. I organized a panel a couple years back on cloud computing. To my surprise, the number one concern of cloud computing was not security. It was trust. It was privacy, having data protection laws.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Question from the room.

>> AUDIENCE: Hi. It's a common comment and a question at the same time. When we talk about incentives, for example, we all know that overall incentive is financial. It's going to be the users that are going to say what the companies need to do.

Unfortunately, the users don't, they are not aware enough of Cybersecurity, so they can demand that. This is one of the problems that we have.

I see here that we talk about education, collaboration and cooperation, right? And what I see is that when we have discussions about Cybersecurity, we tend to deal, talk a lot about technological issues or governmental issues, but there are some other human issues that I think that are not well addressed.

For example, when we talk about education, collaboration and cooperation, those are not technical issues. We need to bring people from other areas to come here and discuss that with us. We need people from education background, for example, to talk to us about education and how we can get Cybersecurity into the education aspect. Internet is not a thing for geeks anymore. It affects everybody's lives in all areas. We have to have people from all areas to discuss that together with us.

About the stakeholders involved again, I'll try and be fast. We cannot wait for them to come here and discuss that with us, because we are the ones that are worried about it, not them. We need to go for them, go where they are, go to their events and try and bring them to us.

The other option that we have is wait for the big thing to come. We only started talking about tsunami alerts and evacuation routes when we had a big tsunami event. We can wait for the big Cybersecurity event to happen, so that it increases awareness. Then we see how we act or prepare in advance and see how we act later.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I was going to point to you, Michael.

>> MICHAEL KAISER: I would answer that question in a couple different ways. First of all, overarching on this, we have to create a culture of Cybersecurity everywhere we are. We live in a car culture, we have traffic, we have a culture of traffic safety everywhere. Right? Those issues and traffic safety are taught by everybody to everyone. That is what we have to achieve in Cybersecurity at the end of the day as well. You go out here into the conference center, you will see little bins for different kinds of refuse, trash that you have. Right? Because we are starting to build cultures of recycling across the world.

It doesn't happen quickly. This is a long-term process. You can see already that we are becoming in many countries cultures that are nonsmoking cultures. We have to become a culture of Cybersecurity. It has to be infused across everything we do. If everyone is touching the technology, everyone has to know how to use it safely and securely. And that requires all hands on deck. You are right. The educational system is important.

Parents, really important. Industry, really important. Government, really important. All play really, NGOs, all play really critical roles in creating the culture of Cybersecurity. That's the end game in many ways.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you very much, Michael. We are going to take a final -- you want to respond to that?

>> CHRIS PAINTER: This is a long-term effort, been under way for some time. One thing that is happening now is that more countries are having programs, including in Brazil, to get more the citizenry understanding the cyber threats, and indeed, we had national Cybersecurity awareness month in the U.S. in October. Many other countries are doing similar things, either for a week or month or a few days, to profile this issue. That is only part of it, to be sure, giving tools to citizens to be able to actually handle some of the threats.

One of the things that came out of the global conference in the Hague and global initiative for cyber expertise, one of the projects that the U.S. and Canada have partnered on is to do exactly this, to bring more awareness of threats to not just businesses and governments, but also to citizens around the world. It's something that if folks are interested, they should consider joining.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Chris. One final question.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you. Hirohota from JPRS, a agency for Japan. I hope my question is in line with the topic of the session.

If important information, for instance, personal data of customers is leaked from an organization, people tend to blame --

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Sir, could you please speak into the mic? We have trouble hearing you.

>> AUDIENCE: Sorry. If important information, for instance, personal data of customers, is leaked from an organization, people tend to blame the organization as a criminal, not as a victim. However, getting attacked and hacked is a usual event these days. There is not a complete security even if the organization tries very hard.

So we, the cyber residents, should perceive that being attacked and being hacked is not a shame, not even a crime. On the basis of such perception, the victims should share how they are attacked to raise their security collectively, of course with a device caution. I wonder how the perception change can be achieved including cyber security. That is my question.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you very much. It's a good question. It's something that we run into daily, that crimes are not reported, because of shame factors or other reputational factors. Jerry wants to respond, and perhaps somebody else. How do we solve this, Jerry?

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I want to push back against that question a little bit. I think sometimes the shame that comes from personal information being disclosed by hackers comes from the fact that that information shouldn't have been there in the first place in some cases. There haven't been proper data minimization practices followed.

For example, in the case of the Ashley Madison hack, there was information that users of that, we don't have sympathy for the users, but the users had paid Madison to permanently delete their data, and when the hack was published, the data was still there.

I think there is enough shame to go around, between the hackers and the companies who have not followed proper deminimization practices. And of course, there is also the fact that in some cases, lax Cybersecurity

practices have been practiced by the companies. I'm not saying we should blame them for not being impenetrable, but we can still expect companies to follow basic precautions.

I'm not entirely disagreeing with you, but just presenting a contrary perspective there.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Jeremy. We had a lively conversation on this topic; so successful topic, I think. But we have to close it at some point and move on to the third one. I'm going to hand back to Paul. Thank you for all your comments.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. Actually, some of those recent points leads us well into the next topic. We would like to move on to the focus on capacity-building, and what are the best practices that we need to address some of the challenges that we have been discussing so far this morning, both today's challenges and challenges in the future.

And what kind of platforms do we need to facilitate this? There are two questions which have been posed for this topic. First of all, how do we promote the use of the Internet for international peace and security, and what recommendations are there for high level principles for cyber cooperation?

Secondly, how do we discover new approaches for institutionalizing and disseminating best practices for capacity-building? To start to look at the questions, I'd like to ask Mr. Wafa, head of the Cybersecurity department of the Ministry of Communications in IT in Afghanistan, to contribute. You have the floor. Thank you.

>> ZMARIALAI WAFA: Thank you very much. Capacity-building is one of the most important components, component while establishing information infrastructure. In order to establish capacity-building program for a nation, it is important to manage this through Cybersecurity, through national Cybersecurity strategy.

Having national Cybersecurity strategy will make this job easier. Security trainings are costly. We need strong support from the senior management. We need buy-in.

The first step towards the resiliency of the Cybersecurity is then Government should establish a multistakeholder environment, bring the stakeholders together from private sector, academia and operators to address the challenges they face.

Critical infrastructure partners must collectively identify priorities, clear goals with clear goals towards their assets. All these threats are shared responsibility. Regular awareness program and training programs are essential in both Government and private sector. In this regard, we need to plan, establish a Centralized Computer Security Incident Management capabilities which is called national SIRT.

To managing CSIRT or SIRTs with a national responsibility, we can provide awareness, manage cyber incidents, support the national Cybersecurity strategy, public/private partnership in Cybersecurity, building a culture of Cybersecurity, national policy framework for Cybersecurity, managing and participating in Cybersecurity exercises, Cybersecurity assessment and evaluation.

One of the initiatives back in 2012 was from the Government of UK establishing as the center for global Cybersecurity capacity-building. Such initiatives itself can provide a good platform accelerating the awareness program.

We do need more of such initiatives. Last but not least, the cyber drill program, one of the most effective practices. Now it is that show collaboration between two various SIRTs, businesses, businesses also need to exercise this practice, in order to exchange information with each other, and see how vulnerable they are to today's attacks. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. I'd like to invite Tomas Lamanauskas to contribute, Head of Corporate Strategy at the International Telecommunications Union.

>> TOMAS LAMANAUSKAS: Thank you very much, Paul. First, ITU has experience in this area, especially starting from a society where heads of state and Government facilitate the so-called action line 5, C5 about building trust and security in the field of ICTs.

In our, so now it has been in this year, we are reviewing the ten-year progress. It is a review of what has been achieved. It is timely here. However, also starting from the way your questions were posed, how would you ensure that we are all safe internationally through the capacity-building, it's an important point for us also, realizing that we only are safe as the weakest link, and the weakest link can be anywhere. It can be in, cyber threat can come from any country. Any country can suffer from it. It is important to adopt the approach, we understand it is not about zero sum game, not about us versus them. It is about protection of everyone. We only can increase our collective protection when every country and every citizen have a protection against cyber threat. It is our collective interest as a global community to ensure Cybersecurity everywhere. It is not because, when we talk about capacity-building, development assistance, we should understand this area is not about altruism. It is about ensuring citizens of every country can benefit from trust in the cyberspace and users in a trusted secure way.

The new aspects, what other new aspects that we should take into account now, especially with the new technology. So again this is no longer becoming, no longer just about data and money, while it is very important. It is also now about Internet of Things, with industrial Internet, with variables. It is also about now lives. It is becoming very important.

Also increasing complexity of stakeholders. It is not just about SIRTs or national regulators or Telecom operators. Everyone is dependent on that and everyone has a stake in it. When we talk about capacity-building and buildings the level of Cybersecurity, it is important to involve them all.

How do we, what are the some of the learning from our perspective, how do we address that, how do we build capacity? First of all, it is important to look at that in comprehensive manner. ITU has come up with 7 high level expert groups with a global Cybersecurity agenda which has five pillars, the way we see this comprehensiveness through technical procedural measures, legal measures, organizational measures, capacity-building, international cooperation.

We need to look at that in a comprehensive way. We need, there is no question, understand a lot of threads can be tackled by simple awareness and people doing simple steps, cyber hygiene. It sounds boring. It is interesting to talk about cyber espionage or big data losses or big incidents. But although there is, a lot of incidents can be resolved by taking simple steps. Your own Government study says 80 percent of the cyber threats could be eliminated by doing steps such as updating antivirus. A similar U.S. study, we can achieve 94 percent reduction in risk if we measure the top 20 controls and apply them that are standardized. It is important that everyone takes steps and we help people to know what steps to take.

We need to ensure that, how we protect all the other vulnerable groups. Cybersecurity for everyone means sometimes we need to take specific steps. In IGF, we have had discussion about Child Online Protection, and other issues that undermine trust and how we take actions against that.

In terms of the measures that we have been doing recently, review measures in trying to build global Cybersecurity, trying to help in building global Cybersecurity culture, is what we believe is that to achieve something you need to know where you are going and need to measure that.

Global community last year in our Plenipotentiary conference agreed on target 3.1, which talks about increasing Cybersecurity awareness by 2020. We as a global community agree to that. Now the question is how we get there.

In terms to ensure that we measure that, we have a global Cybersecurity index measuring readiness of countries in this regard. We collect country profiles ensuring that there is peer learning and see the best practices there, and issued an updated national Cybersecurity guide which helps countries build Cybersecurity policies.

Important theory here, in this fora as well, SIRTs is an important element of the Cybersecurity environment, and building so they are sufficiently mature is important. With our 65 country assessments, we have 13 SIRTs implemented, four in progress, one being updated, and trying to ensure that the basic infrastructure, especially in the countries what we call wide spot countries, countries where they don't have this capabilities there. Already a colleague from Afghanistan mentioned important cyber drills. We see it as an important measure, most of building technical capabilities, but also by building trust among people, both national, international among different stakeholders. We conducted 13 cyber drills in a hundred countries.

Organization and helping build all stakeholders standardization is important. So in our important element, when we have standards in Cybersecurity, an important part is bridging the gap, making sure developing standards from stakeholders, from other parts of the world, so we build it together. That is one element of our approach to capacity-building. It is not just from us to you capacity-building. It is everyone coming together to solve those challenges.

The last point, to make the importance and understanding that none of organizations or entity can do and resolve the challenge by themselves. It is complex and there are various stakeholders. These are different kind of stakeholders, but we need to look inside those stakeholders. We have another layer. We talk about Government. We no longer talk about Minister of Education, Finance, Ministers of Economy, responsible for critical infrastructure, if we talk about private sector, Telecom industry, other industries, banking industries. It is becoming very complex environment in which we need everyone to chip in.

We do it in a few layers. One is the UN layer, where within United Nations we have now the strategy and action plan, how to coordinate action, so various agencies helping member states in the area, but also other stakeholders. And there was a presentation of Global Forum of Cyber Expertise, to which we are a proud partner of, and also partnering with a number of private sector partners, and Civil Society partners in that regard. That is the way forward.

I think this is also, this discussion here is a good way to also bring those stakeholders together. Thanks so much.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. It is interesting. Already there is a strong theme around capacity-building being a shared responsibility, which is in all of our collective interest.

Now I'd like to turn to Chris Painter from the U.S. State Department.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: Thank you. I wanted to address both of the questions, and I think they are different but related. The first is how do we promote international peace and stability in cyberspace. The second is a more general issue of capacity-building.

I want to talk about both of those. In the realm of promoting international stability in cyberspace, this is very important, because having a more stable cyber environment overall, where states don't have an incentive to break that stability and cause disruptions makes the entire ecosystem more secure, and leads to better security generally and better stability throughout the world.

To achieve this, we are seeking a broad consensus on where to draw the line between responsible and irresponsible behavior particularly for states. We really approach that in two different ways, and made significant progress in different forums, including the UN group of governmental experts on this issue.

First, we have been promoting, and we have wide acceptance of the idea, the basic rules of international law apply to cyberspace. Acts of aggression are not permissible, and countries that are hurt by attack have a right to respond in ways that are appropriate, proportional and minimize harm to innocent parties.

But we support a additional set of principles that we can bring forward. They are principles that we are promoting, both that gained acceptance in this group of governmental experts, which comprised of 20 countries, but they are getting wider acceptance around the world, and we are hoping to have many more countries realize the value of these principles, these norms that get wider acceptance and therefore, I think it leads to a more stable environment.

We view these as universal concepts, that would be attractive to all states, and something that we can make great progress on, and I'll list them. One is that no country should conduct or knowingly support online activity that intentionally damages critical infrastructure or impairs the use of it to provide services to the public.

Obviously, not attacking critical infrastructure in peacetime does lead to a more stable environment, if countries sign up to that.

No countries should conduct or knowingly support activity intended to prevent national Computer Security Incident Response Teams from responding to cyber incidents, or use its own teams to enable online activity that is intended to do harm.

Basically, use SIRTs for good and don't attack SIRTs. If you think about the SIRTs as the way to handle incidents, attacking them would lead to great instability, and it's important for governments to recognize this.

The third is that no country should conduct or knowingly support cyber enabled theft of intellectual property, trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantage to its companies or commercial sectors. We think this is something that no Government should do, and indeed this was a subject of a recent agreement reached between President Obama and the President of China and also Prime Minister Cameron and Presidency of China.

Finally, every country should cooperate consistent with its domestic law and international obligations with requests for assistance from other states in mitigating malicious cyber activity emanating from its territory.

This goes to the cooperative environment and the collective cooperative environment we talked about earlier. Those things together as a package would lead to a more stable environment, and we are promoting this around the world, with many of our partners too. Getting wider acceptance, in a way, it's capacity-building in itself because bringing principles, norms forward, getting acceptance helps dramatically.

On the other side of capacity-building generally, there's been a huge amount of work that has been done in a number of different forums. This is a great example of you don't need just one Forum or again one controlling, one ring to rule them all, as I said before, but you have lots of things out there, which are complementary or important. There have been regional work within the OAS, regional work in other organizations. We have heard about other activities here today. There has been work in building national strategies. There has been work in building SIRTs. Those are all really important.

Most importantly, I know this is going to be discussed by my colleague from the GFCE, the launch of the Global Forum for Cyber Expertise was an important initiative that ties together a lot of these different activities, and we are proud to be one of the founding members, and more countries and more entities, it's not just countries, it's countries and private sector, Civil Society. It is open to anyone. But it is really to partner on activities to do capacity-building around the world.

This is really, this idea of capacity-building is incredibly important in our policy, because we recognize that, as one of our previous speakers said, that the weakest link issue is a problem. Every country, as they are getting

more connectivity, as they are relying on the Internet and technology for their economies and societies, they need to be able to build policies and other things and need to do it right. They need to incorporate human rights, but also make sure they are doing it in a way that is interoperable and can work with other countries.

We have done a lot of work in sub-Saharan Africa in the U.S., where we have done things in the SADC community and east Africa, East African economic group, and ECOWAS, and we are continuing to do that because that is an area that is very important. External action service of the EU has done work. There is lots of work going on in the area. The GFCE, and I will not steal the thunder of the next speaker, is a critical and good example of how to tie a lot of this together.

We ourselves are cosponsoring three, four different initiatives with different partners; some targeted Africa, some more generally. We look forward to continuing to work on that.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much; lots of really important substance there. But before I open up to comments to the floor, we have one more panelist to contribute, Lara Pace from the Global Cybersecurity Capacity Center.

>> LARA PACE: Thank you. Good morning, everybody.

I am going to talk about the capacity center. We are housed at Oxford, and I'm responsible for taking all this knowledge as we are building at the center in collaboration with a number of experts and taking it to the world.

We are a research project, and we are focused on trying to understand what effective Cybersecurity capacity-building looks like. We do that by, we have developed a model to understand Cybersecurity capacity, or the maturity of Cybersecurity capacity. And for the benefit of this conversation, when we talk about capacity, we look at national policy and strategy. We look at building this Cybersecurity culture. We look at education and training that a country offers to its people. We look at the regulatory environment and the technical environment.

What we are doing is, through this model, deploying it across the world through international organizations, from the international community and also directive with governments, is gather this learning and experience of how people have built their capacity, and understand really what works and what doesn't.

So maybe when we talk about international cooperation, we can be a little bit more strategic in trying to make that happen. Personally, I'm really interested in the international cooperation element, just because so I represent an academic institution, but I'm not a academic. My background is capacity-building.

When I worked with a international organization, the challenge in making that actually happen, develop wholistic comprehensive sustainable programs of capacity-building, working with a number of stakeholders, both internationally, but also in region, and at the national level. So I think in trying to develop this global understanding, possibly we might be able to be more strategic in our international capacity-building. We need to be more strategic both at the donor level, also at the international level, and also nationally across ministerially.

Going back to the GFCE, we are one of the gaps of the UK Government to the GFCE, and together with the governments of Norway and also the organization of American states, who is one of our key strategic partners. We think that GFCE is good because it actually does bring an element of awareness to what actually is available for people to take up in terms of making the capacity-building more efficient.

One of the outputs of the GFCE is to develop this inventory of Cybersecurity activity, and we have been asked to deliver that, and what we have is we have got a dedicated person working, researching, trying to understand who is doing what where. That is housed on our portal.

As a Cybersecurity planner, in the emerging world or developed world, you are able to go there and see whether the capacity you are trying to build has recently happened in one of your neighboring countries, who

the experts are, and how you can foster building that capacity through that inventory. We believe having this sort of mapping of what is happening may begin to address this duplication of effort, because hopefully you will be able to fast track your capacity.

That is my two minutes.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: My colleague from the UK has an important project there. We have projects there. There are a total of 42 founding members and now 50 members have joined, and they include governments and businesses and other stakeholder organizations. If you don't know about this initiative, and it's important work being done around the world, but this initiative is trying to sponsor that work. The Dutch are not here to talk about it, but I think they would be very pleased that it's getting so much traction around the world, and really trying to harness and do a lot of this work, and get existing bodies like the one in the UK to do work that is really important to the whole ecosystem.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. There is a broad agenda there. If people have questions again, please come to the microphone, in the traditional way. We have heard everything from cyber hygiene, at the individual level, to the principles being discussed by the UN GGE, and I think Lara described sustainable and wholistic capacity-building programs in the area.

I'll open the agenda. If there are any questions, please come to the microphone. First I turn to our organizer who would like to ask a question, and is kindly walking to the microphone. The floor is yours.

>> SUBI CHATURVEDI: Thank you. My name is Subi Chaturvedi, and I'm a member of the MAG. One of the key reasons why we did put the panel together was also to look for answers to many questions, questions because these are emerging issues, and not all of us even have been able to problematize the key challenges.

My question is to Chris. Chris, this is about how one man's hero can be another person's traitor. We as citizens look for answers from governments. We have learned that many times we are in the room, and at other times we are outside where we don't know how our inputs will be treated, especially when it comes to issues like Cybersecurity, like building trust.

When we are looking at issues about surveillance, how do you resolve questions of, do you necessarily proportionate and how do you ensure protection, because it's not easy after you have told the story. Many times recourse is difficult, because this is at the heart of the conversation; national security and free speech and expression and human rights online should not be at cross-purposes.

That is the first question. The second short question is, when we are looking at collaboration between SIRTs and trans-national agencies, law enforcement or online agencies, if you follow due process, it is a very long time to get a response.

How can we develop mutual trust without looking at just Government interventions? When you are looking at crime that happens online, it is in realtime. And there are many actors who are collaborating together. What are the alternatives, not just the formal processes? Two questions going your way, please. Thank you.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: On the first question, look, it's important for there to be basic principles in the way that every Government gathers intelligence. There has been a lot of work in the U.S. over the last two years. And President Obama has spoken about this in looking at those practices, and making sure that there is adequate oversight, proper purpose, and all the things that you need to have a system that is not targeting, which it never has, people for dissenting points of view, political dissent, for religious purposes, but that is not true from a lot of other governments.

One of the things that is a concern, and I mentioned this before, is when governments use the excuse of Cybersecurity, which is important and they should be doing it, in a way that they are trying to draw absolute

sovereignty around their borders and not respecting internationally accepted human rights and the free flow of that kind of information. We see this more and more.

One of the big parts, and this does tie into the capacity-building effort, when we do capacity-building around the world, we bring our colleagues from our democracy and human rights group at the State Department with us. We are not just talking about Cybersecurity and Cybercrime, but talking about human rights aspects too. We are also bringing other stakeholders, private sector and other stakeholders to model the multistakeholder approach to working on policy. As governments are grappling with the issue, it is important that they understand those competing concerns, and often not competing, often complementary concerns and take that into account.

On the second question -- remind me the second question again. How do you collaborate among different agencies and with other stakeholders.

One of the things we have found when we talked to other governments about these issues is that you can't just talk to one agency. You have to make sure that there is a whole of Government approach where they talk to each other, which is a harder trick than you might think. There is a lot of stovepipes out there. I used to say even in the U.S. Government, which has it as well, that we have stovepipes of excellence. People were doing great work in different areas but not collaborating.

That's changed dramatically. And when we go around the world and when we talk to other governments, we bring all the different stakeholders with us, but we also go outside the Government and say, when you are developing your Cybersecurity strategy, national strategies, the best practice is you don't just do it in the Government. You consult with the industry community, consult with Civil Society community. That is how we build our international strategy and other documents. It is a important thing for every Government to do. It gives those strategies more legitimacy.

It makes them more powerful in the long term.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. I see there is one more question at the microphone. Sir, the floor is yours.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Pakistan. I have a question, what if the Government doesn't care for Cybersecurity issues in the country? I see comments on the floor about there are Cybersecurity seriousness, there are steps, there is efforts. But in fact, when they go back to their country, the reality is far away. It is different.

I was just wondering about a strategy that can impose, that can actually force countries to have Cybersecurity laws, Cybercrime law. I think this will be immensely helpful to build better digital trust if all the countries in the region have Cybersecurity laws and Cybercrime laws.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. I'll ask the panelists if they would like to respond to the question. But first the next question from the microphone.

>> AUDIENCE: Hi, Taylor Roberts, research fellow at the Global Cybersecurity Capacity Center. My question is, when we implemented, when you implement a maturity model like the ones we have, we get a review of what existing capacity is. Can you provide recommendations on how to move forward? But a country that is just starting to take Cybersecurity into consideration has an array of options before them. I can invest in a SIRT, in a strategy, awareness campaign. How do you provide guidance on which step to take first? Is it dependent on domestic context? Do we have enough knowledge about capacity-building as a discipline to be able to make this informed decision? Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Are there any questions from remote participants? No? Okay.

In that case, thank you. There are two questions. Sorry, Milton.

>> MILTON MUELLER: This is a question for Ambassador Painter. Do you consider the GGE to be a multistakeholder entity, and how does it, as a governmental negotiating body that is similar to some of the old arms control negotiations, how does it fit into the multistakeholder environment?

>> CHRIS PAINTER: On the last one or all three questions? How would you like?

>> Do it all.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: When you are talking about things like international stability, and what states should do or refrain from doing, that is naturally more of a Government conversation, but doesn't mean there is not a multistakeholder aspect to it.

One of the things we are launching this year, the U.S., is a series of conferences sponsored by UNIDEER in Geneva, trying to bring other countries outside of the smaller group of the GGE and other stakeholders to have these conversations which would help inform those discussions.

Certainly, from my own perspective is, we have had many talks with our industry, Civil Society, as we go through the year, to inform some of the things we talked about. If you look at the GGE report, there is a lot of references to the importance of human rights, which we fought to get in there, thought it was important.

There is certainly reference to sovereignty, and it does exist in cyberspace, but is not absolute. We are trying to make sure we have inputs to better inform us.

On the question about mandating countries to have particular laws, the better approach, a few years ago this was not an issue. This was not a policy issue. More and more countries are now seeing the importance of it. It is maybe true that not all countries are paying enough attention to it yet. But that's changing and changing dramatically and rapidly.

That is the opportunity to make sure that they look at some of the best practices out there. Budapest is a best practice for Cybercrime law, but look at the collaborative and voluntary approaches like the NIST framework we have done in the United States for critical infrastructure. There is a lot of good things that are out there that countries can use. That ties into the last point which is the prioritization point.

I think particularly with the developing country, when they get a new cable drop and they have connectivity, and it may be cell phone and other broadband connectivity, and they are looking at how they can build this, they have an advantage in a way. They can build policies in the beginning rather than trying to layer them on later on like all of us did.

If I were to prioritize them, the number one thing is to have that strategy, that national strategy, because that captures what your game plan is, where you are going, what the responsibilities of the different stakeholders and agencies are in your Government, and it raises awareness as a major issue within the Government.

I think that is foundational.

Having the kind of institutions like SIRTs in place which are critical to doing this, and good law enforcement, those are critical too. There are foundational building blocks, and you can add on from there. Awareness comes next. But that national strategy helps with awareness as well.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. We have two questions from the floor, one about countries that don't have Cybersecurity measures, one about which steps to take first. Tomas Lamanauskas would like to intervene, and Lara would like to add something.

>> TOMAS LAMANAUSKAS: Maybe agreeing with Chris, I wouldn't be that pessimistic that governments don't care. Governments do care, because they don't want issues and can raise more media attention, and their politicians don't want to be explaining why these issues are happening, why they don't have proper strategies in place.

However, there are also ways to do, peer pressure as well. At least from our perspective, what we are doing, I mentioned the targets, and having a committed target and knowing that will be measured, how the Governments are achieving that is usually not a bad way, because no one wants to be seeing them low in a list of the achieving countries. That grabs the attention of ministers and high level policymakers.

Having commitments and measuring them, what we do with the global Cybersecurity index, is important. But at the same time it is important to support, that is where capacity-building comes. We cannot just say have it. We talked a lot about today, how we do the capacity-building and support the governments, how you give them the right tools.

The last point about prioritization, one of the projects that we like is, I would call right questions but not necessarily right answers approach, which means we need to help governments and stakeholders to ask the right questions, but the answers may be different from different countries. What is a priority could depend on a level of maturity of the existing Cybersecurity system, but also -- I agree with Chris, sometimes it's better to have a strategy and implement it, but also a practice sometimes says it's easier to start with a SIRT and while you build a SIRT, you start building awareness what is needed. Other stakeholders get interested. You can build other elements of that.

You have to be opportunistic about that. It is not only about what is right to become first, but where you can actually make it end as well.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. The line is now closed. We will take a comment from Lara Pace. Two more questions and then we will have to move on.

>> LARA PACE: I completely agree with what Chris said in terms of having a strategy. Multistakeholder consultation is really important for that, the broadest consultation as possible. But what we are thinking about at the moment, the priority on developing the strategy is essential. But we also need to make sure that we have an allocation of thought in terms of implementation.

We don't want all these various stakeholders working with other stakeholders from across the world developing national strategies, and they are just beautiful documents but it's difficult to implement them. In the development of the strategies, we need to make sure that there is an allocation of thought and resource to make sure that there is a sustainable implementation plan on that.

>> PAUL BLAKER: I go to the questions from the floor, please. Could you keep your questions to one minute, if possible. Please introduce yourself.

>> AUDIENCE: Steve Zeltzer with labortech.net and LaborNet. I have a real concern, and we do, about the effect of the trade agreements like the trans Pacific partnership, TPP for example, as far as Democratic rights of communication, because under the TPP which has been just released, it would criminalize whistle-blowing by extending trade secret laws without mandatory exemptions for whistle-blowers or journalists. It would compel ISPs to take down Web sites without a court order and associate a domain name with a real name and address. This is part of the TPP agreement. Rules are being established already that threaten Democratic rights of communication for journalists and others. This has to be addressed by the effect on communication and freedom of information. Thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you, sir. You have the floor.

>> AUDIENCE: Thomas Richmond, director for cyber Forum policy at the German foreign office. I will skip the observation I wanted to make on political importance of capacity-building like bringing all governments at the same level, but mention another element in the GGE report, confidence-building measure as a way of developing capacity of states to address security problems.

We are trying to push for, to develop confidence-building measures, setting up mechanisms that would allow the collectivity of states and governments to check and to assess incidents that might happen, so one state where incident happens can address his group, and take it to the group, and see whether anything malicious was behind this.

My question is, really to the NonGovernmental members of this panel, how do you see these interstate confidence building measures, is that a way forward? Or is it preposterous to try to copy what we have learned in the 1970s and '80s in classical arms reduction, for example.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. We can't take any more questions from the floor now. There will be another chance for questions later. We have two questions, one around trans-Atlantic trade agreement, one around confidence building. Is there a member of the panel who would like to respond?

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Trans-Atlantic partnerships is one of my main interests. I agree it is out of place for rules that affect Cybersecurity or more broadly Internet Governance to be placed in trade agreements. It is the wrong venue. It is not multistakeholder at all. If we can think of the worst place to negotiate such agreements, it would be in the TPP.

You are right that some of these aspects that you mention do have a relation to Cybersecurity. For example, the trade secrets provision is not a conventional trade secrets provision. It is more of a mashup between trade secrets and cyber espionage.

I'm not saying these are not important issues, but they are not issues that should be negotiated in exchange for market concessions on rice or automobile parts. They are discrete issues that need to be discussed in a multistakeholder setting. The domain name issue that you mentioned where you have to submit to certain domain name rules in the TPP, there is no reason why that should be discussed in that Forum, given that ICANN is a fully multistakeholder process for developing policies on domain names.

I'd be interested to hear if Mr. Painter has anything to say about the apparent disparity between the multistakeholder model that the U.S. administration promotes, and the fact that rules on Internet Governance are being dealt with in the closed trade agreements such as the TPP.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Milton Mueller. Comment?

>> MILTON MUELLER: Right. I want to make it clear I'm very much in favor of free trade. I agree with Jeremy that there is an unfortunate pattern in the U.S. of intellectual property interests throwing things into trade agreements that are not about trade, but are trying to leverage U.S. market access to get certain kind of enforcement mechanisms that they want.

I think this is, we badly need to open trade and improve trade, and they are, the U.S. is often risking that value in creating opposition to trade agreements by making these concessions to nontrade issues.

I'd like to address, however, the other question that was asked about the confidence-building measures. In fact, that was why I asked the question to Mr. Painter about the multistakeholder nature. I certainly understand when we are dealing with cyber weapons and cyber arms control, that in some sense we are dealing with a traditional state-based laws of war kind of negotiation. I don't see that there is anything inherently wrong with the fact that states are going off in a room by themselves.

However, I think that the larger Cybersecurity problem as I said earlier has to be handled in a distributed, decentralized and multistakeholder way, and equally important, we have to resist the tendency of states to try to jurisdictionalize or border cyberspace along national territorial grounds.

This is, in the name of Cybersecurity, we have to really, that is something that fundamentally threatens the nature of the Internet.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. We are already starting to move to our next topic which is around multistakeholderism. I will ask Chris to respond to some of the points when he speaks in the next section.

But for now I'll hand it back to my co-moderator. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Paul. Yes, it's on. Multistakeholderism is the next topic, we are moving on.

The main question that we are putting down here are what are examples of successful proactive and reactive collaborations to address Cybersecurity challenges, even nationally, regionally, or globally within a sector or across sectors.

We are going to do that on the basis of three questions. How can we amplify multistakeholder participation in promoting national stability of the Internet and enhancing cooperation in global Internet Governance toward a secure cyberspace. The second question, how do we enhance digital trust and protect privacy through bilateral and multistakeholder initiatives and collaborative spaces. The third question, what case studies are available?

I'm going to open the floor with Microsoft and ask Carolyn, Carolyn Nguyen to make a intervention.

>> CAROLYN NGUYEN: Thank you very much. Thank you very much for enabling me to participate in this panel.

A couple of things, because our name has been mentioned a couple times now this morning. I want to start by first addressing that which is the notion of trust and notion of trustworthiness. Several speakers this morning mentioned that the focus of the conversation needs to be about establishing a trusted relationship within the ecosystem, and it's not just about technology.

That for us is very much important. We are the one, we were the ones who launched a concept of trustworthiness, initially at the computing system, but now increasingly that has to be trustworthiness of the ecosystem. It is within that context and that process that we have been working to enable trust with our partners, our users, but also governments of the countries in which we work.

That was part of the conversation that Milton brought up with respect to the issue that we have with the Irish Government and our actions against the U.S. Government. It is entirely to try to establish trust and address surveillance issues that have come up around the world. Without that trust within the ecosystem, it is not possible to address many of the vision and realize that.

From that I want to move to the question of the panel which is very much about multistakeholder. We strongly believe that there is no one stakeholder that can solve and address this issue. Let me take a couple examples. Within Microsoft, we have tried to establish software that are safe and trustworthy for all users around the world. With respect to that, we collect information and data to understand the impact of malware infection rates around the world.

In 2013, Microsoft established the digital crimes unit, which is a, where we work to take down botnets. The organization includes former prosecutors, police officers, technical analysts, bankers, engineers and physicists. We work very closely with law enforcement agencies around the world as well as governments around the world.

We have operations in Washington, Brussels, Singapore, Beijing, Berlin and Tokyo. This is where we address the question of transparency.

Within the center, let me talk about some of the multistakeholder examples. I'll highlight two. One is the capture of botnet which targeted banks and customers in Europe. We worked on this with the UK Government. What came out of this, and this is more in the reactive category, we partnered and announced a partnership with the financial services information sharing and analysis center. Those of you who are not

familiar with it, it is the global financial industries go-to resource for cyber and physical threat intelligence analysis and sharing. In September of last year we announced a part that where we will make our own cyber threat intelligence program available to ISOC members, so they can receive realtime information on known malware infections that are affecting more than 67 million unique IP addresses around the world.

There is also information, such as DDoS attacks as well as botnets. The second one, there was another speaker this morning who mentioned that Cybersecurity is about establishing safety for users of Cybersecurity, and within that, what we have done is to address online sexual information against children to help identify and recover missing children.

This is where we work jointly to create tools to address these issues, to identify photos, and contribute that to the Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It has been adopted by Interpol as recovery efforts internationally.

On the reactive side, as part of our operations we strongly believe in creating a safer Cybersecurity model for all, and it is that, within that, that we start to explore predictive Cybersecurity models that can advance the understanding of key technical and nontechnical factors that contributes to Cybersecurity.

In this we started exploring working together with the Martin school, a multistakeholder model, to address how, what are the quantitative as well as qualitative factors that can help to address and assess the cyber capacity of countries around the world. Those are examples of multistakeholder processes, both reactive as well as proactive, that are ongoing and being implemented today.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I'll move to your neighbor, Audrey Plonk with Intel. You have the floor.

>> AUDREY PLONK: Thank you. I think we have already had quite a robust discussion about multistakeholder on this topic already. Not to duplicate anything that's already been said, the first question about how do we amplify multistakeholder participation in promoting international stability, this gets to the points that Milton has brought up and responses from Mr. Painter.

I think that a little bit more openness around this topic, I agree with others that have said it's important that governments get behind closed doors and talk about this, these issues, Government to Government. But I also think it's important that what comes out of those processes and those discussions be shared in a broader context, and that Civil Society and the private sector are invited to understand what the issues are, and provide a perspective, because I think the piece of the Internet community that differs from maybe other more traditional topics on disarmament and arms issues, is the global distribution of the network and the degree to which these resources that are being used in conflict are built privately by the private sector and often operated there.

There is opportunity. It sounds like the U.S. has interesting proposals for conferences to bring that discussion to a broader audience. I welcome learning more about that.

But that type of discussion could benefit greatly from that sort of input from the, more from the multistakeholder community.

I think Carolyn has already touched on examples, and some other colleagues have mentioned the anti-phishing working group, the M3AAWG, the messaging and anti-abuse working group. I'll go back to my earlier comment about the umbrella of a chapeau nature of Cybersecurity. If you broke it down into specific components like incident response, or national strategies, or public/private partnerships, you would see that within those there is a variety of examples on how multistakeholder communities come together. There is a lot of opportunity for improvement. To the question that Matthew brought up, how do we implement that in a policy, and a policy format, I think that is the challenge that's worth discussing in this session and others going forward. How does the community, multistakeholder community encourage open processes around Cybersecurity policymaking in different countries is the goals that came out of the Dutch conference.

One example I will give that I don't know has been given, since our Dutch colleagues have unfortunately gone, but I would defer to Mr. Painter on this as well, but the process of the global cyberspace conference has started in a much more closed fashion and have evolved over the years to be more open and multistakeholder.

The evolution of that, and I'm not trying to say it's perfect, I'm just saying it has certainly advanced from a Government, intended to be a Government discussion to having a more participation. I think that is very welcome by the community and something we can point to, to show the benefit of opening up discussions around Cybersecurity specifically, but also broader Internet Governance issues to the multistakeholder community. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Next, Michael Kaiser. I have to read it, which is the National Cyber Safety Alliance and please, the floor is yours.

>> MICHAEL KAISER: Thank you. It's an honor and privilege to be here. Thank you for having us in and or moderators for doing such a fine job this morning. You are doing great. I'm going to talk about a specific multistakeholder approach. We are the National Cybersecurity Alliance, a public-private organization, funded by industry and Government. We are created as a multistakeholder partnership to do work in education awareness.

It is not just that we participate in multistakeholder processes, but we are a multistakeholder process. We very much believe in this.

I'm going to talk quickly. One of the questions we haven't talked about is why we even have a multistakeholder process in Cybersecurity. Why is it important? The scale is gigantic. There is no one who can do this on their own. We have to do this together. No one owns this all together. Everybody owns this. Cybersecurity is something we all own, governments own it, NGOs, industry, individual users own it. We all own this together. Therefore, we have to work together on this.

The other part is that Cybersecurity is not cheap. There is no one who is going to pay for all this. We are only going to get this done if we leverage the investments that we are all making together. We have to find a way to take the investments that we do have and put those together to create something that's bigger than what we can do on our own. That is an important element that underlies this. We have to reduce duplication of effort. If we have everybody trying to solve the problem on their own, everybody is coming up with different solutions. We are going to have duplication all over the place. People are only going to invest so much in different efforts.

We have to look at the stakeholder efforts as addressing two different levels. One is ecosystem level security, which is what we talked about here, but the other is the other part of this, is that we have to have every individual network protected as well. Sometimes we need to split those out a little in order to figure out the best way to do that.

Some of the elements that I see in these public-private multistakeholder processes are, you have to have broad involvement, and you have to be open to letting people at the table and you have to let them in at any part in the process. You can start down a path and be way down the path and there is new people you find. Guess what? You have to open the door and let them in. You don't have a choice. That is what a true multistakeholder process is.

It starts with a narrow focus as being very important. It has to be grounded in a shared problem. Our best experience has been around messaging. We discovered there was a shared problem. There was no consistent messaging about Cybersecurity in the United States and we came up with a stop, think, connect campaign, by 25 companies, 7 federal agencies working collectively over a year, conducting research, talking to consumers, hashing out issues that could create something we can all use together. That has to be at the end of the day. If we can't all use it, it is not a multistakeholder process. Self-interest is important and it is fine.

Multistakeholder processes must allow people to come to the table and must be able to express their self-interest and that self-interest must be incorporated into the end result, because we do have self-interest, and to say we are putting those aside, we will never end up in a result that will be good.

Finally, I think that we have to look at this as an effort that is owned by the partnership and not created on behalf of, by somebody else. Nobody else can create a multistakeholder process for somebody else. You have to be part of it. It has to be owned. Ours always operate by consensus. Literally by consensus. If one person says I don't like it, we change it. We fix it. We work to make it right.

You build these little agreements all along the way in order to make this happen. You have to have a way forward but you have to be flexible.

You have to give people meaningful participation. There has to be assignments to get it done. In our process to creating stop think connect, people reviewed the survey instrument. People raised their hand and figured out what kinds of collateral need to be created. People raise their hands and figured out the agendas for the next meetings. That is really important. I'll end with one other little important part of a multistakeholder in Cybersecurity, and that is at the end of the day, everything we all do to be safer online makes the Internet more secure for everybody else.

How we implement that through multistakeholder is everybody doing their part, makes it better for everybody else. That is really a important element. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. We have a remote participant and then I'm going to ask the panel to reflect on what we have heard. The remote participant, please.

>> Remote participant: Thanks, chair. We have a question: Where should the role and responsibility of national Government begin and end in cyberspace in respect to Cybersecurity?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: That is a good question indeed. Thank you very much. Who would like to start with that question before we go to reflection on presentations? Chris, as Government?

>> CHRIS PAINTER: Government has an important role. But Government doesn't have the only role. I agree with Milton. This has to be, there is different stakeholders who have a major role and the general concept of Cybersecurity which is quite broad, so there are certain aspects Government has unique abilities, and capabilities and there is many others where the private sector and Civil Society may have better capabilities than the Government, surprisingly.

You need to have, not really surprisingly, I'm using that facetiously. It is important to have this distributed approach. That is what we have been pursuing.

To answer some of the other questions, Audrey was saying the GCC, yes, that has been a evolution of that conference where more stakeholders have been brought into the planning stages, and that is something that was seen as a important process point.

On the question on the TPP, I'd say that is a very important agreement, and I think one of the things that it helps preserve, frankly, is freedom of expression by defending against the threat of balkanization of the Internet through the creation of fireballs in borders. In the U.S. and every country that is a member there will be a consultation and debate. The text is on line in the U.S. among stakeholders about that agreement.

Finally on the issue of CBMs, that is a important part of our, greater work on stability. There has been work done in the OSC, organization of security and cooperation in Europe. We did a capacity-building seminar on CBMs with Singapore, partnering with Singapore for the ASEAN regional Forum.

These and other things are transparency measures. Part are cooperative measures. They are not just Government oriented but can including other stakeholders. All those things will be important going forward.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Marco.

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: Thank you. Not a direct comment to the question but picking up on things that were said. At a technical level we say security by obscurity is bad. That also applies to this level. We need to start by trusting each other that we all share the same objectives, public and private sector. We all want to maintain the security and stability of the Internet.

I don't believe that one stakeholder can do this. We need to cooperate and use each other's expertise and capacities to mitigate interests. I think it's important to enhance a multistakeholder system and participate in each other's processes, to share information and discuss what each stakeholder can do within their mandate to help mitigate a current and emerging threat.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: Taking off from what Mr. Chris Painter said and from where he agreed with Milton, and also from the specific question, the last question which was asked, what constitutes, what is the domain in which the Government should be getting involved, and what are the domains which should be left to the others, which are best handled by their own respective set of competencies. So possibly I would be sort of interested to know if there is any larger discussion on this specific subject, and maybe what is the appropriate formula. This could be sort of beaten out properly and sort of constructed in the form of a particular model, so that it's more easily understandable, and we have a common understanding on this issue, number one.

Number two, on the point of multistakeholderism, I support a point well-made by Michael which I think is basically, although multistakeholderism and the point he made was that there is far too many technical bodies to have a one-stop shop kind of approach, which defines all the standards and covers all the inclusive things which are very well-made out points. So how to get multistakeholderism in such kind of a scenario is the real challenge, and maybe if somebody could sort of drill that further, and sort of offer us greater insight into that. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: We will turn to the room. Are there any questions? Please come up to the microphone. I understand you can only do that in a traditional way. I've learned something today also. But perhaps before somebody does so, I'd like to make one comment.

IGF has best practice fora. One of them is about mitigation and regulation of communications and what it did -- not so much look for best practices, but for best practices in case studies, where things actually went very well, and not only from the public side but especially also from the private side.

I think that would be very interesting to look at these examples that were provided there, as they really are telling about ways that within countries things can go forward in successful ways.

So that is just a tip. Michael, you would like to make a intervention?

>> MICHAEL KAISER: A point on the question about Government. If you are looking at a multistakeholder approach, Government is a stakeholder. Government has interests to sit at the table on these issues. It is just being honest about those. That is all it takes. That is how it starts. Yeah, Government has interest. Different governments have different interests. It depends who you are talking to at any given time.

There are interested parties at the table. Maybe they have other things they bring like resources or expertise or abilities to manage different kinds of processes in different ways, but that is what a multistakeholder process is. It brings the people who have a say and a stake in the outcome, and Government is always going to be one in Cybersecurity, pretty much in everything. But sometimes they are not always the lead stakeholder. Right? They can be a secondary stakeholder. It could be a tertiary stakeholder.

But you have to look at it that way. That equals the process across the table.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Jeremy.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I agree with that. We have moved on in our understanding of what multistakeholder processes can and should be since WSIS, when originally there was that fixed rigid definition of the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, in which governments had sovereign authority over public policy issues involving the Internet and everyone else was advising on the sidelines.

NETMundial statement was a progression from that in recognizing that the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders can vary issue by issue. I don't think anyone would deny that Cybersecurity is an issue in which governments will always have a role, as Michael said. And there is also evidence I think as Audrey pointed out that governments hold themselves recognizing now that they don't have the only role though, so in future, as we continue on our path of continuous improvement of multistakeholder processes, I think we are going to see that the roles of the other stakeholders in Cybersecurity will be better recognized.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I don't see anyone queuing up. But there is still comments from around the table. Marco, please.

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: Yeah. I want to second what Michael said. Governments are a stakeholder in the process. All the technical community venues are open to everybody for participation. I would like to highlight specific efforts that are taken on; for instance, the organizing Government round tables to specifically inform Government and get them to participate in our process, but also the work that, as you mentioned, in the technical standards work that the Internet Society is doing, and trying to get Government people and Governments themselves more comfortable in participating in standardization projects.

We are happy to take on board more comments on how you think we can enhance that process. But we are doing a lot of effort in getting other stakeholders involved in what from the outside seems like a closed environment. The technical community is open to participation.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Clear invitation I think to others. Do you think that it's difficult to reach out as a technical community towards the Government, to actually understand the conversations? Or do they just don't show up, what happens?

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: I think it's a multifaceted business. Of course, venues like the Internet Governance Forum and regional and national initiatives were great in bridging the gap, and making the contact, inviting people over.

Participation in the different processes, it depends. Again to speak to my earlier intervention, you don't need to solve it yourself. It's also important that you just go to the microphone and explicitly state your needs and explicitly clarify what your objectives are, and have the technical people with their expertise help you in achieving those goals.

It's not fully about totally understanding the technical processes, but at least please participate and please state your needs at the right time within the processes to make sure that the technical community can accommodate those needs.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. We have a question. Please introduce yourself.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from India. I would like to make a comment. In a multistakeholder model, the developing and developed countries and IT industry may play a vital role in helping those who are lacking in terms of technical knowledge for Sustainable Development of Internet. We need to discuss this here and also agree to something which will help to, help in raising funds for the underdeveloped countries. I would like to add, this will help in setting up Cybersecurity excellence centres in these countries.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: Building aspect, probably I'm sure a lot needs to be done in that direction, and the governments are certainly committed to doing much more in that direction. Certainly international cooperation in that area will also go a long way. So we will be consulting help from all other colleague countries, so that we

can also make improvements in that in the end applies leverage our capacities to the best of our capabilities. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Probably also unfortunately, the GFCE people have left but that sort of initiative in which these sorts of questions are actually being addressed, and hopefully solved.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: Yes, yes.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I see another question at the back. First that gentleman, and then you. Please introduce yourself.

>> AUDIENCE: First Lieutenant Arthur from Brazilian army. I'd like to know what is the contribution of open source initiatives in this multistakeholder task force. (pause).

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: You want to take another question first?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: No, that is fine; answer the question if you can.

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: In a sense I think open source and open source community itself is a multistakeholder process. I think that is one of the benefits of open source, is you can contribute, and everything happens out in the open, which from a security paradigm is a good thing, we believe.

I'm not exactly sure whether I captured your question correctly. What is the role of open source in multistakeholder, we should see open source, and especially the larger developments that go on as one of the multistakeholder processes, where I believe everybody should have their role and their say in what their needs are, and work on this together to enhance the security.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you for opportunity. My name is Zak Paretti, I'm from Institute of Education. My question about the Government, who are bad actor, such Iran, Russia and China. And actually they do not play positive role. Of course, they are stakeholder. I want to know what is their role in this process. As I'm talking here, many, probably hundreds as the Government mentioned 50 people are arrested because being on social media, for expressing their idea on Facebook or Twitter or whatever. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: We will take one final question. Thank you for that comment.

>> AUDIENCE: Thanks a lot. Dominica, Professor of Constitutional Law, University of Naples. I was wondering if there is a contradiction between the European and also American policy in Cybersecurity, and on the other hand, the policy that aims to force over the top to create the back doors, because of the back doors, if allow Government to entering the platform, at the same time make this platform less secure. That's all. Thanks.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. Anyone would like to respond to that more comment than question? Then any last thoughts of the panel on this topic? Otherwise I'll hand over to Paul to do the last section of this stimulating debate.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. We are now moving into the last section of our conversation this morning. We would like to start to think about what the next steps should be, what practical and concrete steps can be taken, what initiatives can be implemented, what evidence-based research is needed, and we set two questions for this concluding part of the discussion.

First question, how can Cybersecurity be more open, accountable and transparent? Secondly, what are the next steps and what processes can and should be part of those next steps? I'm going to ask Jeremy to kick off with a few thoughts on that, before opening it up again to the rest of the panel and to the floor.

Jeremy, would you like to say a few words to start us off? Thanks.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I could unless someone else would like to go first because I wasn't expecting that. Does anyone else wish to go first while I ponder? If not, let me express some thoughts.

I think in terms of openness of the Cybersecurity initiatives, there is obviously a definite need for reform of national surveillance practices, that were exposed by Edward Snowden. This is not just something we can lay at the foot of the United States, either. We have to look at what GCHQ was doing, what the 7 eyes are doing. And in terms of both Congressional and legal challenges in court, and in terms of the open Government partnership and various other avenues for expanding openness and transparency of these practices, we have still got a long long way to go.

That is something that we haven't really spoken too much about in this panel. But I thought I'd throw that in.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. I'll pass the microphone to Chris to say a few words. This will also be then a final chance for questions, comments from the floor. I'll ask other panelists if they want to contribute. I'm also warning panelists now that I'm going to ask you to talk about one new thing that you have learned from this conversation. So you have time to prepare. But before we get to that, I'll ask Chris to make a contribution.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: In terms of next steps, as the discussion has shown today, it is critically important for us to continue to have these conversations in formats like this; not just in the format here, but also in the regional and national IGFs. This is a very important component of all of those. I'd urge this to be included to the extent it isn't already in those various fora.

Then of course, some of the next steps revolve around the importance of capacity-building and the Global Forum for Cyber Expertise and work that is being done which carries out and through almost every topic we talk to. The final thing, we need to have these conversations here too. That is why it's critically important the IGF actually continue its existence for a substantial period of time to bring predictability. We have called for an extension as you know of the IGF at the UN General Assembly. We call for it again today. We know that many stakeholders have also joined in that call. We think this illustrates how valuable this Forum is.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much. Tomas Lamanauskas, you have the floor, and after you, Carolyn.

>> TOMAS LAMANAUSKAS: Thanks a lot. First of all, in terms of next steps, and when we discuss the Cybersecurity and how to progress on that, it is important to include universality so we have stakeholders from all nations at the table. And other panelists mentioned that Cybersecurity is different from other areas, in regard that it's Democratic. The issues can come from anywhere. And also anyone needs to be protected in the same way. We need to avoid the discussions about people without them being at the table. How do we bring them together?

In that sense there are challenges as well. There is the number of forums and foras and discussion platforms that we have, cyber Alps, I remember one conference, there are so many. Now we have cyber Alps. So the question is how do we get that alignment, because again, we can't expect every stakeholder from everywhere participate in every fora.

How do we maybe try to break down into issues, maybe have a more issue related discussion and start understanding that we can no longer talk about this broad thing. Now there are various different issues that maybe we can bring different people to discuss them, and ensure the right people are around the table and also the right people could participate, so they know how to participate in the processes in the past and can come. Thanks a lot.

>> PAUL BLAKER: The Rocky Mountains maybe more than the Alps, but Carolyn.

>> CAROLYN NGUYEN: Thank you. I'd like to second Chris's call with respect to expanding the conversations into the regional and national IGF as well, because one of the points that's come out from this conversation is the need to create additional awareness on the issue. I want to bring up another point, IGF as a

platform was created to bridge the digital divide, and within the WSIS review there is a call for addressing closer relationships between the WSIS action lines and the SDG. As we know, Cybersecurity has a critical importance in advancing the 2030 agenda, so within that, similar to what was done in the past year with respect to policy options, Connecting the Next Billion, the next step is policy options for enabling Cybersecurity. And specifically within the context of bridging the digital divide, it's very much about cyber capacity-building, I think which is something that all the stakeholders around the table and in the broader IGF globally around the world can agree on.

That is one very concrete step that I'd like to put forth. It would also create awareness and visibility of all the different multistakeholder initiatives that are already ongoing around the world.

Then to Jeremy's comment with respect to the open Government partnership, that is reaching out to our stakeholders. There are other organizations, very similar to the open Government partnership, which are addressing exactly the same issues in a multistakeholder Forum. It would be nice to identify some of those organizations and also bring them into the table.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Now I'd like to open it up to the floor, if there are any thoughts on the next steps or any concluding thoughts as we start to draw the threads together. Now is your opportunity to come to the microphone, ask a question, or contribute. Or if there are any questions or comments from remote participation. Sir, you have the floor.

>> AUDIENCE: Hi, it's Fabricio again. My question is, we definitely know that we need to engage more people from other stakeholders, we know that we have to try, and I gave the suggestion of going there, and bringing them to events. But my question to you would be, who should be in charge of doing that? Who should be the ones going to the event and trying to bring other stakeholder groups? How do we deal with that? Is that something that we would deal in the IGF, would it be some organization like ISOC? Do we have someone that is doing that? Or maybe we should create another kind of organization to start doing this collaboration and efforts with other stakeholders groups.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Who would like to comment on the question?

>> CHRIS PAINTER: I do think there is a challenge in making sure that people are involved in all these conversations. But I don't think creating a centralized way to do this is the way to go about it. What we have heard from panelists is there is so many, there is a richness of the various opportunities out there for people to participate. We just need to make sure those are inclusive as possible. I think reflecting on my colleague from Oxford, doing things, and even with my colleague from the ITU, doings things that list what is available out there, and that people can understand what they can participate really is a more effective way than trying to create some sort of bureaucratic structure that would do this, because I don't think any one organization can do it alone.

ISOC has a role. Many institutions around the world have a role. Some of them are regional and some are international and some of them are national.

>> SUBI CHATURVEDI: Briefly responding to the question, this year the MAG opened up to a new stakeholder community and that has about three EU representatives, it has opened for the first time. We also believe that each of us carries with us this responsibility of bringing new people with us, whether it's workshops, the way the rating systems evolved from the last two years, how we have been able to privilege and also prioritize and through a formative action bring in new voices, in terms of giving them the benefit of first time proposals. It's also ISOC, many new ISOC ambassadors, ICANN fellowships, but whether it's introducing people through remote participation, also taking us with us the learning that we take from here, and that truly is the value of the IGF process as a platform, which is inclusive in bottom-up and allows open participation.

I think the onus lies with governments to create more fellowships with communication and ICT departments, but also intergovernmental bodies to make these meetings more open and accessible, and also with the each of us to take these learning to each of our respective stakeholder groups, write about it, blog about it, and the Internet is all yours.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. I'll ask Michael and we have one more question.

>> MICHAEL KAISER: Yeah. My answer to that question is a couple fold. One is, you can look to the processes that are out there, and try and gauge, or you can create your own.

I think that is part of the multistakeholder process has to happen at every level. It doesn't just happen way up here. It can happen far down into the community.

We didn't talk about this because we have multistakeholder, but also critical are partnerships. It is who you decide to work with in your own community, to start addressing these issues. Who is right around you in your neighborhood, who is also concerned about this issue, who you should be talking to about this issue and figuring out, how can we do this in our town, our city, our country, our state, whatever your structure is, and start your own multistakeholder process to address the issue locally. We need more of that. We need more at that level, that happening, because that is a next level of engagement in a lot of places.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Question from the floor. Please say who you are and where you are from.

>> AUDIENCE: Sally Long from the Open Group. I'm the director of the Open Group's Trusted Technology Forum. All of the discussion that I'm hearing now about bringing together existing initiatives that are out there, I really support that, because our Forum has created a standard and an accreditation program for ICT providers for product integrity and supply chain security.

It's a standard that was created by Microsoft, IBM, HP, CISCO, Juniper, EMZ and a little bit of the DOD. The point is, and it's a best practices standard, so when I heard you all talking about best practices for ICT providers, I thought wouldn't that be great, if we could work together and you could be more aware of that.

I know it's not -- it's hard to take in every initiative out there. But I think it's important that you don't reinvent what's already there.

I would also like to say this is my first time at the IGF. I'm very amazed at the experience, the passion and the enthusiasm for solving these tough problems. So thank you.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you very much for that. Anyone like to respond on the panel to that point? All right. Thank you.

We are drawing towards our conclusions now. We have covered a really wide range of issues. I'm really impressed at the breadth of the agenda that we have managed to cover. But also the fact that we have looked in some depth at some of the key issues, I really think it has been a valuable session. I certainly learned a lot, and I will take away a lot. And as I warned panelists earlier, we have got a couple of minutes, I'd just like panelists to have a think about one new thing that they have learned from this conversation, the one new take-away, and share with us what it is that you take away from the discussions so far.

>> ZMARIALAI WAFA: Thank you. Throughout the session, we talked about various topics. This is my first IGF, and I am so delighted to be a part of the panel and the Cybersecurity issues as well.

What we learned was the same theme, the collaborative work of the stakeholders. We each and every panelist is representing an entity, and the way that this whole topic, topics were brought up, we were in a position to answer them. So I would say the IGF itself is a good example of bringing different stakeholders to one table, addressing the challenges. Thank you very much.

>> MARCO HOGEWONIG: I think the composition of the panel and the open discussion should be a template for the discussions happening in the other fora, and at the other levels and their inclusiveness. So that is the one thing I should take away, but I'd like to observe that as much as you wish, you should not force people, forcibly exclude people from anything, we cannot also not force them to participate. The invites are there, fora are open, but you have to take the step and participate and be willing to sit at the table. That is also a great take away from this.

>> TOMAS LAMANAUSKAS: More confirmation. Expansion of the multi-faceted plenary should come with issue of Cybersecurity, when hearing the questions from Government actions to open source, you can see how different issues come into the play now, how we need to bring people who are accessing that, in those different topics, if we want to make good progress on that.

>> LARA PACE: I wanted to reiterate the importance on the capacity-building element which we focused on, we spoke about earlier. And I think that when we are looking about, when we are thinking about next steps and Cybersecurity, we really need to try and raise the awareness across the stakeholders, as we spoke about earlier, and try and build a skilled workforce, but also a skilled Civil Society as much as possible.

We really need to get the message out there. And I don't think it's incredibly challenging or expensive. If we work together we can come up with meaningful, practical collaborative approaches to addressing those very big challenges. I look forward to hearing what everybody.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: One of the take-aways from me, which I heard from Michael but which I've been thinking about, is different governments have different interests in Cybersecurity, and we at the IGF tend to divide the stakeholder groups up into these blocks of governments as a whole and private sector as a whole and Civil Society as a whole. That is inflexible, particularly in this area, where we know that there are divisions that need to be recognized and worked through.

One of the ways in which the multistakeholder model can evolve is in recognizing that stakeholder groups aren't unitary, and it may sometimes be beneficial to split them up into groups of common interests. And maybe that is something that we could see in the future evolution of Cybersecurity discussions.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Maybe completely as a moderator but also of course I take something home with me, we have talked a lot about openness, about trust, about capacity-building, about awareness-raising, about security, about surveillance of course, but also what struck me is the where is the weakest link, and we point to some countries in this case, but it's also about Cybersecurity. If we had to fill this room with the number of parties that are involved in Cybersecurity, it would probably not be big enough.

It's impossible to ever reach out to all those that should be participating. You can't force them to participate, as Marco says. But there are sort of parties that probably we never even heard of but determine how safe our devices are, or our lives are nowadays.

So what I would like to share with you, and perhaps that you can take home with you, next year, most likely, who are the main people in a community that is, or business community, that is not present now, that we would like to have here next year, and how do we make them come and make it attractive enough for them to come?

I can give a personal example of work that I've been doing, I've been trying to get input for best practices, etcetera, and people say what is the IGF, why would I put effort into doing this? Now some people actually are here because they saw the potential for their own work. How can we make it attractive for people that do not know about the IGF, but we want to have here next year? That is something we can all do and all think about and all reach out on.

That is what I'd take away from the session. Perhaps we can have a completely different conversation next year.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Carolyn.

>> CAROLYN NGUYEN: Thank you. I want to reiterate the other comments already that there are, I was struck by the amount of passion but also the agreements at the high level in terms of some of the concepts that need to create trust, multistakeholder, etcetera.

But I think a clear take-away for me is that we need to figure out how to harvest that passion by focusing on what is a specific issue within Cybersecurity that we want to bring people together to solve. I think Michael, you made that comment earlier on, because the approach has to be issue-specific, and that is another way to bring people to the table.

It is about interest. That way, you can have a productive conversation, and a very specific conversation.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Chris.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: I've been to several IGFs, and I see this conversation, particularly this conversation has evolved and become better every year. That is an important trend line. I do think that the workshops provide a good place to talk about best practices, and then bring that together in a panel or a plenary session or main session or whatever they call it next year, like this.

I think that's very helpful. I do think one thing that it will be up to Mexico to, who will be hosting this, to really promote, is that I think you don't always get all the expertise you need in discussions like this, because people don't really know what the Internet Governance Forum is, or may say that is about Internet Governance, and they think about it as a narrow term and it is for many people, but we have to get the people that do the issues, Cybersecurity issues, from Government, who might not be coming to the Internet Governance Forum. They think of it as not in their area. Got promotion, advertising campaign and outreach to make sure that those folks know how broad the agenda is, not just in this area but across the board in issues we face in cyberspace, would help to make the conversation richer in the future.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Michael.

>> MICHAEL KAISER: A take-away from me, a couple things, one is there are more people that I have to be working with. (chuckles).

You sit in this room, around this table, go to this conference, and you realize there are so many people doing such good work and that we have to figure out a way to work together even more. That's both a challenge and an opportunity. To the point, this also goes to multistakeholder process too, we talked about, I mentioned that you have to allow everybody to come to the table, but the truth is sometimes you have to pick up the phone and get people to come to the table. Right? Then you have to actually reach out to people to say, it's not just like, do you want to come? Maybe one thing we learned, we need to help get more people to the table at forums like this.

So let us know if we can help.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Any final comments?

>> AUDREY PLONK: The problem with going towards the end, everybody has taken the good observations. I agree with Chris. Coming to the IGF for a long time and dealing with Cybersecurity issues in the IGF, I learned about several initiatives I'm not involved in and I'd like to be. But I also think the maturity of the conversation is significantly different than it was even a couple of years ago. I think the level of interest and understanding on the part of the broad community groups is very encouraging, and I think the solution space, the ideas and the solutions that are being discussed here and offered are very practical and for the most part very reasonable and actionable.

I think that speaks to the maturity of the IGF as a venue to discuss these issues, and so I'm very -- I have learned in all of the Cybersecurity sessions I've been in, definitely something specific that's happening that I didn't know was happening before.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. That's great.

>> RAHUL GOSAIN: Well, the take-aways have been far too many for me to -- this is also my first IGF, like Mr. Wafa who is my colleague on the panel. I echo the same sentiments regarding the richness of the panel as well as the passion with which the comments have come in.

And whether it is about making disparate groups other than a one-stop shop solution, searching for that elusive one-stop solution, whether it is that or whether it is -- I mean the take-aways have been too many. But it's really been an interesting session, and I have, I'm much the gainer for it. So I take away a lot of things for this and hope to continue to be able to contribute meaningfully and further many such matters. Thanks a lot. Thank you, everyone.

>> PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Take-aways have been too many also, I think. That is a sign of a good session. Before I hand back to our Chair on behalf of my co-moderator and myself, we would like to thank the panelists for their contributions. We made you work very hard. We really appreciate all your engagement. I'd like to thank questioners from the floor, and from remote participation and for your engagement. Perhaps most of all, thanks to Subi and Dominique who organized this session extremely well.

We owe them a big debt of gratitude. Thank you. (applause) With that, I'd like to hand back to our chair for closing remarks.

>> PAULO SERGIO CARVALHO: It's now time to end this session. And we would like to thank our organizers, moderators, panel members. We would like to thank you for this very rich discussion in this theme, authorities, ladies and gentlemen, we would really like to thank you for being here with us during this whole morning, contributing to all our discussions.

I would like now to officially close this session. Thank you.

(applause).

>> SUBI CHATURVEDI: Also a huge thank you for the translators and the transcription, and our host country. And thank you, chair. Thank you, moderators. You have done an excellent job, three-hour session, very very grateful.

A Dialogue on "Zero Rating" and Network Neutrality

The following are the outputs of the real-time captioning taken during the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in João Pessoa, Brazil, from 10 to 13 November 2015. 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 event, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

***

>> NIVALDO CLETO: Ladies and gentlemen, we now resume the meeting and I open this afternoon's session, a dialogue on Zero-Rating and Net Neutrality. I'm looking forward to our talks. This afternoon we'll engage in an informative and good dialogue on the complex issue of Zero-Rating. The purpose of this session is to help others in their respective countries and locales in their own analysis of Zero-Rating. The session will promote access to expert insight and multistakeholder community discussion and hopes to look at the views across the stakeholder groups and perspectives.

There are many different viewpoints on Zero-Rating, with some stakeholders being completely against the practice to others being fully supportive. The session will consider the full spectrum of views. In the case where Zero-Rating is advanced as a means to drive Internet access and narrow the Digital Divide, this session will also explore alternative approaches, such as the use of community networks. Finally, we also will cover issues from the workshops and discussions with workshop organizers in order to manage the session there will be three moderators to ensure expertise and facilitation of the dialogue.

I thank you all for joining us this afternoon, and particularly I thank our distinguished speakers for being here with us. We also look forward to hearing the views of the remote participants.

Our moderators this afternoon is Robert Pepper, Vice President, Global Technology Policy, Cisco. Remote moderator, Ginger Paque, Director, Internet Governance Programmes, Diplo. And floor and readout moderator, Vladimir Radunovic, Director, E-diplomacy and Cybersecurity Programmes, Diplo, and Carolina Rossini, Vice President, International Policy, Public Knowledge.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much. Everybody, welcome to what I expect is going to be an exciting session.

We have a lot of speakers. We have five different sessions already on Zero-Rating in one form or another. As a result we're going to have readouts from those five sessions. So we're lucky we're coming today because there's a lot of content that we already can get.

A bit of housekeeping, because it is so -- such a full Agenda, and I was joking earlier that because I'm from Cisco and a neutral router, I'll be really routing traffic in a very neutral way but keeping time and keeping the conversations going.

We'll start with the five readouts and each of the presenters of the other sessions will have 2 minutes. We then have four sessions, four mini panels: The first will focus on -- looking it at research on Zero-Rating; the second is looking at different definitions, what people mean by Zero-Rating; third will be the views from the different national views of Zero-Rating; and then finally, the last session will be looking at the benefits and harms of Zero-Rating.

The expert panelists will each have 3 minutes. We have a timekeeper that will be rigid that will help me. When the time is up, he's going to start tapping at the microphone. We have a clock here for everybody. At the end of the sessions, with national view, perspective, we want a lot of time for the audience, for you, for the participants. This is not about people talking at or to you, this is about a conversation involving everybody in the room.

Briefly setting the scene, last year, in Istanbul IGF we had a very good session on Zero-Rating and there were a lot of different points of view, terrible, good. People were saying we really need to make sure that we connect people that are not connected, as you just said, which is extremely important. Others said that the problem is it leads to lock in monopoly behavior, the costs could outweigh the benefits. There was a beginning of some research looking at the impact of Zero-Rating and how it interacts with principles of net neutrality.

There are really -- I have already mentioned, there are two areas of, you know -- for the people that advocate using Zero-Rating it is designed to solve one of two problems: Both of them are related to connecting the unconnected. One of the things that we know, it is that when you ask people why they're not connected to the Internet there is a group that it is no access. Right. We have had really good sessions. We had one with yesterday on Connecting the Next Billion, other sessions were with the small island countries earlier on how to connect people and get them access if they don't have it.

When you look at where people have access but do not subscribe, they're not online, it is usually for one of two reasons -- actually it turns out three -- there is research here in Brazil that points to these. In Brazil, by the way, 90% of people have access to a 3G connection, which is kind of a basic, beginning real Broadband. About

20% of those that have it available that do not subscribe, say they can't afford it, but 70% of the people -- people can tick off multiple reasons -- 70% of the people that could have it but don't subscribe say they don't see the value in the Internet, they don't think it is important, they don't understand the value to them. And there is another people that tick off they don't have the skill or capacity, another 70%. There is a group of people that say we can have Zero-Rating to lower the cost to address the price issue. Then there are people that say, you know what, if we can get people online so that they appreciate the value of the Internet then they'll convert to regular subscribers and that will help people get connected. It is an awareness issue. Cost, awareness, those are the two positive benefits people use to justify to say Zero-Rating is great.

On the other hand, there is a lot of concern that depending on the structure of a Zero-Rating package it is not the full Internet, it is a subset of the Internet, not really the Internet. By the way, it could lead to lock in, it could lead to anti-competitive behavior, it could mislead consumers, preventing people to go where they really want to go on the Internet. There are very legitimate concerns, and there are very legitimate aspirations for benefits.

What we're here today to do is provide a little light, a little heat, a little light on this debate.

The first part of this, it will be about research. Over the last year there have been a number of researchers affiliated with other universities and research institutes that are going to begin to look at the research questions.

First we're going to go to our readouts from the five sessions that we have already had on Zero-Rating as it relates to Net Neutrality to set the context. We'll start with the readout from workshop 156, Zero-Rating and Net Neutrality policies in developing countries.

>> Thank you. The conversation in the panel was just in the Zero-Rating services as a tool to provide Internet access and how that can affect an open, free Internet. For some of the panelists from private sector public policies show the lack of affordability to get Internet access, but also the lack of interest. For them, Zero-Rating services can help to foster Internet demand. They don't want Zero-Rating services as a permanent situation, but as an entry level for people offline. Zero-Rating must be done under specific rules to prevent distortion of competition through relationships in the whole digital ecosystem. As the Wikipedia Foundation representatives said, Zero-Rating services are not about right or wrong, but a matter of responsibility.

For other panelists from Civil Society the principles of Internet are the ability to connect, create, consume, contribute. The need to connect the next billion doesn't mean we should sacrifice those principles creating a false version of the Internet. In a context where Internet is becoming more corporatized, the Zero-Rating services start that worrying trend.

Finally, seeing Zero-Rating as a solution for the access problem is going to remove incentives to find other solutions to provide a wired Internet access.

Thank you

>> ROBERT PEPPER: You were within time. Thank you.

Access to Zero-Rating, Josh.

>> On Tuesday, a group of ten advocates, academic, we presented in a public show and talked about Zero-Rating and Net Neutrality. It was one of the first times such a broad body of work regarding Zero-Rating was presented and discussed.

Research presentations included insight into the many different kinds of Zero-Rating mobile services offered by top global operators, baring definitions of Zero-Rating as seen through the various offerings through providers, data on the widely varying costs of data in single countries and across the world and how it affects users who are using zero rated offerings. The effect of the data caps on countries that don't invest in fiber optic networks, discussions on offering free access to services like Facebook and others, a practice that many

believe violates Net Neutrality, differing frameworks to use to view the different practices including Human Rights, consumer rights, competition law and innovation policy.

The challenge, many users of -- many users are equating Facebook with the Internet. Zero-Rating being a reality in developing countries since at least 2009, if not before that.

Differing using perspectives on Zero-Rating, some think that access even limited is good, others think that access to only one or selected content providers would be harmful, the need to distinguish between theoretical harms and real harms. We finally all agreed that we all need more data.

Finally, the product presentations had outlines from Facebook on the free basic program and data on conversion rates in the program, questions about the difference between Facebook and various products came up, including the privacy policy with free basics and concerns about free basics being a so-called walled garden.

Finally we had descriptions of the Firefox OS rollout and partnerships with German phone and others and the work to connect this to connectivity.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: 2 seconds left. Thank you.

The Dynamic Coalition on Net Neutrality.

>> The Dynamic Coalition, we discussed the contribution to the annual report of the Net Neutrality which is part 3 in this book, the Net Neutrality companion.

There were initial regulatory perspectives. We had the regional perspective saying in Norway and other countries in Europe, the Zero-Rating is considered as a practice that determines policy discrimination and that it is not considered as compatible with Net Neutrality. A non-discrimination principle and the goal of Net Neutrality is to avoid fragmentation and foster a platform that's open to communication and innovation. According to the Norwegian regulator and others, this is not compatible with the Zero-Rating practices.

The second point was how consumer evaluates the Zero-Rating, and so the reply is presenting in a study, we have consumers that -- there is a data cap. If the data cap is low, consumer may appreciate and they may have a benefit, if the data cap is high, they don't really -- they're not interested. The problem is that this may lead to operators keeping the data caps artificially low to sell Zero-Rating offering.

Subsequently, there was policy suggestion on how to keep Zero-Rating an exception that could be compatible with others, using -- considering the rating as a short-term exception and providing Zero-Rating on free reasonable and non-discriminatory conditions.

Finally, the goal of Zero-Rating that's been presented by many supporters is to foster connectivity. This has been challenged as a statement, and it has been argued that rather than using Zero-Rating it would be more sustainable to use community networks and to empower people.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

The small island session, please, this morning.

>> Yes. This morning we had a vibrant, provocative discussion on this complex issue, widening it to the concept of free Internet, not just on the Zero-Rating. The question around who pays for the Internet and what the concept of the free Internet really was a recurring theme throughout the discussion. It was important to understand whether the discussion was about the infrastructure, applications, the monitory contributions of users, so on, and the group agreed there was a need to discuss each aspect as it related to the overall objective of being able to derive the maximum benefit for small economies.

Several of the panelists referenced the many varied modals used across the world to fund the rollout of infrastructure and reduction of cost in underserved areas, and it was agreed a focus on innovative solutions would be necessary to resolve this issue unique to small island developing states.

Expressions of concern as to whether implementation of free Internet and Zero Rated services present in the Caribbean region were really benefiting the citizens of the nations. There was an interesting discussion around the individual components as a system of levers that need to work in tandem to achieve this objective.

Describing the reducing cost of access, improving robustness of infrastructure, stimulating local content as individual levers with different stakeholders that don't always work in a similar way or the pace, we would like to have the discussions inside of that. The general discussion was around the imperative of the synchronization of the various components of the Internet so that the levers could be identified and manipulated within our own unique economies.

Finally, there was a unanimous agreement that there needs to be an expansion of stakeholder involvement with a strong focus on non-technology players, Civil Society, academia, collaboration was key to getting the Agenda pursued so that the overall desired objective of our states can be realized.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Then the last readout from Antonio from Italy, it was the session on Zero-Rating Open Internet and freedom of expression.

>> Thank you.

The workshop title Zero-Rating Open Internet and Freedom of Expression will take place tomorrow, 9:00 in room 8.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: This is an advertisement for people to go?

>> Exactly an advertisement!

The aim is to consider the impact of Zero-Rating plans on the open nature of the Internet on Net Neutrality, on freedom of expression and inclusiveness. Notably, we will aim to understand Zero-Rating's effect on socioeconomic development. We will explore all the different sides of the crucial debate, focusing in particular on Zero-Rating's effect on competition in our Telecom market, on conscience behavior and on Internet Governance.

Our panel will also attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the current, regulatory trends where regulators assess Zero-Rating plans on a case-by-case or market-by-market basis. The workshop's panel is uniquely well positioned to achieve these aims, diverse with regulators, academic, international organizations and private sector actors from all over the world.

Our final objective is arriving at an exchange of views with the full participation of our audience. As a Telecom regulator I know firsthand how difficult it is to get it right and regulate Zero-Rating effectively as to preserve both Net Neutrality and a vibrant market in the interest of consumers. That's why I'm delighted to have the chance to moderate this exchange of ideas. Join us for this workshop tomorrow morning at 9:00 in room 8.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you. That's a great advertisement. You can probably take things from today's session and build them into tomorrow.

Now we're going to move right into -- by the way, one of the things that I took away from all of the readouts, I think that Josh, you put it really well, which is we actually need more facts, and actually we need to understand impacts. We now have begun to have research looking into this.

We're going to start with the research panel. Each of the experts has 3 minutes to present their expert views.

If you can change the clock from 2 to 3. When the speakers start, start the clock.

We'll start with Silvia Ello-Calderwood, London School of Economics.

>> SILVIA ELALUF-CALDERWOOD: As I heard, there is a call for data. I want to summarize in the 3 minutes that the research that I have been doing in collaboration with a colleague in Denmark and research funds from the Danish Research Council where we have been looking to the issue of Zero-Rating from three angles, competition, issue of innovation and another. In particular, we had approached these from looking at the various questions on who are the people, who are the companies out there that implement this Zero-Rating solution.

Our work has been an overview of many countries, Africa, America, Indonesia and three case studies in Chile, Netherlands and others, and there has been many issues with Zero-Rating, they have pointed to two familiar conclusions. They are that when there is a band in Zero-Rating it normally holds the local setups and small operators because they're the ones that actually implement first Zero-Rating. It is not the incumbents, the ones that use this service to get in the market of people, of companies, of people that are trying to access for the first time. There are many examples of this. We have Chile Virgin Mobile, we have others, et cetera.

The second thing that's interesting for us, when we look at the lowest price offers in the market, the top price market gets more data but that only helps the experienced user. You have to ask the question then, what are the options we're leaving to the new user, the one that's not experienced Internet, should we make them wait for a long time before you get it right or just keep it in some kind of access?

What do we need to do to maximize the coverage? Perhaps one of the things we have to do is to get our assumptions right. We have to understand, first, you know, that as multistakeholder model with complexity, there is very much, it is created on a frame, an American frame of the understanding of the Internet and we have to go on and know locally what's going on before we try to put that frame out there.

The conflict, Zero-Rating with Net Neutrality is perhaps to extend too much the concept, it is a marketing tool in many countries where this is Zero-Rating provided is a way for small operators that are first entry in the market or establishing themselves to differentiate in the pricing.

Finally, we did more studies that are more serious, we talk about the differentiation. I heard in a session for access a discussion, for example, on how people cannot differentiate between Internet and Facebook. I will say is this the fault of the use of Zero-Rating or a way of how the companies market that product?

Our preliminary conclusion -- we're still ongoing in this work and research -- it is that Zero-Rating should not be planned. The affects is less than 1% of the market, that's using it --

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I'm sorry. Your time is

>> SILVIA ELALUF-CALDERWOOD: -- we should explore and find out more about the data.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Thank you.

Helani Galpaya who is at LIRNEasia. I never know how to pronounce this. It is a research institute in Sri Lanka and they have done a lot of work on a lot of issues.

Helani Galpaya.

>> HELANI GALPAYA: It's LIRNEasia.

We live in an environment where we have some of the cheapest blended prices for voice and data in the world according to most rankings. We have met at a micro level 5% target set by the Broadband Commission on Affordability and we have 20% of over people online. We have a long way to go. This is 15 to 20 years after

the deregulation, high competition and five or more years since our government started to throw billions of dollars trying to get people connected.

In surveys of people of the base of the pyramid when asking why you don't use it, the top reason in Asia, I don't need it or I don't see the need for it. It is not affordability or availability of the signal.

In this question, the first question of this context, the first question is Zero Rated content a phenomena that drives people to adopt a form of connectivity that's beyond the traditional SMSN voice? The answer seems to be cautiously yes. For example, in 2015 the nationally represented survey showed that when offered Zero Rated Facebook had a 49% adoption versus the 17% for the whole population as a whole and Wikipedia, the same. If it is free, people use it.

Then the next question, is it an onramp to the Internet? This is a big hole in the research. Repeated use by Facebook, that's the data, they caught 50% of consumers that use free basics, they become paying consumers within 30 days. I think the biggest help in this debate can come if Facebook sheds light on how this number is calculated.

In our separate conversations with operators, Telecom operators that do offer the Zero Rated content, and this is not systematic, they say that the conversion rate is acceptable, meaning as rational profit maximizing players in a market, it is worth it for them to keep subsidizing the free connectivity because people convert to the full Internet and become paying customers.

The next question, do some of them still stay inside of the walled garden? Of course they do! When they are inside of this walled garden, like Facebook, what do they do? We know from evidence that they organize themselves politically, they run political campaigns like they did leading up to elections that ended on Sunday.

We know from our research on gender that there are for example hairdressers that find out about hairstyles of celebrities because this is what their customers demand. There are people who contact other people and occasionally get a job. Evidence from Africa is that the social media platforms like Facebook Zero are used to communicate with existing networks of friends and family because other ways of communicating, SMS, voice, they're much more expensive. It is a substitute.

What is the value of the interactions with related to the large volumes with the job related interactions? We don't know. Do some users think that Facebook is Internet? Yes. Is it related to Zero Rated? We don't know.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Time is up. Can you finish the sentence.

>> HELANI GALPAYA: Is this attractive with other alternatives? That's the biggest question we have. We don't know that. The expressed harms are hypothetical or mythical. We don't have the basis for policy making at this point.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

The last researcher, AI4A, we have looked at that.

>> I want to talk about the research project we started recently, the objective is to use empirically search to determine how service specific data plans, data plans and other new services impact on the Internet affordability in developing countries. In so doing, inform policymakers on the best ways to address these emerging services. From the outset, affordability, it is one part of the access question, but an important part.

The first part of our project looked at the availability of the different kinds of mobile data services across eight countries: Three in Africa, three in Asia and two in South America. We reviewed all of the plans offered by the top mobile phone carriers in all eight countries, and came up with four level panel of classification system. The first category was a full-cost data bundle where you can basically pay the advertised price for the user for data in whatever way you wish.

The second, a service specific. Here a user purchases the data at the discount rate, but only uses the data on specific kinds of sites or apps.

The third is earned data where the user receives data in exchange for performing some kind of action. This may include completing surveys, other marketing kind of services on certain ANS.

The fourth, it is what we know as Zero Rated data where this is no additional cost to the consumer but the data is only used for accessing those types. Based on the review, service-specific plans are available in all countries but Kenya and Ghana. In Kenya, a proportion of the Zero Rated plans were most frequently observed. Zero Rated plans exist in other countries but it is a wide range. For example, in Nigeria, there is only one operated Zero Rated option. The most innovative was only available in three countries, it was the least frequently observed.

Across all countries, if you look at the plan, 51% would be classified as service specific, a third were forecast and only 13% were Zero Rated. The majority were service specific when you buy data at a discount rate but only using it on specific sites.

In terms of our next steps, what we want to do is use this framework now to go -- to apply to inform a set of user surveys in the eight countries I just mentioned. Surveys of mobile phone users in all eight countries to understand the key questions that we have already heard, things like conversion rate, to what extent do the models impact provision of local content, what are the alternatives that exist in the models of data service that could help drive the greater Internet adoption, particularly among the low income groups and other excluded groups.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

We're now going to the floor.

We have Vladimir Radunovic and Carolina Rossini as floor moderators. If there are questions, please go to the mikes.

What we'll do, we'll probably end up taking several questions and then have people respond to those, and the time limit for the people on the mikes is 90 seconds.

If we can change of the clock to 90 seconds or a minute 30. I would appreciate it.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: At this part of the session, it is good to focus on the topic of this part of the session which is actually research and findings and whatever we know about.

I kindly ask you to queue the microphones and for the online participants to queue the online participants as well. Ginger is there to help us include the online participants as well.

In the meantime, I wanted to quickly check with all of you, how many of you actually have a Zero-Rating package? How many of you have a mobile package that includes Zero Rated, Facebook, Google, any other? Can you raise your hands, please? I would say maybe a fifth of the room.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: More of you may, but you don't know it is saying

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Or they don't to say.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Bring the lights up in the room, thank you, so people can see each other.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: We're doing something fun between the mikes, form the lines. We'll start on this side and move to that side. Please introduce yourself and make your question.

>> AUDIENCE: Good afternoon. I'm from Brazil. I'm from National Freedom for Democratization of Communication.

We think that Net Neutrality issues should analyze the crucial document which is a result of the NETMundial meeting making clear the public character of the Internet success in its relation with Human Rights. We defend that Zero-Rating in available period of data bundle is not Net Neutrality but there may be relations of competition law and consumer rights. In the end of data cap, the provision of exclusive ANS and the interruption of Internet access represents illegal discrimination and blockage. We say that essential services imply principles that guarantee the continuity and standards of the equality. In other words, that should be available to every citizen regardless of their social classes with a minimum standard of quality.

The work of Civil Society on Net Neutrality is important because the governments in various countries in Latin America, Asia, Africa, they're omitted for being convenient with the business plans and projects that treat Net Neutrality like Zero-Rating and Internet.org. This kind of practice is a falsification of the connecting and can bring a reduced benefit in short-term. In long-terms this will damage the development of the market and the commitment of competition and innovation.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Vlad mentioned we would like to -- we appreciate the statement. I think that it is really important. There will be other opportunities for statements. This is really -- we want questions on the research. There will be a lot of opportunity for people to make statements.

Also, if the timekeeper could change the time on the clocks, that would be great. That would help us as well.

>> (No English translation).

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: We'll discuss the different types of Zero-Rating in the next part, national approaches, harms and benefits. There are other space for other comments. Try to be tweet like, try to provide tweets, give space, and I encourage different people from different countries, regions, stakeholders to queue.

Don't forget to introduce yourself.

>> I'm from Tech Freedom and I have a question.

Since the topic here is research, I'm curious, Luca, you suggested it was more sustainable to use community networks than to use Zero-Rating to make Broadband, Internet access affordable and to increase awareness. What evidence do you have that having the government build broadband or Internet networks is more affordable, more sustainable, more viable than the current practice of Zero-Rating which has already clearly succeeded in the marketplace at reducing prices? It is something that the consumers actually prefer.

Do you have any evidence that having government build Internet access is actually sustainable? Are you simply providing your own personal policy preference without actually having any evidence?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Before we respond, let's get a bunch of questions so that we can then get a bunch of responses, quick responses.

>> Hello. I'm Luca. I work for Coding Rights of the Civil Society. My work is more technically involving privacy and surveillance.

From what I have seen in the Internet.org's technical specs, the way that they implement, it is building a proxy for it to look at the traffic for it to work, you have to inspect the traffic to know it is going to the service allowing it, or building right in the software that you use on your phone or computer technologies like DRM, Digital Rights Management, we turn on to be harmful for people, they transform people into adversaries and they disallow the use of free software completely because you have to do, like, proprietary things and pieces of code to be inspected. I'm curious how Zero-Rating works without this harmful technology.

Thank you.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Any comment from the online participants? Where is Ginger? Where are you hiding? Nothing yet. Thank you. Signal if you have.

Go on.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Can we have shorter questions in order to get them in? That way we can close the mike lines now? We'll be going over. If we have short questions from everybody who is at the mike, so the lines are closed and then we'll come back to the panel. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from the Institute of Internet and Democracy.

I want to ask since we're talking about fundamental rights if you could approach Net Neutrality as equality, as a fundamental right of equal treatment for the Internet, and therefore if anyone at the table has any concrete data on anywhere where the market had provided equality, talking about concrete data just as was asked for. If you're talking -- if you're believing the market could provide equality or the market can provide only price, lower price and not actually equal opportunities for people to download or even upload information.

That's it.

Thank you

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: You're taking notes of the questions?

Before I pass it, we have online participants over there. Can you take over, and then Carolina Rossini, you can go in your line.

>> GINGER PAQUE: I have an intervention from Emrita of CCIAO India which is a non-profit organization of Telecoms and other providers.

She asks, my question is if you can share any empirical evidence to support Zero-Rating creating a walled garden?

Thank you.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: Thank you, Ginger.

On our side, please introduce yourself.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Consumers Association and I'm a representative of Civil Society in CIGBR.

Regarding the difference we can point between a plain soft Zero-Rating and Internet.org. We think is necessary and knows about recent researchers that proved this kind of practices. They do not represent benefits neither to consumers nor to the market because leading to a false ID of Internet and to stimulate a non-competitive practices and price increasing.

In the end, we defend that Zero-Rating -- sorry.

However, this kind of research proved that this kind of practices do not represent the consequence of this project as Internet.org represents Net Neutrality, and I really am asking about freedom of expression and free flow of information.

I want to inform that the prosecutors in Brazil yesterday released here a technical note regarding the risks of Internet.org represented in Brazil.

Thank you.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Go ahead.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello, I'm a graduate student from India.

I have a question, I wanted to ask the question.

Is there a correlation between the percentage of service-specific packs in specific countries to the number of Telecom service providers that are represented in the countries? The reason I'm asking, you provided percentage data without giving the number of operators that are within the countries.

Thank you.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I think we have to close it.

We're actually over our time for this session.

Some of these are statements, not questions. We'll do one last one, please.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Mexico.

There is a bunch of frameworks when you have the Zero-Rating discussion, one is Human Rights for example. When you want to deal with Human Rights you asked some questions in terms of you ask yourself is it necessary, for example, is it proportionate, is it ideal? There is a debate about awareness.

My question is are you researching on why is this an issue? We're spending so much time, resources, research resources on this. I don't know if there is evidence that this is an ideal tool for awareness.

The second one, there are 12 countries negotiating the TTP, and it has in the electronic chapter exclusive content for ISPs. When you have exclusive content plus Zero-Rating is there any default from this? Research on that?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

So we have a lot of questions and some statements. I'm not quite sure how we're going to respond to all of this in the time that we have.

For the researchers, although there is a quick question for Luca, if you can give a short answer to the question that was directed to you, I would appreciate it.

Then I'll go to the other researchers who actually presented and have them respond to the questions that they feel that they have the data or whatever to respond to.

>> I will respond shortly.

I never argued that government should build community networks, the question is not really pertinent. For community networks, they're built by communities, by people, not by government. It is a tool to empower people, and if you want to know what is my policy preference, yes, that's my policy preference to empower people rather than imposing them to two, three applications.

Thank you

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Let's start going in the same order of the researchers that presented. Okay. Please.

>> SILVIA ELALUF-CALDERWOOD: I think the technical question, how is implemented Zero-Rating, it is a simple one. Many operators that are presenting this service are actually using it for common applications that are social networks, Facebook, WhatsApp, Telegram. Really, there is no special requirement, and the traffic that's being seen is basically routing local communications to international networks.

I want to say that in relation to the demonstrating if there is any recent -- any reason to believe there is accelerating erection of a walled garden, I have to highlight to most of you most of the companies providing this service are not charging Facebook, they're not charging the users, they're -- you want to say it in this way, they're subsidizing the service. Their expectation is that the users when they start using the data they move to more expensive services that they can buy or purchase the data.

Finally, I think that the question about is it ideal to study the services, this is a business. The companies, they're providing the service and mobile operators are trying to increase the number of sign-ups. It is not ideal, but for some people it is an introduction.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> HELANI GALPAYA: There is a question on markets providing equality, if you mean equality with open Internet, that's supposedly what's being done in Asia, cheap prices, access to the Internet and few people are connected.

In Africa, what you have, less of a market provision because markets aren't functioning as well as they do in Asia, markets are not perfect but they have provided an opening to Internet and people are not using it.

Is this an ideal tool to study and should we be studying this as the ideal tool? Zero-Rating exists in the context of other choices human beings have to get online, to communicate, to do other things. Show me feasible other choices and these can be studied in comparison, or go provide them instead of all of us sitting here and talking about it.

Empirical evidence to support Zero Rated creating a walled garden, the positives of this, I already cited this, if you're on Facebook Zero, using it as a cheaper substitute, that's for me a positive thing that you're having more money in your pocket and communicating with people instead of paying more money.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Dhanaraj Thakur.

>> DHANARAJ THAKUR: The first response to the specific question, what we found, 51% of all of the plans we reviewed fall under a service specific category, the user purchased a data package and only used on certain sites.

Does it correlate with the number of operators in each country? In other words, if there are more operators in the country, do we see more of these kinds of plans? Actually, it does not. It varies based on the country involved.

I would suspect then that this has more to do with the intensity of the competition in the market, not necessarily a number of operators, but that's a good question that we could look at more because then it could look at broad issues about competitiveness in the market and what the plans may imply.

To go back to not a direct question but something raised throughout, we should keep in mind when defining Zero-Rating in terms of how it is offered in the markets, there are different kinds of Zero-Rating packages. There is not one site.

Maybe there is a suite of applications, some that are very specifically temporary in nature and some that are not so specific. I think the implications for these are also different. We should keep that in mind.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

So we're running about 10 minutes behind. That's because I think what we need to do is be more vigorous on our time, but also I really want as much floor participation as possible. The trade-off, rather than 90 minutes, if

we could have shorter interventions from the floor we can have -- we can still have as many people as possible from the floor.

This section, this is really going to look at the different types of Zero-Rating and some of the alternatives. Alternatives came up in the last session -- section.

First, Kevin Martin, Facebook, thank you.

>> KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you.

The debate about this is complex and multifaceted because the problems are complex and multifaceted as well.

Facebook wants everybody online. Of the 4 billion today that aren't online, we see them breaking down to three large groups: There is a billion people that lack the access to the infrastructure that's necessary, and Facebook has many programs to Connectivity Lab, trying to address that. Labs, drones, we're trying to bring connectivity to remote areas.

There are a billion people that barrier is cost. We have some programs designed to lower the cost, for example, the express Wi-Fi program we have rolled out in some -- program we have rolled out in India, designed to use unlicensed Spectrum to lower the cost of data connectivity.

Another group, relevance, awareness. They may be the biggest barrier of being connected and they live within a range of a signal but that may be why they're not. We have a program that our -- Free Basics Program, designed to try to address that barrier.

That Free Basics Program is an open platform of basic content that's offered for free. The sites involved in the program include news, education, health sites, jobs, government sites and local content. All of the sites are limited with bandwidth at the limited bandwidth intensive characteristics. The key characteristics are -- three I want to emphasize today:

One, it is not exclusive. Any operator can participate on the same terms.

It is non-discriminatory. It is open to any site that meets the same technical characteristics that are required to make sure that it doesn't use up too much bandwidth.

Finally, it is free. It is not just on Zero Rated to the end user, but free. Facebook doesn't pay the operators to participate, and none of the content sites that choose to participate and design their programs are required to pay it either.

I think there is two overarching, critical important points to put in context for this debate.

The first, it is that in Facebook's Free Basics Program that we're trying to listen and respond to the concerns and critics that -- concerns that are raised. For example, there was concerns about whether or not we were confusing people with the original name of Internet.org. We have changed the name to make sure we're not -- this is not access to the full Internet. It is access to a site and set of basic services. We have renamed the program.

We have made sure, as I mentioned earlier, an open platform that others will participate in, and we have made other changes in response to the concerns and so we're responsive.

The second, final question, is this working? In the end, that's important in terms of trying to get others online. As Josh mentioned in his remarks, you end up with more data. Our initial data demonstrates it is. It is accelerating the rate of adoption. The operators that participate are seeing a 50% increase in the rate of adoption of people subscribing. Second, we see a 50% conversion rate. For people that try this for the first time, 50% of them will become paying subscribers of the Internet within 30 days. We think that's evidence that it is working and that's what's most important in terms of getting people online.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you, Kevin.

You were within time. Great.

>> JOCHAI BEN-AVIE: Thank you.

I think we have talked about connecting the unconnected. I think we have to ask what are we connecting to.

There is discussion on connecting to small parts or corners of the Internet, but I think that the North Star for all efforts has to continue to be connecting people to the full diversity to the open Internet. We care about that because we believe the open lab and the full web, it is a greater engine for economic and social development, for education, opportunity and for building a world where everybody can create on the web.

Zero-Rating in different flavors, it has been offered as a potential onramp or means to get there. While Zero-Rating is currently practiced as most models practice in the market, they don't raise the same prototypical harms of neutrality through blocking or others. There is concerns around this kind of anti-innovation, anti-competition concerns.

I want to be clear, if we're going to accelerate the rate of which people are connecting, there are definitely parts of the world where we'll have to subsidize the cost to user in some fashion. Zero-Rating provides an opportunity to do that, but we believe that we have only seen a limited set of models now. We believe that there must be more and others of alternative solutions to help connect the unconnected to the diversity of the Internet.

In this end, Mozilla, we have equal rating. We're investing in research that everybody is talking about to help better understand the dynamics at the nexus of the Internet openness and access. We're still missing a lot of data.

The other thing we want to do, spark innovation in alternative market solutionists bringing the Internet to everybody, all of the Internet to everybody. Two ways to do that right now, one a partnership with Germaine telephone in Bangladesh. They can watch a 30-second ad in the marketplace and unlock 20 megabytes of data for free to use on whatever they want. They do that once per day.

The other, it is sort of an interesting Firefox OS business model is the Cliff phone, which is a partnership with 20 Middle East African markets. If the thesis is give people a taste of the Internet and they'll see the relevance to their lives and the demand of the full Internet, Cliff phone gives users the text, data, 5 to 6 months, depending on the market. This is not all we're doing -- I know I'm running short on time.

I'll throw in one other thought to say, if we think about sort of there is a lot more work that needs to be done on infrastructure on affordability, incentives, but capabilities is an area where there is a lot of untapped potential and room for exploration.

The small scale study we did in Bangladesh, we took a group of users with the normal onboarding experience with a mobile phone in Bangladesh and we gave a test group the same normal onboard experience and a 2-hour introduction to the web. What's the Internet, apps, data, how does it work. We gave them 2 gigabytes for free and they showed us in return what they did with their months. We saw 20% higher data usage and they had exceeded that free data cap and had a greater diversity in the website visits.

There is a lot of promise. Interested to hear from everybody else.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Great examples.

Steve Song is next, the founder of Village Telco.

>> STEVE SONG: I want to talk about the regulatory options available when dealing with Net Neutrality and Zero-Rating.

Broadly speaking, regulators have two categories of tools, sticks and carrots, to get the behavior they want out of the market: Sticks, you know, punitive, they force operators to do the right thing, if you like; carrots provide incentives to bring new service providers into the market so that people can self-select away from options that don't serve them well. Historically, in communication regulation, the carrots haven't worked out well. It is very, very expensive to build communication networks, millions if not billions of dollars to develop the networks.

What I want to say now, is that's changed. Here I'll focus on Sub-Saharan Africa, the arrival of a dozen undersea cables around the continent of Sub-Saharan Africa since 2009 sparking a tsunami of investment in terrestrial projects across the continent have opened up the possibility of new access options. This combined with the drop in price of wireless technologies, whether it is unlicensed wireless, dynamic Spectrum options, micro GSM services, now the ability of municipalities, of entrepreneurs on community organizations to define their own access options is available. They're hamstrung to some degree by the unavailability of policies and regulations that allow them to do this.

Here, I mean, the Internet loves diversity. What with see in access at the access level is a lack of diversity. It is a bit of a mobile monoculture. What I would love to see in the next IGF is instead of seven sessions on Net Neutrality but seven sessions on access diversity.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Good suggestion. Thank you. You're within time, under time.

Bob Frankston, you will talk about something similar?

>> BOB FRANKSON: I have a language problem.

The word Zero-Rating is a telecommunication term with nothing to do with the Internet and it assumes a relation with each service and with each customer.

The problem is, the dynamic that gave us the Internet is based on entirely different principle. It just makes the middle disappear. You have two machines that just work together and all you have between a package is totally decoupled from the application. How do you even define the concept of a rate?

The problem is, the Telecom and the Internet use the same facilities. They just are using different ways to use the same facilities. We got today's Internet by tunneling through telecommunications. The fact that we can repurpose it has given the illusion that the Internet is one thing in the pipe called telecommunications and even to the point as a retail service. The telecommunications got this thing, broadband, they Zero Rated the television service, Zero Rated phone service because they just include it and they add this thing called the Internet as yet another thing that they can offer. That led to the illusion that it is a service that you get. Really it is one end of the tunnel through telecommunications.

So the concept of Zero-Rating is not new, the 800 number, we had numbers for other services, and the fact that it is over IP shouldn't confuse us. Verizon zero rates the video and demand service of FIOS because it is over IP and outside of my cap. They don't count those packets, but the same connection.

If we really -- we really -- if you want the Internet, it is an economic problem. We have to make that just works available so we need the communities to fund it as a group. It is available on sidewalks. You don't Zero Rate sidewalks, they're just there.

We can -- we need to invert the tunnels. Right now the Internet is through Telecom and Telecom becomes services over the Internet.

So I'll skip through this to say the point I want to get to, to connect the first trillion devices, not just a billion people, remember the people carrying the devices, but I want to connect the next million trees, cows, canoes, there is evidence with the whole network. There is a panel tomorrow, community networking, 2:00 p.m., come to that, a version of this, it is RMFVC/Zero-Rating, this talk is more advanced over that.

Internet is what we create. There is no difference between the community and the government.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Great. Thank you.

That's actually a great place to end being provocative.

This morning you were on the small island session talking about community networks as well.

We're now going to go to the floor, but we're going to have to be very disciplined and probably have fewer just so that we can -- let's try -- I want as many people as possible.

If you could lineup at the mikes. If we don't have anyone lining up, that's okay. I want to try to get back on track.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: If you don't want to come to the mike, just tweet your question under the #zerorating IGF2015. We have learned and heard there are lots of business models out there that are being called Zero-Rating and we may have learned that actually not everything impacts and some impacts and some are good for some countries and some may not be good for other countries.

Without delay we'll go directly here to the panelists on this side, you don't have anyone on that side.

Please introduce yourself, go ahead.

>> AUDIENCE: I have worked with Freedom House, other organizations in Internet policy development.

This year I was in Cambodia. We worked to develop the Internet Rights and Principles that were nation-based on the Internet Rights and Principles document. What we discovered is that when we wanted to crowdsource this rights document we reached out, created a wiki for it and people were trying to engage in that, but the way that was most productive was when they engage on Facebook. Cambodia they discovered they could talk on Facebook and get politically engaged, and I want to hear more about the use of social network, Facebook, Twitter, to engage politically in the democratic cross building.

>> GINGER PAQUE: Alexis and Alice, from Venezuela, they ask if any of the panelists or experts who have spoken think that the applications such as Facebook and Google that are being offered as Zero-Rating -- he used the word jam, remember his native language is Spanish -- which may end up confusing the users about what the Internet really is.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: In my opinion, Zero-Rating is a brilliant idea that represents a violation of double regulation, and I can be more precise. The competition law, it is broken because the content to provider who are out of these agreements are, of course, persecuted. It is a violation of the competition law. At the same time is a violation of the Net Neutrality. If Internet neutrality means that to the consumer have the freedom to choose what content, of course I have a form of freedom, but if the content of Google, YouTube, I can have it free, I go there. I don't go to the new competitor. So competition is broken and also Net Neutrality.

One way to represent the double.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: I would encourage friends from Africa, Asia to come to the microphone. We want to hear all of the voices. Join us in the discussion.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Brazil Civil Society.

In countries like Brazil where there is a lack of infrastructure that left offline millions of people and the mobile devices are their only access to Internet we are in a second category of citizens.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm Arthur. I'm speaking as Arthur. I'm not representing any University today.

You guys, I think, around the table, most of you are middle class academics and intellectuals. I think I appreciate if you want to bring I think poorer people or those -- to give their views, so to make sure that their views, those that are being presented here, that they're also benefiting from the perspectives of the beneficiaries of the services that the likes of Facebook are deploying.

Secondly, you know, technology, that deployment of technology should be seen from a development paradigm. Take when you're talking to me, I think as an African, you know, there's a concept gradual realization of the economic and social rights. If you give me WhatsApp and Facebook, I think it is a good steppingstone. Why don't you encourage like in a Facebook, all of that to say what you should have done, it is good, why not build that up to the next step rather than I think killing or destroying what's good or what other people consider as a good service?

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

>> [Applause].

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: There was a person in line. He wants to do the question in Portuguese. We agreed I could translate for him.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: We have to close the line. We're way over.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm Marcus. I'm from the Brazilian Civil Society.

First of all, I would like to say that Marco da Civil is going through many mutilations, changing its principles. There are many principles which are being changed, and when we discuss the topic here, Net Neutrality, this hasn't been regulated. This has been causing lots of confusion and debates and we see the market acting and violating a law which was created. So the question is, do you have any information as to how the Net Neutrality is being treated in different countries, also regarding Zero-Rating.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Those are tweeting, there is a lot of reports, if you want to pose a question by a tweet, put a word question so we can be alerted. Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Okay. If you can actually get really close to your microphones when you speak, that would help as well.

We'll start with Kevin, then Jochai Ben-Avie and Steve and Bob.

>> KEVIN MARTIN: We talked about the confusion created. We certainly heard that concern particularly where the service was referred to as Internet.org. We changed the name to address that confusion.

We also -- I want to point out we support Net Neutrality as well. We think it is critically important to have that and make sure that there is no blocking, throttling, no paid fast lanes. We think that has to be consistent with the ability to bring more people online in an effective way.

We have rolled out our free basic service of this same Zero Rated service in 29 countries around the world and in those countries, there hasn't been a problem, and in the U.S. and in the E.U. they adopted stronger Net Neutrality rules. They have that with the ability of Zero-Rating, but looked at on a case by case basis.

>> JOCHAI BEN-AVIE: To pick up on a couple of points.

When we did research this year in Kenya, India, Bangladesh, we would ask people in rural areas, we would ask have you connected to the Internet? They say no, we don't have the Facebook account. We say have you connected to any other website? They say no, I don't have the Facebook account yet. You know, we certainly do have concerns around that confusion.

I think that what this says actually is Facebook is a hub for a ton of local, relevant content, photos, stories about peoples' friends, family, that's not surprising. We know that we need to do more to make that value proposition to certain populations of what the Internet has to offer and what it can be. That goes beyond Facebook.

I think one of the -- we published a study around the power of the smartphone as a form factor that may help to generate sort of local content in a way that we haven't seen before.

I guess my time is up because of that tapping. Happy to follow-up offline I guess with anyone.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Steve.

>> STEVE SONG: I would like to emphasize the point made by the one gentlemen, that's this is a group of middle class -- you know, above all, connected people, that are perhaps attempting to make a pronouncement about whether people will be somehow subverted by something like free basics. I think that they have to -- we have to give people credit that they will be able to figure that out on their own.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: If you don't have enough time, people are asking questions on Twitter. You can do that.

>> BOB FRANKSTON: We need to have another discussion underlying all of this. We're talking about consequences and related issues. The confusion, it is actually very deep and something that will take a lot more time to talk about.

The -- I hate to use the paradigm shift -- but starting with this, the Internet is something new. It is not a thing in itself, it is a byproduct of software and what we're able to do ourselves. This is just touching it. Beyond that, that's a longer conversation.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Thank you for everybody for being brief and to the point.

We're still behind, but making progress.

Now we're going to have views, national views and actually we're going to start with Igor Vilas Boas de Freitas from Brazil, our Host Country. Thank you for being a great host and a great country.

Following that, we have a remote participant from Slovenia.

The tech people in the back, get ready. When Igor is finished, we can put Dusan Caf up on the screen.

>> IGOR VILAS DOAS DE FREITAS: Good afternoon to everyone.

It is my first time in IGF, it has been a very good experience.

When -- a couple of months ago when we try to sit together some public entities within the Brazilian government to discuss the regulation of Marco da Civil I confess that Zero-Rating was the most main and difficult topic to get to a draft to, to get to a first draft. That's why there are -- there are very, as we see in this session, different concepts of Zero-Rating.

During the discussion we realized that we had to -- we went up to a Constitution level. In Brazilian Constitution, freedom of economic activity is a principle. We realized fast it is first impossible to list exhaustively what kind of model specific, business model regarding Zero-Rating is allowed or not because it changes very fast.

We should be careful because there is no legal basis neither in general law of communications or in Marco da Civil that allow State to keep service providers from offering specific packages, including Zero-Rating functionality. This is a right -- a right law, a question that's very difficult to answer.

What we think, State intervention should occur when there is evidence that those offerings, the Zero-Rating offerings, are harmful to competition or to the right of freedom of consumer.

Of course the main question, one of the panelists said, it is who pays? Who pays the bill on behalf of the consumer? This is the main issue to define what kind of Zero-Rating we're talking about. When there's someone different than the network provider paying the bill, for example, the bank, the government itself, there's no specific issue related to Zero-Rating. When the network provider, the owner of the means is paying, of course we recognize there's a potential harmful effect on competition and freedom. This is in the immediate and long-term. We recognize it exists.

Of course the way different -- to see this in Brazil, it varies a lot. We tend to see that as a competition issue that we have to observe. By now, there is no -- we cannot conclude that there is a need for regulation. Instead we understand that we have to observe and to let things evolve and observe the real effects on competition or the consumer rights to choice.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

We're now going to go up to the magic of remote participation. Dusan Caf who is Electronic Communications Council, Slovenia.

Are you there? Go ahead, please.

>> DUSAN CAF: Slovenia was a second country that tried the concept of Zero-Rating in the national law in 2012. It came in force in 2015 and mobile operators of the Zero-Rating pros, video streaming and music and Cloud storage and the ordinary data caps. It was small, and there was higher data caps in other cases and others were virtually unlimited. The discrimination was huge among users and highly anti-competitive. So the council examined the abuse of illegal business practices in the mobile industry and filed a complaint to the national regulator. The complaint was successful and the regulator issued the first of decisions accelerating in January of 2015 and the rest in the following months on Zero-Rating. The effect was surprising as similarly as in the Netherlands, the mobile operators immediately increased data caps substantially. Unfortunately, the victory, it may not last. Firstly, civilian operators, they're highly litigious and final judicial decisions are awaited in all cases. MNOs, our right to freedom of economic initiative violated and others on the o other side, the Net Neutrality proponents claim that hour rights have to be considered as well like the freedom of opinion and/or expression, the right to confidentiality, written communications and the right to protection of personal data. These are the freedoms that you will also discuss at the IGF as I have heard before.

Secondly, the provisions may be unfortunately overridden by the new European regulation adopted by the European Parliament a few weeks ago. The rules are not well defined and the implementation will depend on the guidelines that has to be laid down by the body of European electronic communications and regulators in the coming months and later on by the national regulators.

Another issue that is very important and we have experience in Slovenia, this is a different view of regulating the servicers, regulators like to do that through competition law, bullets see what happens here in Slovenia. We know that these practices are highly anti--competitive, on the other side we know in certain countries, especially not well functioning markets with weak regulators competition regulation is not really effective.

There is samples of abuse of dominant position cases that are in the electronic communication markets, including other states or at the E.U. level that's taken 8 years or even more from the data -- from the date of opening of receivings to the final ruling. Competition alone is, therefore, unlikely to be effective and the success of Zero-Rating practices, according to our experience, it should be regulators intervening to protect the users and to protect others against discrimination.

That concludes -- we need clear rules, proactive regulation and strong regulators. This is based on experience of Slovenia.

Thank you very much

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

>> [Applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Interesting that we have one regulator saying it is not and others saying it has to be. A wide range of views.

We're now going to hear on the national situation in Argentina from Eduardo Bertoni, Universidad de Palermo.

>> EDUARDO BERTONI: Thank you very much.

Actually I will make my presentation in two areas: First, the situation in Latin America, and I will touch on the situation in Argentina.

B, the two main arguments I find in Latin America when we approach Zero-Rating, and these two arguments are first Zero-Rating is against Net Neutrality, and second that Zero-Rating versus access of Internet argument.

The situation in Latin America: Many countries already approved or implemented or are in the process to implementation of Zero-Rating. According to a recent research those countries are Paraguay, Colombia, Panama, Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Guatemala. That could be a basis for field research on the benefits or problems with Zero-Rating. The rest of the countries did not start yet as far as I know any discussion on Zero-Rating.

Now we move toward I think the two main arguments when people in Latin America oppose Zero-Rating: First argument, Zero-Rating is against Net Neutrality. This argument is closely related on how we define Net Neutrality and also on what Zero-Rating is from a technical point of view. Having said that, some laws passed in Latin America on Net Neutrality do not appear to be an obstacle of Zero-Rating services. On the other hand, there are examples of Net Neutrality seem against Zero-Rating, Argentina and another could be Brazil. This law changed Internet access with the content services protocols or applications that are used or offered to the respective contracts since Zero-Rating consists in giving access to content with no cost it could be against the Net Neutrality in Argentina if pricing is a matter of Net Neutrality those regulations are against Zero-Rating. In Brazil, under the Net Neutrality regulation in the Marco da Civil there is a duty to process on an economic basis the economic package, if this means equally before the law, Zero-Rating is against Net Neutrality regulation.

Finally, the second argument mostly used to oppose --

>> (Applause)

>> -- oppose the Zero-Rating. It confuses the Zero-Rating services with policies that offer real access to the Internet.

For me, this problem is more a semantic problem than a real problem. However, the confusion could be used politically for not implementing policies to increase real access to Internet and this is happening.

Thank you very much.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I would now like to call for a fourth country view on Ambassador Daniel Sepulveda from the United States. He's over here. Please.

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: I want to say, this is an incredibly useful conversation. I'm moved both by the participation and the passion being brought to this conversation and this venue.

Second, I'm extremely happy this conversation is taking place here, not on the floor of the United Nations. The idea that we have a conversation that includes issues ranging from technology, to economics, to ethics, political ideology, and hearing a variety of different views on the relative merits or lack thereof of a specific question as it relates to Net Neutrality is a good conversation and why the IGF was in part created, the ability to come together in a certain fashion to share expertise, ideas, values and to take them home and then use what you have learned and apply in whatever manner you deem useful for you and your people.

I do want to say -- I think that the explanation just recently about the different laws in Latin America and also in Europe relative to Net Neutrality and how Zero-Rating relates to each of those laws is incredibly important. What we have to understand is that there are different types of Zero-Rating and in Net Neutrality law around the world including in Europe and the United States, Brazil, there are exceptions allowed for practices that are not complying with Net Neutrality. The question for regulators in each of those spaces is it in the public interest to allow this particular exception? There may be a case where a Zero-Rating program is in the public interest to be allowed and there may be cases in which it is not.

We don't know that until we have a specific complaint relative to a specific case and the expertise of a regulator to determine whether or not the public interest has been violated.

So I think generally regardless of how you feel about any given specific Zero-Rating program that the process that the world is coming to general consensus on or at least these three parts of the world is that Net Neutrality is good as a basic principle we defend it, contain it in our law, and there are cases in which an exception may be, should be allowed. And that to have that case you need an open dialogue, transparent process and an evidence-based discussion on the affect it would have on the Internet on the edge of the Internet and on users and welfare. What I -- the last thing I say, is that we should guard against paternalism in that case. I want to go back to what a colleague said, poor people understand their interests as much as we do, the agree to exercise that in the market --

>> (Applause)

>> DANIEL SEPULVEDA: We try to enable as much as possible choice and opportunity in the market for them to exercise their capabilities as consumers while at the same time ensuring that any service that's provided to them isn't their only option and doesn't harm them -

>> [Applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

This segment did not have comments Q and As because it was reporting out from different national perspectives.

Now we're going to the last section which is harms and benefits. We have been hearing about some of those, but now we're going to have four experts who are going to dive deep into that.

Pranesh Plakash, Center for Internet and Society.

>> PRANESH PLAKASH: Thank you.

Talking about harms and benefits of Zero-Rating is a very difficult proposition since there are so many different kinds of Zero-Rating each of which have different kinds of Harms and benefits. Therefore I will present some theoretical considerations rather than making categorical assertions.

If one takes Zero-Rating to be the practice of not counting some data traffic towards a consumer's regularly metered data usage and not everyone does use this definition, then one finds that Zero-Rating can be paid for by the end consumer or subsidized by ISBs or subsidized by content providers or by governments or a combination of these. It can be deal based or criteria based or government imposed. It can be based on content type or agnostic type, imposed by the ISB, or offered by the ISB and chosen by the customer and transparent and understood by customers or it could be non-transparent and it could be available on one ISP or across all ISPs. The harms and benefits depend on the market conditions, the existing regulatory frameworks, et cetera, regulatory responses must therefore be very carefully collaborated keeping in mind these different kinds of -- keeping in mind the existing conditions.

So moving on to potential benefits: One, Zero-Rating can enable Human Rights specifically the rights to freedom of expression, the freedom to receive information and the freedom of association especially when access to communication and publishing technologies is provided. It can enable all of the benefits of Human Rights that the Internet enables. By enabling the product differentiation it can potentially allow small ISBs to compete against markets. It can act potentially as a discovering mechanism as free basics hopes to. It can provide cheaper access to the Internet, a plan proposed by others in India to provide free, slow Internet access for all as one example. In some cases, it isn't even slower, Cal Tig, the first ISP I ever used in India was at one point and was at one point India's second largest ISP actually offered free data, free Internet.

Consumer choice, it enables consumer choice and unbundling of services, for instance, a service specific data pack can do that. It can align consumer interest with ISP interest and help towards correcting the distortions and transit markets. Potential harms, it could be anti-competitive with specific ISPs or other manufacturer, anti-competitive amongst content provider, it can harm online openness, diversity, generative and at the edges and I'll just end it there. These are just some theoretical considerations that people can keep in mind while thinking about this.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

That was a great list.

Pros and cons.

Anka Kovacs, Internet Democracy Project, you have been involved in these issues for a long time.

>> ANKA KOVACS: Thank you.

Poor people understand their options and interests as well as we do. That's true. They often do so with far less options available to them than to us and they understand that very well as well.

I can see there may be short-term benefits to Zero-Rating but in the absence of clear data let's take a longer, historical perspective looking at issues that may matter for those poor people and determine what the options available to them are.

The first question is what kind of Internet do we envision? Even ten years ago the Internet was a very different beast. Today it is much more centralized and even for all of us who have access to the full Internet empowering potential of the Internet today is far more mediated by corporations than it was ten years ago.

That didn't happen overnight. We got here step by step very slowly. If today Zero-Rating would allow practices that actually work against those strengths I will definitely sign up to make Zero-Rating a regular practice. At the moment though it looks as if it will set us further on the part of centralization and especially the massive investments that have been made around free basics in India, very much focusing on the discourse of

promoting access rather than awareness, one indication, that it does matter to the big Internet corporations and there is a reason for that. The second question I want to ask is what kind of vision do we have for our own societies? The context of the World Summit on the Information Society review process I have been really struck by how much talk there has been on how ICTs support SDGs, but very little about what kind of access people need exactly to be able to make that empowering potential a reality.

Mobile phones may be the first point of access, but that may be part of the problem, not of the solution.

If we are not more ambitious today, are we not letting people down? How much will we still work towards another option, community networks being one among them? If we look at our historical record in other areas, the record isn't great. Many of our countries, very important services like health, education are already two tiered.

Yesterday somebody asked me but you're saying that government education should be scrapped because it doesn't provide the same quality. That's true. But it should never have been done in the first place as many argued and in context of countries like India, it is community-based education that would be the way forward.

So the question really is, what incentives are still there to work towards providing access to all of the Internet for all of the people all of the time? If the Internet isn't to that extent yet we have an option to make choices and let's be careful about examining the options.

Thank you

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

>> [Applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: The next speaker is Belinda Exelby, Director, Institutional Relations, GSMA, U.K.

>> BELINDA EXELBY: Thank you.

For anyone not familiar with the GSMA, we represent the mobile industry worldwide and have over 800 million mobile operators.

We have heard a lot this week on definitions and types of Zero-Rating. I'll start by clarifying our viewpoint which is that Zero-Rating is simply a commercial model. It bundles Internet access with specific services or content to make it attractive to certain consumer segments.

There is similar practices and two-sided commercial models like this in lots of other sectors whether they have been established over a long period too far time and promote competition and bring economic efficiency and social benefit. A couple of examples, many newspapers are provided free of charge to readers through advertiser funding. In London we have the metro in the evening standard who both operate on that basis and they compete fully with paid for alternatives.

Consumers have a choice as to which they prefer.

Similarly, with television services, we see wide range of consumer choice, some advertising funded, some subscription funded and others funded by governments.

We see that the variety of business models and differential pricing benefits both competition and consumers, it is about consumer choice.

My next point is that much of the discussion around Zero-Rating this week has focused on the auto enrollment use in developing countries to encourage the adoption of Internet. In other markets we're seeing that Zero-Rating benefits consumers in other ways not just by allowing them to trial a new service without concerns about data consumption charges but providing access to promotions, advertising, marketing, so on without the risk of incurring unwanted, unintended costs.

Another benefit of Zero-Rating from Sylvia, it supports competition in the content and as a domain allowing new entrants that want to offer services compete with established content providers and they do that with the marketing and distribution and billing platforms of operators they may not have access to. Where content providers can do this, they're doing it because they recognize the increased value of reaching more consumers and there is nothing wrong with this as a business practice.

In fact, in the longer term, it is particularly important as we look for ways to extend connectivity as the more people that content providers and providers have on the platforms and networks the more incentive to invest in expanding them in developing new and innovative services.

I'll conclude by noting in the long-term, it is not clear whether Zero-Rating will be sustainable as others have said, it is a highly complex, competitive market. In this environment the key point is that competitive markets and competition law should be sufficient to provide safeguards against anti-competitive behavior and it is not the job of regulators to prohibit practice it's that can benefit consumers and create markets for new, innovative services, the sustainability of Zero-Rating is something that the markets and consumers should decide.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Our final expert, Christopher Yoo, Communication and Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania.

>> CHRISTOPHER YOO: Thank you for allowing me to participate in this fantastic event. It is a privilege to have witnessed a rich presentation of views.

We heard that this is not a unitary phenomenon, we hear from others how life is changed at the first IGF we would be talking about fixed line Internet. In fact, the wireless revolution transformed the way we have to think about the devices that are used, limits on the bandwidth and enriched ways that the mobility that it enable, enriching things in fantastic ways.

We have heard about the challenges faced by countries, small islands, developing states, they face real challenges. We heard from the Indian operators that if you look at the affordability matrix established by the OACD that equals to $2.50 U.S. per month as an expected revenue and faces the unique challenges that certain markets face. We have heard that there is differences in networks and that in fact when you have MVNOs that are new entrants making new services that they cannot differentiate on the network itself or the price and that in fact they look for new ways to compete and if you look at the enforcement actions brought by Chile, Slovenia, they tend to be brought against new entrants, small players, one with a 1% market share doing fairly small services such as Cloud based services and Virgin mobile was doing what's up and flat rate and it is a provider that's committed to flat rates.

What we see, in fact, different models of deployment. We have heard that in fact Zero-Rating is not the dominant model, that it is a service specific model and it is not in fact one an but in fact what's up, Facebook, Wikipedia, these are music services, Cloud services, they're all different parts of this that are rich and we find the different systems are exclusive or compensated. We have heard about the importance of the demand side and Zero-Rating how it enhances that in an aging economy in an aging population, senior citizens are getting different phones. Islamic countries have different -- require different phones we have found out in research we're doing. We have learned that we're seeing a grand experiment in the U.S., one of the things I'm tracking, some attempts to wire Indigenous Peoples in the U.S. and it requires different strategies.

What we then -- what we have heard as a common theme, we need more information. We need more data. It is a young practice. The question is what do we do?

Law has a traditional answer. When you're unsure about whether a practice is beneficial or not and it has sufficient promise, let the experiment continue, that is the tradition of the Internet, one of the default answers, it is yes, not no. We can try to find out what different things, what new great innovations we have ever seen are yet waiting.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Right on time.

What we'll do, we'll -- we have -- we were supposed to be at the wrap-up. I would really love to have more interventions from the floor. If we can keep them tight, short we can get as many people as possible and then we'll have the panelists respond as we have in the past and then I don't know whether people will stay an extra ten minutes maybe to have the final wrap up if that's okay.

Thank you. Please.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: My line is longer than yours!

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Keep the mikes closer to your mouth. Swallow the mike.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: I'll try to.

Since we have a bit of people around that want to take the floor, please make sure you actually tweet your words and others will actually transform it.

Go ahead, please.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from New Delhi, India.

Zero Rated services we have heard about so far in practice, not in theory talk about access and proceed from the point of view most beautifully summarized by our friend, the spy for humanity, one Mr. Snowden who says surveillance is the business model of the Internet, we're listening to people talk to how to bring the net to the whole sphere on the assumption that privacy is the privilege of the rich, the ones who lived in the jurisdiction of ECJ or others, any effort to present the tiny part of the Internet to the less majority on the false ground this is all they can afford, this is in fundamental conflict with any rational policy of social development through innovation. This is something that the citizens from our countries resent and our government should prohibit as an obstacle to social development. Why few services are better than giving away promotional data which allows users to discover Internet for themselves. Why should a content provider or Telecom operator choose for them? If we keep getting bogged down in these conversations about the neutrality of the net, a term so gloriously indefinite that everybody supports it, we don't know it.

The poor deserve the same sanitation, healthcare, drinking water and primary and secondary education and network communications of the rich. It is the responsibility of the society to provide them. We like many efforts of the private players and we will work for them like we do for free speech and expression. Nine of your ten choices may be good, this one is bad. Drop it.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: If we want everybody to speak -- that was really -- you know, it was well, well, you know, said.

We have to compress it and pretend we're in a Twitter world or something very tight. Otherwise we won't have time for everybody who wants to speak to speak.

Please.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: If you can put the one minute here, we'll stop people at time. I'll go through this line here.

Introduce yourself please.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. I'm Amanda from Brazil, an ISOC Ambassador.

Private investments and initiatives on social interest is always appreciated and it happens every day in a range number of sectors. The principles are already here to guide this kind of private innovation in public interest. My question is, here, I see the private sector taking advantage under the scope of accessibility to improve their own business and interests. Why does the private sector refuse to provide Zero-Rating data package to allow the people to choose freely the content choices.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I come from Bolivia. It is a country where Internet.org or free basic, it is implemented.

I want to make a point about information GSMA, it says it is all about consumer choice, we need information to make smart choices as consumers. In Bolivia, it is not only the problem of consumers but also the government. We didn't have this debate set at all. Nobody is talking about this in Bolivia.

So some activists are alone saying crazy things that nobody understands. I guess really we didn't have any information about what's going on. We cannot make smart decisions and even we cannot develop any public policy information that we have.

I want to -- I would like to for all of us understand that we here are talking about things we understand but the whole rest of the world, even especially the people who are not connected, they don't understand this discussion.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Vladimir Radunovic, we have to keep tweeting, not blogging.

>> CAROLINE ROSSINI: We can't read the tweet questions right now. Back to the line.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you.

I'm from Research ICT Africa. We collect tens of thousands of product prices across Africa every quarter. I must reemphasize how bizarre it is that we have spent all of this time over so many months, years now in different projects looking at Zero-Rating. Zero-Rating is just one of multiple access options, bundles offered, people use Zero-Rating as part of multiple access entry points, the poor have multiple strategies moving from Zero Rated product in order to use the service on to public Wi-Fi, going to school, et cetera, the idea that people are stuck on Zero Rated services that as we have found, it makes up a tiny percentage of the product, it is really tiny. It is really ridiculous.

The other question to raise, issues of competition, we hear this anti-competitive, what's anti-competitive? The issues of the big platforms dominant in the market, keeping our small view entrants in markets apply to non-zero Rated products, the issue is that it is process competitive, small telcos, it is pro-competitive. Just to say that people are using multiple strategies, accessing the net in various ways and if the poor, if there is a breach of Net Neutrality, let the poor decide, put it out there, let them make that choice.

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: We have online participant. I think we can close the queues here.

Please, be sharp, up to the point. ginger.

>> GINGER PAQUE: Thank you very much.

We have a comment from India.

Zero-Rating is one of the ways to increase Internet access and adoption. Our approach should not be to shut down Zero-Rating, but to improve it. In case any competitive issue comes up, it should go to competition

commission. Moreover, nothing stops anyone from providing services for free for increasing Internet reach amongst the unconnected people. Why haven't they done so?

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: My turn again, please. Yes,

>> AUDIENCE: Hello, I do partnerships and policy and work with Wikipedia Zero.

I think IGF this year showed us that Zero-Rating in itself is not negative but there are benefits to it, and we strongly believe there is a positive way and responsible way to do Zero-Rating, our approach to it was developing principles by which means we think that we're supporting competition and Net Neutrality yet providing our mission which is serving an underserved community that cannot access the sum of all knowledge because of affordability barriers. We have an open invitation for all interested stakeholders to a develop this operating principle or responsible principles to continue to zero rate and provide access to services such as Wikipedia, yet protect competition and Net Neutrality.

An example is Chile where in 2014 a regulator issued a circular banning free social media such as Facebook and WhatsApp to a commercial bundle, however after a clarification we were able to see how services such as Wikipedia were not covered by that regulation.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: George Suduski, ICANN.

I like the answer to the harm question, it depends, he's right, the reason he's right, Zero-Rating is a heterogeneous collection of all kinds of techniques to create results for companies that are involved in it. We have a goal, it is to get as many people on the Internet as we can. Zero-Rating is a way of doing that and we have to desegregate that and look at those things that are common and contribute to the goal, looking through the lens of subsidies and relying on competition law and government practices and incenting the behavior as well as corporate practices that we're better off understanding Zero-Rating in that context rather than a homogenies concept which we can say very little of in general.

Thank you.

>> STEVE SELTZER: Steve Seltzer, from Labor Net. The question of Zero-Rating, it is ludicrous. We could have municipal Wi-Fi for all people of the entire world. We have the resources to put everybody online.

>> [Applause].

>> STEVE SELTZER: That's blocked. That's been blocked by the Telecom companies that want their revenue stream to continue. They prevent Wi-Fi in San Francisco where we're from because it would threaten the revenue.

I think that the ideology that's being debated here really is privatization. Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook, they're for privatizing the Internet and public education in the United States and the word. This is issues for the public and not just for the private corporations to decide. In Facebook, they have banned sites in the United States, certain sites, not violent, they have done that, unilaterally without debate, discussion. They have become an octopus, making decisions on what's valuable. Awesome -- not. That's got to be challenged on an international level.

Thank you.

>> [cheers and applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: We're doing live coverage of data mining of the words at the moment, we're tweeting. It will be interesting to check applauses.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Zimbabwe, the telecommunication regulator.

I have a question with the Zero-Rating. What's driving our Internet usage is social media, also with the introduction of WhatsApp and the Facebook and the likes, revenues are going to the operators and some have been closing. I need to know if there is research that's been done to see the impact of the Zero-Rating on the social media services now that these are the ones that are now driving the telecommunication sector, now that they're coming at being Zero Rated whereby the operators are forced to by big companies to offer these services free of charge or at a very, very low cost, is somebody actually trying to monitor our ability to develop our own local content which would be cheaper because of the Facebook, the users, everybody is going there, now it is Zero Rated and free, how will we have a local content being competitive with the social media which are coming from multinational companies.

>> [Applause].

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Google policy at Strathmore University.

Zero-Rating is providing Internet where users need a balanced Internet. It may be a transparency to keep the developing countries in the darkness of the information age. If we're genuine with tons of money, want to help the community, zero rate everything, not just one website, people without access to the Internet don't need access to one website, they need access to the entire Internet and please don't give us a long definition of the Internet because we know that the Internet needs the entire interconnected computers. Those who are breaking Net Neutrality rules are trying to play God, they think without them that the poor cannot access Internet, they're wrong. Remember, if you're not paying for the service, then you are the product.

Thank you.

>> [cheers and applause].

>> That quote, it is a good tweet. Go ahead.

>> AUDIENCE: That's really, really awesome.

I don't think I can add much more from what my colleague from Zimbabwe, Kenya talked about.

The other solutions to Connecting the Next Billion online, it is that we have to look at the long-term. Zero-Rating is a short-term fix. We have to develop infrastructure and look at the long-term solutions, what's needed for this. Not just to be online for a short time and then it is disconnected from being online.

I just wanted to echo their sentiments of preempted, and I want to say thank you very much.

For the record, I'm Afrion from Kenya.

Thank you very much.

[Applause].

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Intervoices Brazil.

I would like to hear from the panelists about an assumption that there is currently in the Zero-Rating defenders arguments, is this Zero-Rating a part of the path for affordable and universal Internet access? In my understanding it is not. Experiences shows that this increases the data cap prices and Zero-Rating only makes sense in a disconnected world. To overcome this are the public policies and companies investments in the policies, I agree with all of the floor claims and Eduardo Bertoni, let's discuss the Internet policies and

regarding Marco da Civil, I agree with what Eduardo Bertoni said, treating data package in an economic way is incompatible, this is what's in Marco da Civil Article 9, emergency services, technical requirements are not exceptions that can be applied to this case.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

Again, we're over. We're going to go over a bit because we have had great interventions.

I want to go back to our four final experts for some quick responses.

>> The last one in line here, and closing, just one, he was here.

>> AUDIENCE: Good afternoon. I'm from Brazil, Gabrielle.

My question, it is based on democracy.

If it is not for the people, that the Internet work, I don't know who it is. In spite of that, I think most of the people spend their time with Internet, Facebook, WhatsApp, social media anyways, this -- the companies, they bank Zero-Rating, how can we convince the population that Zero-Rating is something bad for it? That's not good for the Internet when they kind of like using the social media that banks Zero-Rating?

That's it. Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you very much.

Gabrielle, we actually chatted yesterday. He had some great comments on our session yesterday on Connecting the Next Billion. Thank you. I apologize for not having seen you over there because of the lights.

Let's go back to our final four experts for just the last quick interventions, and then a close.

The close by the way will be in Portuguese. If you don't have the phones, it is okay because of the text, the scrolling captioning will be in English.

Please, we'll start with you. a final wrap-up comment? Same order that we had the presenters, the experts.

Do it as -- pretty quick.

>> PRANESH PLAKASH: Very briefly, there are great things at stake here including democratic principles. We must make sure that we can't just take a knee-jerk response, the regulatory responses to this must be carefully collaborated. There are many possibilities between just banning something and allowing it without any regulation at all. We have to carefully consider those.

My appeal to all those who want to ban all forms of Zero-Rating is, one, to think about what exactly you want to ban, whether it is specific kinds of Zero-Rating practices or anything that I initially define as Zero-Rating first. Secondly, what kind of regulatory response makes sense in your particular market conditions, because not all of them have the same affect.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Anka Kovacs.

>> ANKA KOVACS: Thank you.

I think what a lot of the interventions from the floor in this section especially raised are really questions about what is the vision of the Internet that we have and what is the vision of our societies that we have? Clearly for

users Zero-Rating practices are being proposed and caused enormous anxiety around exactly these things and a lot of the debates about Zero-Rating do not seem to take those anxieties into account at all.

I think that's about the opposite of a good way to build trust and something we should really shy away from.

There is good reason for these anxieties as I mentioned earlier. Allison's point, it is bizarre that we spend so much time on Zero-Rating, but at the same time if it is such an important part of the market, then why is it that Facebook sends our Prime Minister to their head office, pays for 50 journalists to fly over, makes sure that during the duration of the Prime Minister's office for every single day we see across India media news coverage of the point that free basics will connect people to the Internet.

Clearly there are real issues there and I do think that they need to be addressed.

On the point of regulation versus incentives, I think that there is perhaps some openness. If we incent other options more, perhaps banning is not needed. We don't see that happening in all countries.

Thank you.

>> BELINDA EXELBY: I want to pick up on the point on consumer choice.

The question came from Bolivia saying that consumers don't understand the whole concept of Zero-Rating services. That may well be the case. What I would say in the circumstances is that those consumers need to have the opportunity to understand what is being offered through the services. A ban on these practices before they even are given a chance to be experimented with and innovated, it would be doing harm to the consumers rather than benefiting them.

Thank you.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

Last word, Christopher before I close.

>> CHRISTOPHER YOO: This is dynamic.

I searched the Internet for IGF 2013 and the word Zero-Rating didn't appear n is fantastic. The way it is appearing in terms of political organizations, both through SMS, social media, in terms of organizing, applying for education, it is fantastic.

I think in some ways some of the questions set up a false choice, we shouldn't try Zero-Rating or meshed networking or municipal Wi-Fi, we should try all of them. In a sense, there is challenges and questions on Zero-Rating, is it the right thing in every place? We don't know. I live in a city where we tried municipal Wi-Fi, it was not successful, that doesn't mean we can't learn from that and do better. We need to push instead of trying to decide which one to pull, we have to figure out how to pursue this in different ways. Overall, in the end, we must show we focus on consumers and what helps them. Many times this discussion is abstract on principles and in fact we should focus on what consumers want and how to provide the service they need.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you.

We're going to have our close from our opening Chair who will try to pull all of this together.

Right before we do that, I want to thank both Vladimir Radunovic and Carolina Rossini who had to leave because they're moderating sessions at 4:00 and they had to leave.

A big, big thank you to Susan Chalmers that put this together. It was not easy. It is a great group, amazing group of people. So Susan, thank you very much, very very much.

>> [Applause].

>> NIVALDO CLETO: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen for attending this session of IGF 2015.

Thank you, Mr. Pepper, for your excellent moderation. Thank you for the audience. Thank you for those who participated via the Internet. It is such an important topic and it is being a reason for discussion. All Internet for all around the world.

I would also like to thank Susan, I echo the complements to Susan for the organization of this event.

I would like to thank the participants for the high-level discussion and for the questions.

I will now close this panel of IGF, 2015.

Thank you very much.

IGF Dynamic Coalitions Main Session

>> CARLOS ALBERTO AFONSO: We'll try to present the work of the Dynamic Coalitions.
We have had since the beginning of the IGF actually, but in the last nine IGFs we didn't have this opportunity to have this direct interaction with the work and the results or the outcomes of the work of the Dynamic Coalitions. And this is an important opportunity we have to have a better interaction with them to hear what they're doing and to think about other Dynamic Coalitions that may wish to be formed and presented of the outcomes of the future.

I'll pass on to the moderators to begin, to really begin the session. Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you very much for introducing us. Just a few words before we start.

The IGF has a long tradition of being experimental, trying out new formats and to improve the discussion, integrate new issues and new people. This session now sort of continues this tradition and we hope to make progress with this format on two challenges: One concerns the integration of Dynamic Coalitions which for a long time rather played a marginal role in the IGF; the other issues concerns a long-term question, and that is the outcome orientation of the IGF. Quite sensitive issue. Lots of reports have noticed that the IGF is very good at addressing issues and discussing them, but it is not often clear what follows from that. We want to tackle these two issues and perhaps combine them.

One has to say, it hasn't been easy to prepare this session. We have been discussing the modes of doing this until the very last minute.

I will now hand over to our two Co-Facilitators for explaining the rules of the session today and that of tomorrow morning.

The Co-Facilitators, they're old hands when it comes to IGF procedures.

>> Thank you.

This is a pilot project and a pilot project is how do we take the work, the good work that these Dynamic Coalitions have been doing? The Dynamic Coalitions, they're all bottom-up organizations. They have all sort of come to their methods and their methodologies for coming to agreement on things on their own over the years.

We have gotten to the point now where we have been meeting with these Dynamic Coalitions over I guess -- it is the last six months or so to figure out how to move beyond Dynamic Coalitions doing their own work.

As was said, basically is there a way to make the work of the Dynamic Coalitions more part of the IGF process? Can we find a way to take the work they have done and declare that it is output from the IGF? Now, at the moment, we're not sure how do that. We'll talk about that at the MAG, at the Multistakeholder Group, they have talked about this process throughout the year and will continue to talk about it.

What we're doing this time, we have taken one full session and divided it into two halves. At this half each of a number of the Dynamic Coalitions, those who believe that they have output that's ready for further consideration and one that has strong output but believes it needs another year's work before it is ready to ask for a certain amount of feedback from the community. The point today, is each will be given 7 minutes to present a paper that they wrote, those papers are all online, all open to comment. We'll present that.

At tomorrow's meeting, we'll have most of the time dedicated to discussing those works and to see whether any have reached a point where the community feels in its feedback that, yes, this is stuff we want to put out or, you know, the feedback may be that it needs more work, it is something that we like the progress that's been made. And so we're really going to try and engage the moderators, the Chair, we'll try to gage to what degree has this work reached a point where it may be considered for IGF output. We're still really working on that problem.

Another part of this, it is that we're within this pilot experiment, we're trying an additional experiment with rating sheets.

Rating sheets, it's something that Jeremy will explain once I finish. They're basically a set of statements we ask between 5 and 10 statements related to the papers, this will be posted somewhere and the community, all of you, will be able to indicate the degree to which you agree, don't agree, are confused by, add your own comments, to basically get some more feedback. Now, this feedback is meant for the Dynamic Coalitions. The extent to what we may use it in further discussions is still very open. We need to see how the experiment works. With that, I'll ask Jeremy -- sorry. I'll pass it off to my co-facilitator, my senior co-facilitator to say a couple of extra words.

Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

Let me also put it as Avri said, the Dynamic Coalitions have been with us since the very beginning. They were a compromise, some groups on the two established proper form on working groups and others were opposed to that as it looked too much like proper sort of institution at the IGF. It was meant to be a platform for dialogue, and at that time they felt it would be inappropriate. What's happened, they have evolved kind of in the margins of the IGF. Some of them went away again, disappeared, while others stayed on and actually produced some serious work. The work was never brought back to the mainstream of the IGF community.

Within the IGF two years ago we sort of thought it was time to take a step further and introduced the Best Practice Forums as part of intersessional work. This year we came up with another track for intersessional work, and in addition it was decided to bring in the Dynamic Coalitions as a third track of intersessional work. They're distinct clearly from the Best Practice Forums as their themes were self-chosen, bottom-up, they were never discussed by the Multistakeholder Advisory Group or approved by anybody. They were self-chosen themes. There were only very basic sets of conditions imposed of them, they need to have a website, they need to have a mailing list, and in the process we discovered that each of the Dynamic Coalitions has different rules, different internal procedures, but it was then decided we would not change the rules in mid-game and led them get on with that. That was a decision taken at the Paris meeting of the MAG in early September.

Where we are now, we have Dynamic Coalitions, they all have different rules and procedures, internal procedures, and we have to accept that and respect that. The idea is also that after this session there will be a stocktaking and with the objective of moving towards some common baseline, some common rules, some common procedures. That will be a process that will not happen overnight. That will be a part of a big discussion.

For the IGF I think it is an important moment. It can show that we have a mechanism in place where they can do serious intersessional work, and that also -- up until now the Dynamic Coalitions had other freedom and

could kind of use the IGF label, but moving forward I think it will also be necessary to impose certain obligations and responsibilities that go with using the IGF label.

As Avri said, we're in an experimental phase. This is what we're doing today and tomorrow, it is a pilot project. Then at the end of tomorrow's half of the session, we can decide whether or not it was a pilot project that deserves to be continued or in what way that would need to be corrected. That will not be a part of tomorrow's session. That will be taken up later by the Multistakeholder Advisory Group.

With this, back to the moderators.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

I'm Rachel Pollack. I'm a newcomer to the IGF and the Dynamic Coalitions, but very happy to be here today.

I would like to just start by explaining the order a bit more of today's discussion. First, we'll hear from the Electronic Frontier Foundation who will speak for 5 minutes about the idea rating sheets and describe this. The Dynamic Coalitions will speak for a maximum of 7 minutes, and to have fairness in the order we'll pull names from the box to determine the order.

Now I hand the floor over to you. Thank you.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Thank you very much.

As explained, we were in agreement on the kind of thing we want to accomplish to bring the output of the Dynamic Coalitions to the IGF as a whole. We were not sure how to actually go about that. I suggested we used a methodology, idea rating sheets. That's the experiment we're going with this year.

I'll see if this clicker works -- yes!

What are idea rating sheets? They're -- can we please have the presentation on the main screen? Apparently not. Something is happening.

There you go.

So idea rating sheets are a simple methodology you can use in face-to-face meetings to gather feedback on ideas. You can also use it to collect or to generate ideas as well.

We're only using it for generating feedback on the ideas because we have already produced the ideas in the Dynamic Coalitions themselves. We have prewritten the ideas on the sheets. You don't need to write the ideas on there. All you have to do is put the feedback on those sheets.

Here is an example of an idea rating sheet. Net access should be financed by a tax on domain names -- that's a fictional idea. I'm not suggesting it is a good one.

On this sheet it shows strong agreement for some reason. What happens, you fill in one of those dots depending whether you strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree or confused by the statement, you may not understand it. When you fill in a dot, you sign your name.

This is not meant to be anonymous. We're meant to stand by our convictions and to put our name down to prove that we are not falsifying the dots. You can't fill in 10 dots because then there is not the right number of signatures.

You have the opportunity to write a brief comment on the strengths and opportunities that you see in the idea or the concerns and weaknesses or both. That's optional. You don't have to do that. Don't change what's in the idea box.

We have different colors of pens. There are all of those colors -- don't memorize those, they have labels on them. I have put the labels to what you see there, correspond there.

Where are the sheets? They're this the back left corner of my perspective of the room. They're laid out in tables there.

There is a sign for each Dynamic Coalition and a series of sheets. One sheet for each idea that that coalition put forward. We have seven Dynamic Coalitions that made idea rating sheets. Of those, six are laid out on the tables. There is one which we couldn't fit on to the tables because there were 21 ideas and we hoped for between 5 and 10 ideas. That one, I'll explain what to do for that one.

You don't have to complete all of the sheets. Maybe you only have strong opinions about a few ideas or maybe only a few Dynamic Coalitions. Feel free to dot as many or few as you please.

We also have an online version. This is for two reasons: Firstly because we have remote participants; the second reason, because we don't have much time here for everyone in this room to use the paper sheets. Instead, when you go back to your hotel, you can put your feedback in there at your leisure. You go to the Internet Governance website and click feedback and it will lead you to an online version of the idea rating sheet which should be self-explanatory, you move the slider from strongly disagree to right for strongly agree. Only do one, don't vote twice, either use the paper sheets or the online sheets.

I would recommend giving that we're finishing this session at 6:00 you may want to take the time to complete the idea rating sheets during an interval of this meeting when you're not interested in what else is going on.

Sorry. That came across the wrong way.

>> (Laughter).

>> RACHEL POLLACK: You should be interested in all of the session!

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: If you find yourself with a free moment, feel free to go to the back to complete the sheets. If not, use the online version because we're going to be coming back tomorrow morning to collect up the sheets and there probably won't be a lot of time.

We'll complete the -- we'll capture the completed sheets tomorrow early and we'll try and produce a brief summary on which statements received really strong approval and which ones didn't, and for the Dynamic Coalitions who wish to have that feedback referred to in the session tomorrow then you'll be able to avail yourself to that.

Reporting back session tomorrow, we'll have the feedback from the participants here. We can get feedback directly from the sheets.

I think I'm done -- I'm done. Yeah. That's it! Probably not time for questions but individually, I'm available.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: We're running short on time as we have nine Dynamic Coalitions to speak. We'll ask you to limit your remarks to 7 minutes. Please set the timer for 7 minutes.

We'll start by pulling out of a hat.

We have Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries.

>> CHRISTINA de CASTELL: We include 140 participants from all stakeholder groups and we presented this statement over 2015 and it builds on prior efforts to discuss the role of libraries and access to information both within and beyond the IGF at national, regional, international levels.

The feedback on the Principles on Public Access in Libraries will help to us continue to underline the critical role of libraries and ensuring access to information both in the WSIS+10 review and the national development plans that will follow the Sustainable Development Goals defined in the UN 2030 Agenda.

Over the past few days we have heard that achieving access to information requires more than investment in technology infrastructure, requiring a policy environment supporting governance and power stakeholders in publishing information online and ensuring it is accessible and an environment ensuring individuals have the ability to find and use the information provided via the Internet and an environment that ensures that communities have the capacity and incentives to publish local content online.

Hundreds of millions of people use the Internet through shared connections and through providers of public access such as libraries. Libraries are used, safe institutions that already exist in many developing countries. They include skilled and qualified library staff who are for the public support on technology and training on information and media literacy. Libraries provide an avenue to achieve access to the Internet and ensure that people have the skills they need to access information through technology.

The members of the Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries agreed to the following principals, infrastructure: Libraries should be recognized as a vehicle for universal access to the Internet; libraries should be used to initiate universal, affordable infrastructure in developing countries and underserved communities in developed countries; libraries where they don't exist, information and documentation centers should be recognized as a vehicle for ensuring universal access.

Policy, policies and legislation should create an enabling environment for universal access to information by supporting the role of libraries in providing public access to ICTs, Internet connectivity and technology training. Copyright, national and international copyright frameworks should balance the public interest in accessing information with the rights of authors and others to provide public access to libraries in all formats.

Accessibility: All people irrespective of gender, age, capacity, race, ethnicity should have access to information through ICTs and the skills needed to participate fully in society.

Privacy: Individuals have the right to privacy when they seek information using the Internet. Internet users in public venues such as libraries must not be subject to surveillance of their activities.

Skills development: Libraries should be supported in their role of offering training and skills development in using technology, media, information literacy so that people can access the information and services that they need.

Open access content: Through providing technology and Internet access libraries offer and promote access to free online content supporting education and development, complementing access to commercial content through online subscription resources.

Local content: Through providing technology and offering support libraries have the capacity to promote and enable the creation of local content and to ensure its preservation. Libraries should be supported in using and facilitating access to open data and open access solutions and libraries role in providing access to government information and services should be recognized.

The next step of the Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries is to identify concrete actions that IGF stakeholders can take to further the implementation of the principles.

We hope you would like to join in developing the recommendations by participating in the Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries and continuing this conversation.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you for keeping the remarks concise.

The next speaker, Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility. I, therefore, call on Nicolo Zingales.

>> NICOLO ZINGALES: Thank you very much.

The Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility is pleased to present the work developed in the course of the last year.

Throughout mailing lists in a participatory and multistakeholder fashion the recommendations are grounded on a framework for business and Human Rights according to which governments have a duty to protect Human Rights, corporations have the responsibility to protect the Human Rights and they have a joint duty to offer an effective remedy. The aim of this recommendation is to provide guidance on what constitutes responsible conduct by online platforms in the protection of Human Rights of their users, in particular privacy, freedom expression and due process.

This guidance has been developed by reference to the Council of Europe's Guide on Human Rights for Internet Users and international Human Rights documents, a variety.

Through this recommendation we not only identified minimal standards for the respect of Human Rights platform operators which we refer to as standards that shall be met, but Best Practices which we refer to as recommended or should be followed for the most responsible adherence to Human Rights principals in the drafting of terms of service for this platform.

One of the issues that we had to deal with in the developing of the recommendation, it is the conflicts that may be between international Human Rights law and national laws which may implement international standards somewhat differently. This recommendation recognized the need for a company to submit to national laws, but only to the extent that these are not legitimate. We define laws as procedural legitimate when they are enacted on a basis of a democratic process. In order to be substantively legitimate this law must respond to a pressing social need and having regard to the impact being proportional to the aim person.

The first principle that I mentioned, due process: Due process in this recommendation is defined as clarity and predictability of the substantive law, the right to an effective remedy against any Human Rights violation and the right to be heard before any potential adverse decision is taken regarding one's self.

In this respect the recommendations require meaningful notice to be provided to user before the amendment and termination of contracts, specifically given the impact that this can have on the Rights of individuals. It also recommends that platforms make termination of accounts possible only upon repeated violation of terms of service or on the basis of court order. And regarding adjudication, it suggests that platforms should offer a quick solution system, but not as a substitute of regular court proceedings, only as a complement to that. In particular, it requires platforms not to request waver of class action rights for their users.

With regard to freedom of expression: This recommendation recognized that certain platforms can be seen as more public spaces that constitute speech enablers and, therefore, should be subject to higher standard of scrutiny. They in any case should provide clear and separate mechanism that are necessary and proportionate to the purpose in removing any content from the platform.

Regarding government blocking and takedown: Platform operators should execute such requests when grounded on legitimate law as referred to earlier. Platform operators should also adopt law enforcement guidelines and release periodic transparency reports.

With regard to privacy: We define the Best Practice for platforms to limit the connection of personal data which is necessary to achieve a specific purpose with a general purpose consent. We ask a user to opt out for data collection even after the consent is provided.

With regard to data use: We require a consent to use personal data for purpose and duration specified in the terms of service. We identified the Best Practice of specifying that constant is limited to existing services and does not extend to the future services. Platforms are to give users the opportunity for getting accurate data concerning them. We require them to always permit the users to delete the accounts in a permanent fashion.

Finally with data protection with third parties: We identify the Best Practice of providing a way for users to be informed of full uses of the personal data by third parties and the value form of legal process and the platform should release a periodic transparency report for each jurisdiction which it operates.

We very much look forward to your feedback and to the discussion.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: The next speaker is from the Dynamic Coalition on the Internet of Things. I pass it on to Maarten Botterman.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I appreciate this extra flavor.

I'm representing the Coalition that didn't come here to ask for rough consensus or to seek that, but to really place something on the table that can help us to over the coming year come to something that we believe would deserve the discussion. We may be a bit further away, but this is the intent.

With that, we have put a draft declaration on the table in the full understanding that the Internet of Things is happening. Tens of billions of things will be connected over the coming years collecting, sharing data, even acting. This is all driven by the business opportunity and also by the social needs that require that.

If we look, for instance, for the completion of the Sustainable Development Goals, there is a couple of those where it is clear that connected technologies are needed to make possible. That they happen.

Very happy to see that we have still 7 minutes.

With that, we need the space to innovate, and with that, we need to develop that in a responsible way. In these discussions earlier on, it is like we shouldn't have the regulation because this domain requires space, but there is obviously regulation that should be respected and how do we deal with that in such a way that we can develop this and help us to come to a future we want. We believe it requires ethical standards in order to come there, and as formulated in the Internet of Things the good practice principle for now, we feel that the Internet of Things could practice aims of developing IoT products, services, taking ethical considerations in the account from the outset, to find the ethical, sustainable way ahead using IoT creating a free, secure and enabling rights based environment, the future we want.

So to have the framework for the IoT good practice, what's ethical, where we stand now, the inputs to the debate, it is the values that are the product of applicable law, cultural values, morals, habits, and globally expressed in the outline of the Universal Human Rights and the Sustainable Development rules that are adopted by the general meetings of the UN.

Good practice in IoT practices and services, it requires meaningful transparency to users. Understandable, clear terms of use and the ability to act on those data that require user control in a meaningful way.

Without going into full detail on all of this, I would like to point you at the document and really invite you to use this amazing platform even when we're not in Joao Pessoa and even throughout the coming year.

What we have done to get where we are, it is to involve stakeholders over the world already into this debate, have people from Civil Society, from governments, from big business and from the technical community on board. And this morning we made quite some progress and had some valuable insights raised in a meeting where, for instance, the new ITU Working Group 20 on standards was present, Information Society was present, business was present, also we have good participation of the room. Various IGFs provide good focal points for these discussions. We look forward to continue to open up and to invite you all to participate in that over the coming year in the meetings that were organized and in the online platform discussion that's made available.

I would like to leave it at that.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you for your intervention, for your openness to receiving feedback.

Our next speaker will be from Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: As acting Chair for this meeting, it is a pleasure for me to be able to present an update on the work of the Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values in the absence of the coalitions main coordinator who unfortunately was not able to come to this meeting.

I'm honored to relay the following message, what's the Internet, about what makes it what it is. What's the architectural principles, core values and what is happening to the core values in the process of its evolution? What is it that needs to be preserved and, what changes are inevitable? What does the Internet community say that can't be changed? How much -- how could changes and improvements be brought about without compromising the core values? How is the different positions between stakeholders be redone to look at these values? We had a workshop with ISOC, the first Chair of the Workshop on Fundamental Core Internet Values examining these questions. Since IGF 2010 the deliberations continued as the theme of the Dynamic Coalitions Internet Values since the first workshop. The coalition has held yearly workshops with distinguished speakers and experts -- and I'll go through a few of them just to give you an idea of the people that were there back in the day to tell us really what the values were about and whether we're losing the values as time goes.

Panelists and discussion in the Egypt workshop included Daniel Darverai, Allan Michael, a member of the parliament of the United Kingdom, a director of One Web Day, the then coordinator of the Internet Government Caucus, president and CEO of the Internet Society at the time, Markus Cameron, the director of the ITF, a long time ICANN Internet society leader from the National Autonomous University of Mexico. The workshop defined the topic and listed a set of values.

And then the first official IGF meeting of the coalition took place in 2010 with a long list of additional speakers, a long-time Internet activist, an ICANN activist, a then-Chairman of the Board of the ICANN, again the Imagining the Internet Center and again Markus, the leader of the IGF Secretariat. There is a pattern here! Many had -- many of the above speakers and many others that had taken place over in Istanbul who was, of course, the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information to the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Now, the meetings focused on different aspects of the current values. Intersessional work includes several sessions at other venues from the Future Web 2010 conference, seminars in India and all of them were along the themes of the impact of altered core Internet values and business, commission, innovation and an open, universal Internet. What makes this coalition different from the work of other Dynamic Coalitions relating to defending the Internet model? For one, the values are based on the technical architecture and of the Internet itself there are other coalitions doing an excellent job of linking the Internet to freedom of speech, Human Rights, both issues are very important overarching issues and we commend the Dynamic Coalitions on the work they have done; however, the other issues are so fundamental that they sometimes have the ability to overwhelm the core reasons why the Internet works, how it works.

Among the Internet core values, the following are the most significant ones: A single domain name system, permissionness, innovation, open, borderless, user centric, end-to-end, robust, reliable. Some of these values have eroded or broken over the years. For example, the end-to-end nature of the Internet was broken when network addressed translation was used to ease the scarcity of IPV4 addresses. It was technical, not political. On this occasion the Internet continues to evolve technologically and now we're seeing the introduction of IPv6 the core value will be restored ultimately.

As the Internet evolves more challenges with the delivery of Zero-Rating services, we saw that in the previous session, bandwidth capping, address translation, port blocking, filtering and depacket inspection. These are serious threats to Core Internet Values.

Our session at this year's IGF Core Internet Values had showed an exchange of views based on the one-pager that's been put online at the contribution of the IGF process. One page. Please, comment on it. There are a lot of comments. We need a lot of input on this.

We have participants with Kathy Brown, CEO of the Internet Society, Director General of APNIC, the regional registry from the Asia-Pacific region, the University of West Indies and the U.K. government's Department of Culture, media and sports.

We discussed the meeting of a free Internet, Zero-Rating services, Internet as a technology providing end-to-end services, fragmentation, finally the possibility of drafting a document which stakeholders including large Internet organizations, Civil Society and governments could actually commit to, thus ensuring that the future Internet does not deviate from the Core Internet Values.

As was explained by the government sector panelist that this would be unlikely as it would turn any point into an interstate negotiation, other panelists agreed with that, and the way forward was seen to actually have a Best Practices document but no signature at the end of the day.

Plans for the forthcoming year are, therefore, to consolidate the core values into a dynamic living document. And why dynamic? The Internet itself is dynamic. The moment you print something it risks becoming obsolete. By sustaining the ongoing discussion of each year's threats to the Core Internet Values, the coalition aims to keep as dynamic and up-to-date as the Internet's evolution. Work will continue on the mails list and everyone is invited to join.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you for the overview of the history and the Coalition of Dynamic Values of the Internet.

The next speaker is from Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility.

>> LUCA BELLI: Thank you.

Good morning to everyone.

The document that will be presented this year as to request feedback has been -- is not the first outcome of the Dynamic Coalitions actually. The Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility was created in 2013 to produce outcomes. A main goal was to produce a model framework on the net neutrality and to create -- to figure a dialogue and debate on the Net Neutrality, a global debate, to try to enshrine the tendencies of the debate in an annual report that's been published every year and discussed at every IGF since 2013.

The first -- as I was saying, the first outcome was the model framework on Net Neutrality and it has -- the purpose of the model framework was to provide some regulatory indications on how to regulate Net Neutrality was a transposition of the Working Group process. We decided to open the mailing list, a public mailing list, where everyone could share information, but also cooperate in the deliberation of this document. The result has been presented in 2013 at the IGF. It played an inspirational role, both the Council of Europe has used it as a working material to deliberate a recommendation, and also some Committees of the European parliament have used it as an inspiration to amend the initial proposal of the commission on the connected regulation.

Last year, at the IGF in Istanbul it was quite clear that something more was needed to consider it an IGF outcome. So that was very clear in the IGF Chair Summary that suggested a need for a validation process to consider this an outcome of the IGF. We decided to use, again, the ITF to transpose that process to use the last call process used by the ITF to go from a draft to a request for comment allowing all of the participants to further comment and to refine the document. We have decided not to have a regulatory model, but the policy statement, a principle statement.

The result, it is that we shortened the document and modified it. We had a very intense consultation period during six months involving a wide range of stakeholders and in the first part, which is corresponding to the first idea rating sheets, it is the preamble that sets the basic fundamental element of Net Neutrality and also the aspirations so it is accessible to all people. Net Neutrality plays an instrumental role in preserving the Internet openness, fostering enjoyment of Human Rights and fostering competitiveness and more, spreading the benefits of the Internet world to people.

The third part of the preamble, it is that it is the interest of the public by preserving a level playing field by providing equal opportunity for intervention and development of new applications, services and business models.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Can you read slower?

>> LUCA BELLI: I have only 7 minutes!

The third point, it is suggested very intensely, particularly by private sector participant to the consultation, that competition among broadband networks, technologies, all players of the Internet ecosystem is essential for ensuring the Internet. And the last point, all individuals and stakeholders should have the possibility to participate in the deliberation of any Net Neutrality regulatory instrument.

So after I think this fundamental elements, we define some safeguards and we have stated that the instruments should at the minimum provide the following safeguards: First, we defined principle of Net Neutrality, and then Net Neutrality is the principle according to which Internet traffic is treated without unreasonable discrimination restriction or interference regardless of its sender, receiving, the type of content.

The previous definition on the model framework didn't have the qualification unreasonable. This was added due to the debate we had. We felt the need to introduce something, some flexibility and the private sector participant particularly felt this need and we felt that if the unreasonable, that's quite a concept, it had to be added. We should have defined what was reasonable traffic management.

Reasonable traffic management is defined immediately after, and it states that entrant service providers should act in accordance with the Net Neutrality, and any deviation from the principle may be considered as reasonable traffic management as long as it is necessary and proportionate to secure the security and integrity. Which is agreed by many stakeholders. To mitigate the effect of the temporary, exceptional conjunction primarily by means of protocol agnostic measures, when not practical by other measures. We have to use the term protocol and specific to make sure we're talking about the service, not specific application or competing application.

Also the third exception, which is also in the Marco da Civil here, and suggested by the India participants --

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: You have to wrap up in the next 30 seconds. The clock is off.

>> LUCA BELLI: We have law enforcement, a separate principle, it is not reasonable traffic but acceptable traffic management due to the overblocking problems that can be led to transparent obligations, meaning that operators should provide meaningful information on the conditions of the speeds.

And then to go very fast, the last two points, they're privacy, and someone could wonder why privacy is here. Several traffic management practices need a prior depacket inspection, a prior monitoring and, therefore, we stated it all, all Internet players should comply.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

>> LUCA BELLI: Last point.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: You need to stop.

>> LUCA BELLI: Resource implementation.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: We'll hear from Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance, Bishakha Datta.

If the timekeepers, please, could you start the clock at 7 minutes now. That would be very helpful.

Thank you.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: Thank you very much.

The gender -- the Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance, or DCGIG as we refer to it in short-term, started back in 2008. I was not part of the IGF deliberations at that point. The reason that it started is out of a fundamental belief that gender cannot be seen as an add-on, an extra, something that comes at the peripheries of Internet Governance, but something that's actually fundamental and integral to the Internet Governance that no one gender should be able to articulate, define, identify Internet Governance, rather Internet Governance must be shaped, defined and articulated by different genders.

Now, when it started in 2008 the term that was used for gender was actually even though it was called the Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance, what we were talking about was really women. The -- if you look at the documents, you would see that the word women actually predominates. The main mechanism used to see whether women played a critical role in Internet Governance is a mechanism called the gender report cards. Very briefly, what the gender report cards represent is that in every global IGF workshop as part of the report back, the workshop moderator is required to report back on diversity considerations. For instance, there are specific questions around how many women and men are there on the panel, how many women and men are there as moderators, as participants, how many times gender is mentioned, so on. This is baked into the IGF process. This was thought to be a good way to see if we were coming closer to our aspiration of gender parity defined in those days very much by women/men in a binary sense.

Moving forward to 2015 we had a really good meeting today. You will see this in the idea rating sheets, we want to make a series of propositions: One, we would really like to expand the definition of gender to include more gender identities. We would like to include transpeople, that's transmen, transwomen, we would like to include people who identify themselves as intersex and we had an interesting discussion on how would we do this. We don't want to add another column starting to tick off trans, et cetera, in the workshop reports, but we would like to see if it is possible for the IGF registration process to either add another column or to find a way to allow people to self-identify across genders beyond men and women.

The second important thing we looked at today, we looked at how to add a qualitative dimension to discussions on gender parity. While the report cards help us looking at the women in the room in terms of numbers, sometimes it is not possible to measure significance through numbers. For example, we know that the findings are showing very clearly that the numbers of women as moderators, panelists, participants, it is going up, but they're going up more in the subtheme on Internet and Human Rights. Where what we really want is for gender issues to be sort of cross-cutting issues and to be there in many more sessions. This is something that we're also looking at, how do we actually accomplish this.

The third thing that came up, which may be a bit new, it is that there were certain cases reported this morning -- and this is not in the report, it was only reported this morning at the Gender Dynamic Coalition, there were mentions of cases of sexual harassment that women have faced either at the regional IGFs or online during IGF governance processes or at the global IGF. I'm not at liberty to actually describe specific cases right now. Let me say that they were not numerically -- there were a few cases mentioned. One of the arguments made at the Gender Dynamic Coalition is that if we're talking about getting more women to participate, you know, to empower women and to help women achieve their rights through the Internet, et cetera, well, women have to feel comfortable in this space. A thing we need to think about since a few of these

have now been voiced, is do we want to have friendly space policies? Do we want to include something around sexual harassment in the code of conduct? This was something that was enthusiastically endorsed by the meeting this morning and this is something that we really would like to have feedback on.

In conclusion, we have five ideas that we have put up on the rating sheets. I have sort of given you a broad view, they're specifically broken down. We would very much like comment from everybody.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

We would like to reiterate that this sheet in particular is very clear and encourage everyone to take a look at a model perhaps for the future.

We have two speakers left. One, the next will be the Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights & Principles. We have two speakers, Hanane Boujemi and Marianne Franklin, time is still limited to 7 minutes.

I would add that the idea rating sheet is available online only in this case.

Thank you.

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: Good afternoon.

I'm sharing the presentation with Hanane Boujemi. We won't take 7 minutes but 3:30 each.

The Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights & Principles was established in the 2008 IGF. The IRPC has two elected Co-Chairs and an elected Steering Committee. The list serve currently has 344 members.

In its main session we would like to present the IRPC as an IGF output. I have it here so that the camera can pick up under the subtitling, the Charter of Human Rights and Principles. This were drafted and released in 2010/11. The 21 Articles of the Charter articulate the interconnections between international Human Rights laws and norms, design, access, use, and the Internet Governance processes. The objectives of the Charter are to provide, first of all, a shared reference point for dialogue and cooperation between different stakeholder priorities in the Internet Governance domain; secondly, to provide an authoritative document for framing policy decisions and emerging rights-based norms for the online environment; thirdly, to provide a policy making and advocacy tool for governments, businesses, Civil Society groups.

So how does this work? You can take a look, but just to run it down briefly, it articulates fundamental rights and freedoms under international law for the online environment, first as rights that we know as hard law and also as soft law. For instance, existing rights such as Article 8, the right to privacy, and aspirational forms of rights, so-called soft law for instance, our first Article right to access to the Internet.

This Charter has been gaining in statue and recognition since the launch in 2011 in the European dialogue on Internet Governance in Belgrade. Our 10 Internet rights and principles in 25 languages were derived from the full Charter and is a way to reach out in grassroots and global levels.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: So the full charter is made available in several world languages through the efforts of committed legal experts and lawyers from all around the world.

At the moment, the Charter booklet is containing a full Charter and 10 principles. It is currently available in eight languages, initiated and achieved by the dedicated teams on the ground. We have the English version, the original and others. So the English edition is in the 4th copy, the 4th edition. We launched the Brazilian copy today.

We would like to thank all of the translators that contributed in this work, which is reaching millions of people all around the world.

Why these efforts are so important, it is because the cooperative efforts to translate the Charter and also the booklet to engage and mobilize language communities for outreach and implementation at the local level.

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: We have endorsers and 1,443 signatures in support of the work.

We would like to highlight milestones -- we have 3 minutes and we'll cut those and move to the last bit if we need to.

Points we would like to underscore is the way that the Charter is recognized in official reports, for instance, the European Agency for Fundamental Rights, the 2013 Chilean Internet report, a close partner initiative, an important one, the Council of Europe's Guide to Human Rights for Internet Users, which is just adopted in 2014. We have seen it adopted in the national level, for instance, in the New Zealand Green Party's Internet Rights and Freedom Bill and the Italian Declaration of the Internet Rights which we talked about today, it has been inspired by the Charter, the Marco da Civil and other outcome documents. There are more details online on these initiatives.

What we would like to stress, this is a living document. This underscores the value as a framework and advocacy tool at the same time.

We would like to note that we have undergraduate students participating in the IGF consultation process, and they have been providing substantive feedback on all of the DC or many of the outputs. We welcome you all, invite you all to take a look at the very interesting comments.

We would like to thank Facebook for their constructive comments. I hope we have responded appropriately. Yeah. So, yeah, keep the comments coming. We're enjoying them.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: Right.

Why should this meeting adopt this Charter as an output of the Internet Governance forum? We have six reasons for you:

It has been the source for national political processes, for example in Asia-Pacific, New Zealand as a case study through the Internet Rights and Freedom Bill in New Zealand which was led by the Green Party.

The second reason in its use for outreach and education on the ground all around the world. For example, it has been used in the Middle East and North African region at the universities, in classrooms, Latin America, Europe, the U.S., Asia-Pacific. The comprehensiveness and authority is based in existing Human Rights law, it has had a recognized impact on multilateral and multistakeholder undertakings for Human Rights-based Internet Governance. For example, the UN Human Rights Council and NETMundial which took place in 2014. The Charter has been implemented as a coherent and authority framework for national initiatives in Italy, adopted by the Italian parliament in July, 2015.

Finally, the 21 Articles played a role for Internet Governance processes, for example, as a source of reports from working groups on ICANN, social responsibility on respecting Human Rights and was presented there in June of 2015

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: We have 10 seconds.

We have observer status in the Council of Europe's Steering Committee on Media and Information Society.

So just to sum up, we believe we have an effective and working document, and we invite you to support us in this continuing work.

Thank you for listening.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: Thank you very much.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

It is great to hear about the achievements of the Charter.

The final speaker, we have one left, it will be Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability with Andrea Saks.

>> ANDREA SAKS: I work as a volunteer for the ITU and work with my colleague, Francesca Cesa Bianchi, from G3ICT for Global Inclusive -- I never say it right. She's my scribe.

I'm a Person with Disabilities. I'm dyslexic and I have age-related disabilities. You have seen me dancing with my cane.

We decided to do something practical: There is a saying called nothing about us without us.

Now, if you are a person with a disability, you can't get here. When you get here, you can't get in. If you can't understand what's going on how in the heck can you participate? Though we deal with Internet Governance, though we deal with getting online, all of that kind of stuff, we realized that we really needed to deal with accessible meetings. So we created, and we kind of crystalized it last year, a guideline. We hoped to get it accepted as an output document last year.

I'll hold it up. You can't really see it well.

It does say DCAD Accessibility Guidelines, last year, it was 2014, this is now updated and it is 2015. We include in our group Persons with Disabilities and we do it with captioned telephone calls because we all live all over the globe in different time zones.

Now, in the introduction of this, the Internet -- I'm going to read this to you. I think that I want to quote this properly:

The Internet Governance Forum's Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, we call ourselves DCAD, would like to provide the following guidelines to the IGF Secretariat on how to improve accessibility at IGF meetings to eliminate barriers. The intention is to help the IGF Secretariat to improve accessibility for Persons with Disabilities and to include Persons with Disabilities with age-related disabilities in IGF meetings -- this is where we're really dangerous since we're a Dynamic Coalitions who wants to influence the IGF. This requires the staff of the IGF to understand certain procedures and include those requirements as mandatory in all host agreements. That's going out on a limb, but this is very necessary.

We made this with a simple -- it is not very long. We have references to make it more complicated if you need to find out specific information.

It is -- it is already posted on the IGF website. We did update it. We took in all of the comments that were put on and added them. We had our Dynamic Coalitions meeting and added what we thought we were missing.

This document really should become a living document. It is online. We'll add to it as we find out more, as people add to it saying we forgot this or we didn't do this that we did last year.

Sometimes we forget what we learned. If there is staff changes, consistency, education, it is sometimes lost. Although we did something really well one year, we forgot to do it this year. Throughout we have to have something written down that everybody can use.

Now, it is not a perfect document. It is a small document that could be used by many, many people. You haven't lived -- and one of my colleagues is sitting there -- we used to meet in the kitchen elevators with the tomatoes to try to get somewhere, and it is not funny if you're in with stinky tomatoes and it is also funny in a way if you can laugh at it. But stairs, they're obstacles,

You're all familiar with captioning now. IGF really was fabulous and Markus got behind it. They were the early group to really use the captioning on a full-time basis. We couldn't live without it. There is more. Sign language interpretation, there is one here, but the young lady was in the dark. Who could see her? It was only one sign language, which is okay. We have other -- every sign language, for instance, in every country is different. There is something called International Sign, but there is no international sign language.

The big problem is getting people here. We need to have a greater population of Persons with Disabilities and we haven't really dealt with that, and we are working on that idea of getting funding, fellowships, but we thought we can't have them come here if they can't access. What we wanted to do is to kind of make something that was tangible, that was usable, that would be accepted by the entire IGF as a bible, if you like, or whatever book is your book to help the host. The host may have people -- by the way, Brazil is great! The volunteer kids who came here to help us, I have had my bag carried from Timbuctoo to China. People are wonderful, trying to make things accessible, but there are issues with remote participation, but many can't come and they have to use tools and when the tools themselves for remote participation are not accessible, and there isn't one tool in the world that's accessible to my satisfaction.

There's a lot of work to do. One of the things that I also want to point out is in the back of this document we have references -- you see that -- of other guidelines that are more specific, and also this inspired the question 26 of Study Group 16 of the ITU to actually write and it has been past and it is at the UN now on accessible remote participation, on guidelines for that, also remote meetings. There are two technical documents that you can download.

This needs to become a living part of the IGF creed so we can have a live, updated guideline on how to get an accessible meeting so we can include Persons with Disabilities because nothing about us without us must be the plan.

Thank you very much.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you very much.

I think you made a great case for the need for an accessibility and disability bible, and also to thank the Brazilian host for all of their help.

We have actually -- we actually have a bit of time that we weren't expecting, about 15 minutes. We thought we could use this to take information-related questions from the floor. The main discussion and question and debate will be tomorrow morning after everyone's had a chance to sleep on it, fill out the idea rating sheets. Now if there are any initial questions for clarification we can take them. There are microphones on both sides of the room.

We also encourage you to start completing the idea rating sheets either online or in the back where they're in paper-based form.

>> Can the technical people put on light back there I wonder? It is hard to see the sheets otherwise. We'll see if they can.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Are there questions regarding the presentations that we have heard?

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: Can I make a suggestion? Which is if we have time, you know, would it be possible for us to actually give time for people to go to the idea rating sheets and pick them up, sort of things. I'm honestly skeptical that after four long days of the IGF that anybody is going to work at night or sort of go online. Honestly, most of us have put in a lot of work and would like the feedback.

>> AVRI DORIA: If there is no questions for clarification, that's a perfect thing for people to do. I would endorse that particular suggestion since I see there is one question for clarification.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you.

Actually, it is not a question for clarification, just a couple of suggestion, first of all, congratulate to you all very much on the work of the Dynamic Coalitions which I think are the living part and the beating heart of the IGF. A lot of ideas of workshops that we see throughout the day, they come from people involved in the Dynamic Coalitions. I think that we cannot say how important they are in words. Thank you very much for the hard work that you have been doing all over the years, and also thank you to the amazing team that's worked and kind of fused their brains to come up with a solution, a methodology to look at the work of the Dynamic Coalitions.

A couple of suggestions to make, I think this is a straightforward exercise, and I think that we understand how it works, but in order for the IGF community to be sufficiently informed, about how to participate in the importance of the session. I would like to suggest for the next year that leaflets are produced explaining the methodology of the session and maybe handed to the participants, not only inside of the beautiful backpacks we receive with a lot of information on other things, but also during coffee breaks. Maybe even the Dynamic Coalitions could have a stand in which the leaflet and the recommendations that you have made, for us sitting here, listening to you, sometimes the time is short and for us to kind of digest what you're talking while you're reading the recommendations, it is not very easy. If the recommendations were kind of put together in a summary and handed in to participants beforehand that would also be a very valuable thing for participants to think about the recommendations and to be more prepared in the session and to filling the sheets.

Another idea is to record the videos. Many of you have made excellent presentations that do not only talk about the recommendations for this particular meeting, but also talk about the work of the Dynamic Coalitions and give us a broad overview of the importance of the Dynamic Coalitions and a bit of their history. If the videos are recorded and made available, maybe a couple of weeks before the IGF, they could also be used to do outreach so the that people know that this exercise is going to take place and that they have an idea of what to expect in terms of methodology and the recommendations of the Dynamic Coalitions.

Again, thank you very much and congratulations. This is an amazing pilot experience. I hope that we can repeat it again next year and improve it always.

Thank you.

[Applause].

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you so much.

We have had a request from the Chair who would like to make a quick response.

>> CARLOS ALBERTO AFONSO: Quickly, what's been proposed, very interesting, important, it seems to be the coalition of coalitions, a sort of forum or procedures for us to act together to disseminate the work, so on, which I think is very, very interesting.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Maybe just to add quickly, this is the first year that we have had a main session for Dynamic Coalitions, and also the first time using the idea of the rating sheets. It is a pilot. All of the suggestions are definitely well appreciated and I think will be taken into consideration in the future.

I see we have another question -- also, if we could please limit it to 90 seconds, timers --

>> AUDIENCE: Give us the heads-up when the time comes.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Can you step closer to the microphone?

>> AUDIENCE: The question I have, it is as you look at the coffee break and your ability to get to the coffee much more quickly it is clear that a lot of people have left already by this point and by tomorrow significantly more will have left. We seem to have a head long rush to do a tabulation. I would argue that by tomorrow numbers are not what's important. What's important is feedback on whether people were able to use the form. Numbers are not a representative of anything at this point because you don't have people. If this tool is meant to be an input tool to the Dynamic Coalitions, it can't be much beyond that, why not leave it open o so that after people get home they can provide input and you can do a running tabulation, because tomorrow's tabulation is a meaningless number that's a futile exercise. What should be is a debrief concept of hey, was this useful? Did you have something -- I'm guessing I'm at the 90 seconds

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: An intersessional idea rating sheet?

>> AUDIENCE: Essentially this is two things. It is, one -- there are two issues I see with the rating sheet:

One, someone came up with an idea. I have no opportunity to input my ideas and maybe the idea is not representative of what a lot of people want to talk about. One, we have to figure out what's the workability of that.

The second thing we have to figure out, what's the utility? How is it going to be used? We have a tool without understanding what we're doing with it.

I think tomorrow let's maybe do this as an open discussion of could this be useful, people see what it is, and they can provide feedback on that. A concept of tabulation doesn't make sense. We're making a headlong rush, you have 15 minutes, it is dark back there, fill out a dot. That doesn't seem to be a good path forward.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Very good points.

I think that you would like to make a comment?

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: Thank you.

>> Joe, just a question, would a blank rating sheet be a good idea?

>> AUDIENCE: I think that would give you then confusion because then you would not necessarily know how to map anything.

I think this is the concept of if a Dynamic Coalitions has a question saying is this useful, at least feedback, it is not conclusive feedback in any way but a feedback loop. I think you could have a write in version where people say perhaps this is something that we would like to discuss, and then that would be a way for Dynamic Coalitions to see perhaps what the future work is that we should do and that's an in the methodology

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I could answer on the rating sheet idea.

Yeah ,it is normally done -- they're normally blank so people around the room with their own had ideas can add those and get immediate feedback on them. We're keeping it simple

As everybody has been saying, it as pilot. We haven't put really the resources into what it deserves this year and we haven't allocated the time. It is something we tried to do, we had to negotiate with the MAG to try and at least split this into two sessions so that we had some space in between for people to complete the sheets. Regrettably, the two sessions are the last one in the evening and first one in the morning.

Everyone's comments are very valuable, and we're hopefully look at the process again next year and we'll be able to do a lot better next time.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

I see we have two more questions. Maybe we could -- three more questions.

If you could keep them short, again, 90 seconds, even one minute would be better.

I think we should take them in a row, and then we'll answer all at once.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello, everyone.

I would like to know about the aspect about the book, is this at a virtual access, should we buy it? I would like to know how to acquire it? I'm working on forensic specialization for the local University.

>> [Applause].

>> AUDIENCE: I commend you for trying to get feedback. This is actually not my original question,

The comment on how the form is usually used, if you're to fill it in, usually the forms are designed for certain kinds of feedback, usually if it is blank it is open-ended, that usually taking it from one context to another can be quite problematic. They're designed for certain purposes and not for others.

The other thing that's interesting to me, I found for the first time what the sheet looks like and how it will be used, and you'll use color coding to identify the different groups. I'm hoping -- the question is, are you taking into account in the spirit of the IGF which different groups register in different ways because the kind of consensus decision making only works if basically all of the different stakeholder groups buy into the proposals, and it is important that it work not just for a head counting exercise but works for all of the constituent multistakeholder groups of the IGF.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm Andre from the youth IGF and from the observatory of the youth in Latin America.

We, the youth, will see the possibility to express part of our claims here in the IGF, specifically the question about the participation of the youth, and we have been asking in other places about the question to open space for the participation of the youngers. That's the first point.

I was talking yesterday -- and the second point, is the possibility to open the IGF to start -- and start this in the Dynamic Coalitions, with a real reasonable dialogue looking at the room structure, with the youth thing, in the audience, we have in the room, because I know it is a hard wish but it is not a regional dialogue. We have a section -- a session in one of the workshops we had, we had a talk with the audience, and in the Dynamic Coalitions that is not a problem. I think here is a local one that we can start to think of real dialogue. It is a hard wish, but help us.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> CARLOS ALBERTO AFONSO: With those comments, we close the session and hope that you all will be in the second part tomorrow morning.

Thank you very much.

>> VERIDIANA ALIMONTI: Good morning to everyone.

I'm the Chair of this main session. I have been a representative of the last term, and we're going to start this second part of the session of Dynamic Coalitions. Yesterday, we had asked the Dynamic Coalitions to present. The participants were encouraged to complete rating sheets broken down on the main issues under discussion. This morning we'll give additional Dynamic Coalitions who wish to do so the opportunity to introduce themselves, discuss their work and encourage participation in their group. The rest of the session will be focused on the discussion and debate of outputs yesterday and the feedback received via the rating sheets will

provide guidance for the future work of the DCs. I'll allow the session organizers and moderators to explain a bit more of how we envision this session going.

I would like to give the floor to our moderators, Jeanette Hoffman and Rachel Pollack.

The floor is yours.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. We start with a short wrap-up of what we did yesterday, and Rachel will describe how we envision the session this morning.

What we did yesterday, first we got a bit of a background by Markus Kummer and Avri Doria about the history of Dynamic Coalitions, the discussion going on of how the IGF could become more outcome oriented and how the two issues are related to each other. Then we got an introduction by Jeremy Malcolm about the concept of the idea of rating sheets. Then we had a presentation, nine really good presentations by Dynamic Coalitions.

Since we had a bit of time left, we already opened the floor for comments, and perhaps not too surprisingly if one knows about the history of the IGF most comments were indeed process oriented. Despite all of the suspicion and discussion in the run-up to this session lots of people actually supported the approach chosen by the two Co-Chairs of the main session. There were several comments suggesting that we should start earlier during the IGF week with introducing idea rating sheets and also allowing to people to make comments after the session so that people can still use them and comment on the presentations online perhaps between the IGF meetings. We found that encouraging and I'm sure that the MAG will have debates on how to carry on with this approach.

Now I hand over to Rachel.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

Today we'll proceed first by hearing from those Dynamic Coalitions who did not present yesterday, we have at least one and up to three we would like 3 minutes maximum and we'll hear from Jeremy Malcolm about the results of the idea rating sheets both online and the paper versions. We'll open up the floor for debate, keep your intersections to 90 seconds or a minute 30 seconds and we'll do that for a half hour and conclude with responses from each of the Dynamic Coalitions.

Now I give the floor to the Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety. You have 3 minutes.

Thank you.

>> MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: The Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety welcomes the initiative to stimulate further interactions with the broad IGF community as well as to seek ways to better inform about the nature and scope of our work as Dynamic Coalitions which should be mutually beneficial. The Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety was created in 2007 and currently has 24 member organizations as well as 55 individuals affiliated to its mailing list some representing those organizations and others acting in personal capacities. Provided an estimated 1 in 3 Internet user is under 18 raising to 1 and 2 in parts of the developing world, the members of the Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety believe in the importance of advocating for and positioning issues around the Rights of the children within the Agenda of the Internet Governance forum by providing an open platform for discussion and sharing dialogue among representatives of children organizations, governments, industry, academia, other Civil Society groups including those made of young people themselves.

Children Rights and in particular the issues about the link between those rights and Internet Governance should be in the limits of all actors across sectors. It is not the sole responsibility of children organizations. This is reflected by the wide variety of our membership and through concrete outcomes which were imported by a large members of our organization. The Internet Governance is a main actor in the Internet Governance

ecosystem. This is why we welcome to hear the views of those attending today whether remotely or in person, on how Internet Governance stakeholder should embed the issues concerning the Rights of children in the digital age in structures and policies. We encourage all interested parties in joining our coalition to contact us and we look forward to cross collaboration with other coalitions.

Thank you for your kind attention.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

I would now like to invite any other new Dynamic Coalitions who have not yet presented.

Do we have someone from the dynamic coalition on accountability? Thank you.

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you.

We have recently convened the Dynamic Coalitions on accountability of our Internet Governance organizations. The reason behind convening this Dynamic Coalitions is to look at the mechanisms that exist in accountability that exist in Internet Governance organizations and by that we mean Internet Governance organizations that are involved with binding or non-binding policy making processes. It focuses on -- it can focus on Internet Governance forum, WSIS, ICANN and other organizations that are involved with Internet Governance.

The importance of accountability comes from the fact that if we need to uphold the Internet Governance principles that we always go on and on about and talk, we want to be multistakeholder, we want privacy, we want transparency, if we want these things we need to have certain accountability mechanism to make the Internet Governance organizations accountable and transparent. If they are not, we should have some form of some process to -- for redress, for reformation.

We have recently convened this Dynamic Coalition. We're -- if you have any suggestions, if you have feedback, that would be great, you can be a member other also a co-organizer and we'll welcome any kind of suggestion and participation.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you very much. Are there any other Dynamic Coalitions freedom of expression, the media, if you would like to make a few remarks, you can come up.

Thank you.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH Thank you.

The freedom of expression and freedom of the media online have a pretty full discussion to set out our Agenda for the coming year. The past 5 years have focused on swish issues of intermediary liability and the Delphi case and we decided after that was ruled on on the next objective to look at the different dynamics of censorship online from the public private, privatization, self-censorship and algorithm censorship and looking at violence extremism, violence against women, child safety online, we look forward to working with other Dynamic Coalitions to make sure that the elements of freedom of expression and freedom of the media are concerned within responses on dealing with other issues.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you, Courtney.

I see that there is a question from Luca, I give you the microphone.

>> LUCA BELLI: Really a bit of advertising, we wanted to create a Dynamic Coalitions on drone governance, if there is any person in the room interested in exploring drone governance, not clearly only from military use but from mainly from a civilian use, come to me after the session.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

Now we'll hand the floor over to Jeremy who will discuss the results of the idea rating sheets.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Thank you very much.

Despite the fact that we left almost no time for people to complete the idea rating sheets we still have a few interesting results, not so much results in terms of a clear consensus on any of the substantive points but more results in terms of how the different idea rating sheets were received and which approaches to drafting them have been more successful. I guess the topics that are contention, most popular -- contentious and most popular. Clearly the most contentious and/or popular of the Dynamic Coalitions based on the number of responses received are net neutrality and public access in libraries interestingly.

This could reflect a number of things, it could reflect the fact that those coalitions did the most outreach, it could reflect the controversial nature particularly of net neutrality. We also find that all of the eight topics -- all of the seven topics, but two, received only positive responses or neutral responses. There were only two Dynamic Coalitions whose ideas received any negative responses at all, one of those, again, net neutrality. The other one is core Internet values. Core Internet values, we received an hour prior to the opening of yesterday's session a new set of idea rating sheets for that coalition which we weren't able to put in the paper version so the paper version only has one question covering the entirety of the core Internet value topic. That clearly wasn't successful because we can see on that sheet virtually no one responded either online or off line and amongst those that did. There is a real spread from disagreement to agreement with no pattern at all.

But for the revamped online idea rating sheet for the core values coalition we have a much more useful output in that there is a much more interesting spread of responses, more responses and so I think that the lesson for that, from that, for the Dynamic Coalitions is don't just have one question. Split up the question, your ideas, into -- we had recommended 5 and 10 questions.

The one question on the core values sheet which received negative response from some was on the end-to-end architecture which probably makes sense which was stated in the session yesterday that this was something that was compromised in the Internet as we know it today. That's feedback that the Core Values Coalition will be able to go away with and think about maybe how they reframe that question or present it next year if they wish to could do so.

Core values, they had a mistake of too few questions, another coalition had perhaps too many, because there was only one response, and that was Internet Rights and Principles. We didn't have a paper sheet for them because there were 21 questions. Even on the online version that was by far the least responses that any coalition received.

The most responses, sill not high, 18, we're not talking representative in anyway. That may show that there needs to be a balance struck between having too few and too many questions.

What else can I say, gender, probably not too much in terms of the number of responses that I can talk about the results.

Internet of Things, not enough to be representative.

Net neutrality: In the net neutrality coalition we had 5 Civil Society responses, three private sector, 4 technical community and 5 academic community which is not a bad spread I think.

The most contentious questions which the Net Neutrality coalition has to go away and think about were 2, 3, 4, and 5, 2, the net neutrality that Internet traffic is treated with no discrimination, et cetera, et cetera.

The next question, which is also controversial, it was deviations permitted from the net neutrality principle.

The next one, which was the ISPs should be able to give force to court orders or legal provisions to bypass the net neutrality principles and the one following that about publishing or interestingly, I don't know why that was controversial, ISPs should publish meaningful, transparent information on the net neutrality practices.

The idea rating sheet with the biggest spread amongst the stakeholders was the platform responsibility coalition. We had an Internet governance stakeholder respond to that and others, that seems to have the potential to be quite popular and quite consensual, there was no negative responses, most were positive. That's a good sign for that platform, responsibility coalition to continue its work and to maybe next year when we repeat this exercise if we do on a larger scale, they may be able to reach some message from the larger IGF community that supports the platform responsibility principles.

Likewise, the Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries, they can be happy, there was not a broad stakeholder spread, but the very predominant result from that coalitions' idea rating sheet was strong support, they can be very happy that they're going in the right direction and once again, if we do reach a point in the future where we have a more representative sample it might be that they could -- there could be a form of rough consensus emerge around their principles.

Having said that, clearly today we're not in a position to judge any rough consensus for any of the documents discussed because we didn't give enough of an opportunity or get enough participation. I think at least from my perspective we have made a good proof of concept here and hopefully we can run this on a larger scale next year.

Meanwhile we'll leave the online rating sheets open and I'll be provided access to the raw data from those to the Dynamic Coalitions organizers and give them copies of the paper idea rating sheets which apart from the numbers also have a lot of useful comments in the strengths and opportunities and weaknesses and threats fields.

Regardless of the limited nature of the trial, I think it is definitely proven itself to be promising and hopefully will be useful to the Dynamic Coalitions in their ongoing work over the next year.

Thank you.

A question?

>> For the record to remind us, could you tell people where they can go for the online access for the rating sheets?

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: On the main website under feedback on the IGF site, if the screen is wide enough, it is the right-hand side of the screen towards the top. The label again is feedback.

Yes?

>> Thank you.

How long are these going to be open for?

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Yesterday it was suggested that they will be open indefinitely. We don't have a date. We can get interim results at any time. If the Dynamic Coalitions want to start working on the results next month, we can give them the results but leave it open for as long as we want to.

Yes?

>> LUCA BELLI: A question.

Who is allowed to use the rating sheets? Everyone or only the IGF participants?

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: Well, the IGF community in theory is the whole world, right?

People have to sign their name, they have to give their name. They have to give their afill -- not the affiliation but the stakeholder group. At this point we're not going any further to accredit them in anyway.

It is really open.

Any other questions on the idea rating sheets? before we move on?

Back to the moderator then. Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you, Jeremy.

I think this is an interesting exercise and provided helpful feedback and lessons learned if this exercise is repeated next year. I think that Avri Doria would like to make a few remarks.

>> AVRI DORIA: Most remarks I wanted to make were covered. I wanted to thank Jeremy who has put in a fair amount of effort in this experiment and has been adaptable moving forward.

The other thing is, I have asked Jeremy to add one more rating sheet and that is on the notion of rating sheets. As people go to the survey button, it won't be on the paper ones, but as they go to the survey, if they want to comment on the whole notion of rating sheets themselves, it will be possible to do that. The paper ones will certainly remain up for the rest of this session, but when the walls or whatever are torn down for this room to change, they'll go away. Until then, they'll be available for people.

Thank you. Thank you, Jeremy.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

We'll now open the floor for debate from the audience. If you could please lineup at the microphones we have someone on both ends and we'll gather all of the questions and comments at once and then for about a half hour, again, 90 seconds each, and at the end we'll give time to each of the Dynamic Coalitions to respond.

Thank you. You can begin here.

We're having a problem with the microphone. If you could please state your name and affiliation.

>> AUDIENCE: I will. I'm Roger Matthews and I represent the certain operators association of India representing the mobile operators in India.

My comments are related to the DC on net neutrality and my comments are as follows: First of all, please, I would like to be on record that the DC does not fully represent the perspectives of the industry certainly from India. We have subjected the comments and they have submitted them and there is no result and feedback given to us as to why some of our comments were rejected, the transparency is in question. We adamantly are not in agreement with many of the points that have been eye lighted by the DC and we don't believe it is fully transparent. It appears to be a top-down kind of push trend, exercise for that reason we stand opposed to many elements that are enumerated in the DC. Certainly the process is as I indicated, it requires improvement in terms of involvement of the community, all aspects of it, we're opposed to the IRS document being used and I'm glad that that alternative has been provided. Our objections are indicated in a document that's been submitted. I'm not sure why 100,000 dollars needed to be spent when survey monkey could have done it as equally or adequately as well --

>> RACHEL POLLACK: You have 10 seconds.

>> AUDIENCE: I close with one thing, saying that, please, IRS should not be an instrument for gorging consensus.

Thank you.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: We didn't spend any money at all. You may be confusing this methodology with the deliberative polls, I don't know how much money was spent on that either. I'm sure it wasn't that much.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Luca Belli is asking for the floor.

>> LUCA BELLI: I think some of the participants may be confused providing comments and having their comments considered and integrated with copying and pasting or they wish to have in the statement. For instance, I wouldn't say that the comments from the gentlemen has been ignored and indeed one of the exceptioning --

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Excuse me. We're gathering the comments and questions at once, if you can keep your remarks --

>> LUCA BELLI: One of the comments has been provided by them is one of the exceptions included in the paragraph 3.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Please don't get into the details of the response now.

Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: As a matter of the process, integrating comments into the documents that have been presented, certainly with regards to the Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values we're gathering comments. No work has been done on actually integrating that on the document because we would rather have all of the comments in or a large number of comments in before starting to make amendments and we would certainly not be modifying the page and so on based on the comments received. We would have those discussed on the mailing list to be able to involve everyone in the coalition.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

Before you reply, this open mike session was meant to focus, to address the presentations of the Dynamic Coalitions we have received so far. Those in the audience, we would be grateful, I'm sure that all of the Dynamic Coalitions would be, if you care to give feedback on what's been presented yesterday and what can be found online.

Thank you.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: I just wanted to follow-up again with the comment on how we plan to use this and the idea rating sheets going forward based on what you said actually.

I think from our perspective for the coalition it would be really useful because the ideas are actually for many people easier to digest than going through the entire document. Particularly if we think of the Internet Governance community as all users, right, essentially. What we were trying to do over the next month is actually use our mailing list, use the platform as well as the idea rating sheet survey to see whether there is enough consensus for our work so that we can use it to sort of really shape our Agenda for the year ahead.

I just want to say that.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Please go ahead, introduce yourself.

>> AUDIENCE: European broadcasting union. We participate in four of the Dynamic Coalitions, we have a broad view on the various activities and we're very happy of the work that's done there because I think that the

Dynamic Coalitions mainly help to focus on specific aspects, then some of the aspects suddenly become trendy and fashionable, but the work has been done during years in which was not so trendy and fashionable. It is very important, the tool for the IGF and for the future of the IGF.

In this sense, I think that the reason -- the discrepancy between the way that the work -- the way we work at the MAG on the organization of the workshop and the Dynamic Coalitions, there is a gap. Sometimes the work that's done within the Dynamic Coalitions and the process to assign the workshop is totally separate and split. We have duplication, same thing coming over in various workshops, et cetera, et cetera. I'm wondering if among the things that we add to the shopping list of work we have to do there is not a possibility to work a bit more on that. I'm sure that Markus from his wisdom, he could suggest a way to do so.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: I'm sure the MAG will take note of this recommendation. Are there more comments on actually the substance of the Dynamic Coalitions? From the audience?

Otherwise, go ahead.

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: We're the guilty party for providing 21 questions. The reason being, we have seen the rating sheets at an opportunity to present what's quite dense material in another way. I would like to applaud the IGF and also Jeremy for actually providing a multifaceted way of feedback. There is the paper form, in which case our approach is perhaps not the best, but the online rating sheets, they're really quite fun and I think this is a way we can actually communicate and spread the idea of getting people to engage in our material in another format and another kind of length, another modality. We certainly are looking forward to the online aspect of this exercise in turn. I think that's important to carry on.

The online platform itself for the substance for all of us, I have great respect for, we have something really important there for a long-term wider form of feedback. If you look at what the students from Syracuse already are providing, I think we can say this is a huge success online and off line.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Do you want to go a bit into the substance of the feedback you have got?

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: It is an enormous amount of feedback from the students, from Facebook, we have had pertinent points on phraseology, phrasing, we have responded in one case and they suggested that we should change a phrase to innovative business models and in those cases we responded with the fact that the text covers that idea and is another section that we will take to the coalition.

We're not thinking so much of rewriting the charter at the moment. I think that's something that could happen.

As for the students, very briefly, their comments are very wide ranging, what's really striking is that they're speaking very self-consciously as the digital natives. This is our communication. This is for us. We think at our age that privacy should be respected, there is pertinent comments on consumer rights, about education, cultural diversity. They're very, very concerned about their freedom of expression being constricted but they have looked at the text of the charter and also of other DC coalition input. Sometimes they have written essays, I can't quite summarize it today. Some are direct interactions with the texts from an editing point of view and some are general responses. It is a lot to take on board. It is an extraordinarily successful exercise. Thank you.

I hope that's enough for now.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Who knows!

I have been wondering whether the Dynamic Coalitions actually would care to comment on each other? One of the things I found striking while listening to you yesterday is there is considerable overlap between what you

are doing, sometimes reinforcing each other's messages and sometimes also contradicting each other. Would you as long as there is no comments from the audience want to comment on each other?

>> LUCA BELLI: More than comment on each other, I think that yesterday afternoon was an excellent occasion for the first time to meet and understand a lot of synergies could be created, a lot of duplications could be avoided. A lot of work could be done together. Naturally maybe because of the proximity on this side of the table we have already started to think about some potential actions that could be developed together.

I think that regardless of the format we will use in the next years, a meeting for Dynamic Coalitions, the coordination, it is essential to me.

>> My comment goes in the same direction. I like the idea of having a coalition of Dynamic Coalitions so yesterday as mentioned, we had already some ideas of collaborations following this meeting.

I want to also put a plug in for the work of Dynamic Coalitions net neutrality in the sense that, A, regarding the comment that was made earlier, they did develop a code outlining the process that will need to be followed in order to have something to be considered as an output of the Dynamic Coalitions, not all Dynamic Coalitions have a process and bylaws. I'm wondering maybe this coalition of Dynamic Coalitions could also work together towards some kind of code of conduct that will be useful next year if you want to have something validated as an output of the Dynamic Coalitions.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Avri Doria, please.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

I wanted to basically give some thought on this Dynamic Coalition of Dynamic Coalitions. In fact, in a sense, I think the group we started pulling together to come up with this pilot is such a thing. I think it would be quite beneficial for that group in its own bottom-up way to basically start developing methodologies for defining what is an outcome that sort of comes out relatively uniform across. Obviously it is something that takes greater discussion, consultation perhaps with the MAG in terms of methodologies, I think that's actually -- that would be a very good outcome from this pilot exercise to look at how to go further with developing this process.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you, Avri Doria.

Please introduce yourself.

>> CHERYL MILLER: I'm Cheryl Miller. I'm a MAG member. Thank you for all of the -- MAG member. Thank you for the work you have done in the respective coalitions over the years. I know you don't get paid to do that. It is a heavy lift in many instances.

Thank you for that. Also thank you to Avri, Markus for their work with the Dynamic Coalitions.

I agree, I think perhaps next year, moving forward within the MAG we can try to talk more about the process. Maybe it would even be an interesting project for future intersessional work to find a way to engage people and talk more about how we may move forward with that.

Thank you very much.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Yes.

>> FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you.

More on issue specific. I can see that Dynamic Coalitions normally come up with principles and what's accepted as a principle, as a whole. I think in Dynamic Coalitions accountability we're trying to come up with

mechanisms and how to uphold the organizations answerable if they actually break those -- if they don't uphold the principles that are being made in other Dynamic Coalitions. I might be wrong, you might be working on mechanisms as well. I think the way we complement the other Dynamic Coalitions that work on principle is that we will look at how to enforce and uphold those principles.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Please introduce yourself again.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Not only working for us, but also recognizable for other participants. A discussion that we had with the Dynamic Coalition on Internet of Things yesterday, it was how would it be if all of these things would have different interfaces for the same thing that one time you need to give a voice, you put a finger in the ear, whatever you need to do to make something to happen. Basically I can see the challenge for people at the IGF to interact with Dynamic Coalitions that all have their own ways. If there is recognizable patterns that still work for us, that would be great.

That's the first thing.

Second thing: Yes, we are so busy doing our thing that we have too little time to listen to each other. Subjects like data, privacy, they're something that touches upon many of our different Dynamic Coalitions. I have heard some sensible remarks about it. It is different, the discussion, if they're not connected, maybe also we can identify a couple of issues that we need to discuss in this coalition of coalitions.

I hope this helps.

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: That's one possibility. Another possibility is also to consider the Dynamic Coalition representative on the MAG, either as elected representatives from the DCs on the MAG and that could integrate and communicate our work better between us and who is doing what kind of work and where the work overlaps or resonates, I think we have started to understand just how we work in terms of our priorities. I would urge caution on over hasty programs of standardization. The Dynamic Coalitions are very diverse and their concerns are diverse and require different approaches. Some approaches require clearer forms of enforcement, mechanisms as we call them, other approaches are about awareness-raising, learning to understand a different point of view in the instance of disabilities, I think we have to be careful about being too standardized too quickly and move forward with the diversity.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: The freedom of expression coalition would like to agree with that approach.

I think as you pointed out there are many different things that the Dynamic Coalitions are trying to achieve. Sometimes it is about exploring different options and understanding the issues. The standardization is probably not the best approach. But the idea of coordinating with other Dynamic Coalitions we strongly support.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you for all of your comments.

Just let me remind you that we were supposed to talk about the content produced by Dynamic Coalitions. For whatever reason IGF participants easily get worked up about process, but have problems to focus on content. I know that you all want now to discuss the issue of standardization and some principles for Dynamic Coalitions, but I would still like you to think about the substantial overlap between you. I think if a coalition, a Dynamic Coalition of Dynamic Coalitions emerge, it should not only talk about process but also how you take each other into account in terms of developing principles and standards.

Perhaps you could sort of propose some ideas about how to go about that substantial overlap?

Thank you.

Who is next? Olivier Crepin-Lebold and then Andrea. Andrea first.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Thank you.

Since we actually did produce what could be considered a standard, and I'm actually going to comment on what we presented yesterday and about the overlap.

We effect everybody. We overlap definitely, every single Dynamic Coalition has an issue where accessibility for Persons with Disabilities would in fact impact your work.

Also, we do things in two areas, we deal with actual access to the Internet and some of the different kinds of problems that people actually encounter in trying to use the wireless Internet and different programs, including platforms.

Also we find it a place to give ideas to the industry that comes here on how to better serve not only Persons with Disabilities but everybody who uses the services that they provide. I mentioned yesterday about what we call conferencing tools that we use remotely, remote conferencing tools that not one of them really satisfies the accessibility needs of the community and what we have found is that -- captioning is probably the best example.

There -- they fought it like mad like some of us are fighting Dynamic Coalitions. Everybody uses it. We found that there were non-disabled, quote, able to use that politically incorrect term, we found that was useful.

We have, in fact, written the standard, we called it the Dynamic Coalition guidelines. We would like to see several things with this: One, we want an output document, we want to be able to produce an output document. We do feel that the MAG should take a look at this possibility. We want something that we produce to be useful. We want the community to input in it, on it if they don't like it, they want to add to it, be able to encourage people to come and tell us what we have done well, or not well.

Standardization is my bag. I standardize everything right in standardized language. I think when you write a standard, then everybody knows where you are. The IGF traditionally has not produced output documents from my knowledge if Markus can correct me if I'm incorrect. One camp, we shouldn't put them, a dialogue situation this should be, the other side, well, we should.

We have a clear view that what we have done, whether we call it an output document, whether we call it a standard, we have a clear view, we called it guidelines to kind of be politically non-controversial to make the IGF probably one of the more accessible units in the UN system. We want very, very much to have more input with other Dynamic Coalitions, but it is not the only thing we do. We want to be able to have a person on the MAG who either is a person with a disability or someone who is knowledgeable about -- let me wind it up.

She speaks sign language! I love it!

We want somebody on the MAG who represents this area, and we want to be able to have more input into the policy making on how we do things to include people with disabilities, including fellowships if that can be done.

Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: I think when you look at the different Dynamic Coalitions and their coordination of course it hasn't been formalized so far, it is a mistake to think there's been absolutely no coordination at all.

I guess in the early days when the coalitions were created there was a time when the coalitions looked at one another saying why is this one on, we're doing something similar, certainly in the Internet rights and principles coalition and the current Internet values there was overlap. Quickly, I think that with some people being in both coalitions there was some bridging of discussions and we ended up with each coalition finding its own bed as you would say.

The overlap was basically more of a collaborative nature rather than an overlap being of a conflicting nature. Certainly the meeting we had yesterday was -- I think was extremely good in that we were able to have all of the coalitions in the same room and as you know, IGF meetings are so busy and intense, it is difficult to get sometimes everybody in the same room.

As far as the network neutrality, I had a conversation with Luca Belli and great aspects of their work, it would feed into the core Internet value coalition and the other way, some that go along over with the network with the Internet of Things coalition with the Internet values related to this. I think this is a first step to having a more formalized collaboration between the coalitions.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: So perhaps one way to go forward is to ask each Dynamic Coalition to sort of point out statements of other Dynamic Coalitions that they really fully subscribe to?

>> AUDIENCE: Can I add a point --

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Introduce yourself.

>> MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Dynamic Coalition on Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety, Marie-Laure Lemineur.

In addition to us Chair, sort of speaking to each other, establishing mechanisms, there are cases where people are participating in different coalitions, so the cross feeding, so that's also to be taken into account.

We as Luca was saying in response to the question, to your points, we after the session yesterday we sort of agreed that there is a section on Children Rights in the document that you have been producing in your too so that we would sort of work together and the Dynamic Coalitions members of the Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety would look at and agree on and work together.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: You worked on that now?

>> MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: We agreed with that after the session.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: I'm trying to drag you more into substance. It is not easy!

>> MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: I can't say it. We had a brief conversation with Luca saying that there is a section on children's rights. Maybe explain further.

>> LUCA BELLI: I'm also the Co-Chair on the Dynamic Coalition of Platform of Responsibility, that was referred to, the platform responsibility section, a section on Children Rights. The proposal was to further review that section with the help of the Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety in order to strengthen it. If I can add another elements, I think it would be excellent for the Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility to work with Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values and also Internet of Things, knowing that the majority of things -- half of the Internet traffic in ten years will be produced by things, so maybe it would be interesting to check how the traffic could be shaped with their colleagues.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Why don't you just take a few minutes, improvise two, three sentence, read them to the audience and then we get some feedback while I hand over the microphone to the lady of the Coalition of Public Access and Libraries, DCPAL.

>> CHRISTINA de CASTELL: There was opportunities to get feedback from others on our statement in particular in the areas of accessibility and in the areas of freedom of expression or technology infrastructure approaches.

I think that to really engage we may with our different membership groups we may need a point of entry.

I suggest that each of you draft sentences that we could circulate to our respective lists with the idea rating sheets in order to keep that work going. I think we do -- we have interest but we need people to have an entry

point. Certainly with our Dynamic Coalition we have stronger participation from the Civil Society sector although we have members from all stakeholder groups and that that means that we need some additional feedback to have more diverse voice and other Dynamic Coalitions could help with that.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Please introduce yourself.

Thank you.

>> NAVEEN TANDON: My name is Naveen Tandon.

I have a question. Before that, I would like to congratulate the Dynamic Coalitions for the tremendous work they have done.

When they respond at the end of the sessions, can they also consider responding to whether they're willing to accept a single standard process and procedure of working in agreement with the MAG and the wider Internet governance community which applies all across all Dynamic Coalitions or do they prefer proceeding in 2016 continuing with the internal rules of processes or standards?

Thank you so much.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

Anybody wants to respond to that?

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: I want to return to content.

I think we're beginning an important process. All of the Dynamic Coalitions material, it is up on the consul day active platform. We're starting to read each other's material more closely.

That's important.

Secondly, the rating sheets, they're available online which also allows the wider community to respond.

From the point of view of the individual Dynamic Coalitions I would like to suggest that we take the time to consider the responses and comments so far to our own work and then a second stage would be -- I don't want to make more work.

I'm sorry, but the second stage ideally is to start to interact with each other's work.

I personally did actually post some comments on other Dynamic Coalitions outputs because I sort of thought that's only fair and this is a chance to do so.

At the start of a process, we're actually getting into the content and I hope we can continue that and really start to substantiate things.

I think that cooperation needs to be cemented and again I would like to stress that representation on the MAG would be a very clear and coherent way to create the lateral interconnections we need at the immediate IGF. That's my response to the gentleman who just spoke.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: You go ahead.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: I'm from the Dynamic Coalition on gender and Internet Governance. I wanted to follow-up on the thread of working together with other Dynamic Coalitions, this is on the action plan for the year ahead. Simply, we, too, feel that gender is a cross-cutting issue. Perhaps it is the kind of issue that there is a tendency to assume that it links more directly with certain Dynamic Coalitions and a tendency to assume it is far removed from others. While we totally agree with many suggestions so far for working together and would like to do so, I think in the case of gender it also means perhaps slightly more intensive one on one interactions

with some of the Dynamic Coalitions to understand the links without being artificial and, you know, if there is genuinely no link, there is genuinely no link.

We really want to explore some of these dimensions. We also feel, for example, if I may use the Internet of Things as an example, I think we could seriously influence our own understanding within the governance sphere and really think about doing a paper on gender and the Internet of Things even though it sounds totally different at this moment if you know what I mean. It helps us to take the concepts back to our own coalition so that people that are members -- because there is a tendency sometimes in our coalition to avoid or not have enough information on some of the topics that are considered more technical.

That, too, would help us with our, you know, constituency in many different ways. This is something that we would like to do. Going forward, there is another question that I would like to ask all of the coalitions. It may sound a little odd, but because most of the conversations around Internet Governance is confined to the IGF community and that particular website, I'm curious about whether any of the coalitions have considered taking some of these issues to wider platforms including social media, in terms of just building, you know, a broader constituency of governance, not necessarily people that will come to the IGFs, but who are definitely like Internet users, that are concerned on these things and what people's views may be on this.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

First of all, that's not why I raised my hand. That's wonderful. I think that many of the -- I also am on the list for many, I'm a lurker pretty much on most.

You know, they're already doing that outreach, that's what we're bringing in or what they're bringing in for many cases. I think expanding that is really quite good.

I wanted to go back to the gentleman who asked for a pledge. Almost reminded me of a political campaign. Basically I think that that would be problematic in a sense. I'm hoping that we don't get a pledge because an essential nature of the Dynamic Coalitions is their bottom-up nature. The fact that people come together from these broader communities, they're not a top-down, the MAG will sort of determine and speaking as member of the MAG, while I hope that the MAG works with the Dynamic Coalitions and I actually think having whether it is liaison, representation, what have you of the Dynamic Coalitions on the MAG is a really good idea I would think it unfortunate if the MAG somehow became a determinant of what was the one-size-fits-all that was imposed on Dynamic Coalitions. I think we need to integrate them more into this community but I think we have to keep that bottom-up energy where the kind of coalition it is, the topic that it works on, the population that it is outreaching to has a lot to do with determining how it does its work.

Certainly at the IGF level, when we're talking about do we want to decide something is not output from the Dynamic Coalition, that they should do on their own, but output from the IGF, then certainly, there is a certain amount of give and take between the coalition of coalitions and the MAG and the larger community. I would really like to avoid making the MAG a top-down determinant of how Dynamic Coalitions should work and asking people to sign pledges while we're still trying to form ideas would seem problematic to me.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

Cheryl?

>> CHERYL MILLER: I want to take a step back, I don't know if I consider the gentleman's comment a pledge. Earlier I talked to some of the youth that are here at the IGF and they were asking about the Dynamic Coalitions, I think from a perspective of a newcomer, I was and I probably still have, having a certain amount of process, it is really important. People don't really know how they can engage and in what ways they may engage. Now there are a number of Dynamic Coalitions, you are growing, there will lob probably be more next

year. I think it is important. I agree, you don't want something so strict and prescriptive, but when you're working on documents and, you know, you're moving towards wanting outputs, other things, it is really hard as a new person coming to the IGF and wanting to join a coalition to know, okay, first of all, what the heck is it, you know, you have been seeped in this.

I just raise it from that point of view to have you chew on that. Think about that.

Thank you.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Some of my colleague, maybe I'm more technical than others and I'm a business economist by the way.

I talk about interaction, which is like making it easy for the outside world to understand what's going on with us. That's not determining how you manage your internal processes at all I think. It is making it easier for the outside world to connect and to be able to contribute. It is making it easy for me to find out what the Dynamic Coalitions are all about rather than having to dig in and to do a lot of work to get what it is really about first.

That's an important plead.

The second thing -- I'm sorry for being 10 minutes late. I was 10 minutes late because there was actually a workshop on Internet of Things here at this IGF, I don't say that Dynamic Coalitions should be the only one having a workshop on IoT but it is good that these are also cross-informed if not set -- I'm not setting about setting the Agenda but talking about the cross information beyond the Dynamic Coalitions also. Workshops, they're not supposed -- not expected to work intersessional, yet they do important work too and that's considered too.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

>> NICOLO ZINGALES: I wanted to add a further remark, I'm from Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility. On the question of substantive overlap, I wanted to mention that I think that there are two Dynamic Coalitions which would work particularly well in synergy with ours, one is, again, Internet of Things, one of our concerns with platform possibility is to make sure that Human Rights are respected moving towards a more hyper connected and increasingly automatically enforced work where rules can be implemented by machines that are connecting to each other.

There in our rules we try to preserve the autonomy of users and in particularly making sure that they are given the due process before any content removable and that any use of their data only follows after they have given their consent or they're adequately informed on the way in which data will be used.

With regard to the Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance, this is one of the hot debates I think regarding, you know, the extent to which intermediary is an online platform that should proactively, you know, protect minorities to that extent it goes also to the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability. You know, in this respect, I think we could work together towards some joint statement. Of course we can comment on each other's work but we could also find areas where we can come up with something that has broader, legitimacy because it is joint work of multiple Dynamic Coalitions.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Yes, I think that captures it quite nicely. That Dynamic Coalitions benefit from each other if they collaborate.

Andrea.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Naturally, we would love all of the Dynamic Coalitions to listen to us for sure. I want to bring something down to a practical level in how we could work -- am I not speaking properly -- I think I'm so loud and I don't need a mike. Thank you.

I want to bring it down to a practical level. How do we work together over the distance that we all live? We have a solution, and I'm going to bring it down to accessibility again, we caption conference calls. That's the easiest way we can do it. One of the things is that, okay, we can wait to meet at IGF, we can do it by e-mail correspondence, but that is very, very difficult unless you're disciplined and you appoint somebody specifically for that Dynamic Coalition to work with somebody else. That's one thing.

Do a budget for that? We are supported by the ITU and we have a budget for captioning. That's one thing.

Second thing, the technical aspect, Internet of Things is very, very dear to us. We need to communicate with the standardization bodies that there are problems in not including Person with Disabilities, I'm technical, there are a lot of other issues. You're quite correct, the speaker just before, that the gender issue would be an important one. I don't know how we can do this if we want to work together, we have to come up with a way we do it, not just talk about it. We have to maybe work together to find a way and like I say, do you have a budget for captioned phone calls?

Thank you Jeanette Hoffman now it is Olivier Crepin-Lebold I think.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: Thank you.

Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values. A few points. First I support the points made by Avri on the dynamic nature, the bottom-up nature of Dynamic Coalitions. We have had a different type of inception, the way that we're built is probably different structurally wise, so on. Trying to put a top-down standardization on the output, the organization, it is probably not particularly positive.

Regarding the commenting on the ideas presented by each other's organizations, coalition, I know that you would like us to comment here, but it is a bit difficult because apart from the ones that I know pretty well having been involved with some of the work, I learned about the work of the other ones personally and it is hard and after a week like this, it is a bit of a haze and it probably would be better to comment a bit later on perhaps by --

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Feel yourself challenged!

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: I'm already challenged enough.

Thirdly, there is some process with regards to the actual feedback. We have this ability to have all of the differentiating sheets on the same page but the documents to which the rating sheets are relating to, they're not actually linked from that page.

It would help to have that. I think at that point all of our coalition members could actually access all of the documents of all of the coalitions and then submit not only feedback on their own coalition, but feedback on all of the coalitions that are there.

That would really help.

Finally, just a quick point on the idea rating sheet itself, apparently one of our members has said when you hit return it actually submits it. There are some incomplete studies out there. You may wish to look at this, Jeremy. When you hit return, when you're in the text field, it submits it without -- if you want to go back, then it erases everything that you have written before. That's a bit of a problem.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: As we only have about 15 minutes left in the session, we really would like to have some substantive discussion if at all possible, we're going to ask each of the Dynamic Coalitions to please give a sentence, a comment on getting feedback then we'll have more discussion. We'll start with the gentleman from the Internet of Things.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Feedback I want from the audience is what you intend? That's a very general question. What do you think of our ideas basically? This is why these idea rating sheets are there.

Difficult to ask it for one specific subject I would say. Read the paper, come back.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Just choose one that's really dear to your heart.

>> LUCA BELLI: I don't think we can choose one as a coordinator. If we're really a bottom-up structure we can choose one single point, we can pick a favorite point F we want a point on a feedback, an idea, we should consult with the other Dynamic Coalitions members before taking an initiative.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Perhaps you didn't understand.

It is not about privileging one point overall others that your Dynamic Coalitions is covering. It is about choosing one thing that you would like the participants in this room to comment on. I cannot imagine that you need feedback from your whole Dynamic Coalitions for that.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Andrea, one thing.

>> ANDREA SAKS: We want to be in the MAG and influence the IGF to use our knowledge. That's my favorite thing.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

Child Online Safety.

>> MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: In the statement I read earlier, I asked a question to the audience. I would like to again reread it and ask feedback from the audience how Internet Governance stakeholders should embed the issues concerning the Rights of children in the digital age in Internet Governance policies and structures. We would very much welcome feedback from the broad community now or at a later stage.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Coalition on Public Access in Libraries.

>> CHRISTINA de CASTELL: We want feedback using libraries where they exist to initiate the access for communities that are not yet connected as this would be a starting point in a community that's not connected that brings the greatest access the most quickly.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you for that.

Who is next?

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Freedom of Expression would like feedback from other Dynamic Coalitions on how to balance freedom of expression for different populations so from the Dynamic Coalition on online safety, gender, disabilities, this is a cross-cutting issue, when we talk about freedom of expression, whose freedom of expression and how to balance those different things.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights & Principles.

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: We want to invite you to interact with our comment and to the general comment in the room and those listening by remote participation, to potential participants, I will read from the last part of the preamble of the charter of Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights & Principles, we bring this as a standard comment of achievement for all stakeholders in the Internet environment, every society should act to promote the rights and freedoms and by local and global measures to secure the universal and effective recognition and observers, observants, I hear by submit the charter of Human Rights and principles for the Internet to be adopted as output for this session so that we can continue the conversation together where we overlap and where we differ.

Thank you.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: I thought you are -- gender, sorry.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: Two ideas, gender, meant to think women W want an expansion of that category to include all genders, especially transitioning genders. We're proposing a policy for the first time or sentence or statement or something around sexual harassment whether we call it a friendly space policy, whether we put it in the code of conduct, whatever.

That is something that we would really like feedback on. It is the first time that this idea has been proposed by the gender DC.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I'm prepared now if I have a chance .

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: I think it is Luca Belli first if I have it right, if you have the patience now.

>> LUCA BELLI: I think that two core ideas anchor elements of the world that we have been developing over the last three years is that the net neutrality principle is a non-discriminatory principle and is instrumental to foster the full enjoyment of Human Rights and to preserve Internet openness. I would like to have the feedback on these two points.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

Now Nicolo Zingales.

>> NICOLO ZINGALES: I was going to go with one statement but since everybody has two parts, I'll expand.

The first one: Really the concept of responsibility. I mentioned this in the first day, that we recognize that sometimes companies are required to comply with laws that might not comply fully with Human Rights standards. To that extent I would like to hear the feedback about the concept of legitimate law that we find whereby companies would only be required to comply with those laws that are a result of a democratic process and that they're not disproportionate to obtain a legitimate aim. This is a first part.

Second point, it is on the idea to have users informed at all time in a clear, transparent manner about everything that the platforms are going to do with their data.

This doesn't mean necessarily consent is required for everything.

To the extent that there is a legitimate interest that the platform may want to pursue with the users, the users should be informed in advance of the types of the categories of users that are going to be made of their data.

Thank you very much.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for this opportunity.

First, for all, meaningful transparency, what does it mean to you?

How do we get meaningful transparency in a world that's increasingly digitalized. The second aspect, how do we balance the use of data while respecting privacy, how do we make sure society can benefit from all of that data out there?

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

I have been informed that the Coalition on Youth would like to ask for feedback.

>> EPHRAIM KENYANITO: This is Ephraim Kenyanito.

I would -- we didn't participate actively in this because we are going restructuring, we would like feedback on how to -- expertise from other coalitions especially on doing transitioning processes how to have a smooth transition, Steering Committee and apart from that, we're doing elections and we want to do elections for the new Steering Committee and we would like as part of the revamping effort expertise from other coalitions especially infrastructure to do the online elections and all of that. To really appreciate the mentor ship from other coalitions.

Thank you very much.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOLD: Thank you.

I think there is only one point which we would like some feedback on, it is a bit controversial. The current Internet values could be deemed as unalterable core values. The word unalterable has raised eyebrows.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

I think we have heard from freedom of expression, you have spoken unless there are comments from other Dynamic Coalitions? I see we have one from the floor.

>> ROHAN SAMARAJUA: Rohan Samarajua again from India.

An area that net neutrality needs to engage with is the government, being subject to license, license conditions and governmental oversights, governments are not comfortable with multistakeholder approaches, they don't function in that environment. I would like to see the IGF through its UN affiliations, others, begin to start educating governments as to how they function in a multistakeholder approach in terms. Laws and regulations that emerge that are enforced upon licensed operators such as ours.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

I believe Freedom of Expression wanted to make a comment.

>> COURTNEY RADSCH: Another request for feedback especially given if there is remote participation. Our specific case studies to understand the dynamics of censorship and the balancing between the Human Rights and other rights from specific examples from as many different countries and the issue, we'll be compiling those in the next year. So some of these -- you know, this idea about legitimate law I think is something that we would be interested in talking about as well.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

If you could please, this is the last question or comment from the floor.

Please introduce yourself.

>> DOMINIQUE LAZANSKI: I'm Dominique Lazanski, a MAG member, and I work for the GSMA which represents 800 mobile, operators and 250 ecosystem players. In response to the net neutrality Dynamic Coalition, net neutrality as a term is very restrictive, negative and prescriptive as we have seen throughout the debates here this week. However, we believe that the open Internet is a better term because it actually will be more encompassing and it actually will preserve Human Rights among other issues interconnectivity, security, stability of the Internet.

So both NETMundial output and the Council of Europe has been using open Internet and we think that would be a better term.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

We have one last comment.

>> [Applause].

>> RACHEL POLLACK: A last comment from Luca Belli and we'll wrap up the discussion. I think -- yes, before it will end, we'll hand over the mike -- I'm sorry. No time for Luca Belli I'm told.

>> LUCA BELLI: Can I exercise my right to reply?

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Yes, a short reply. 30 second reply.

>> LUCA BELLI: To point out the NETMundial statement and the Council of Europe, they use the net neutrality wording. It is both in the NETMundial statement and in the 2010 declaration of the Council of Europe, I suggest a careful reading of the actual document.

Thank you.

>> RACHEL POLLACK: Thank you.

Now we invite the Chair of the MAG to give some remarks -- as he's coming to the microphone, I would like to say that the discussion should continue as we have said, the idea rating sheets will be online and now I think we have a good summary of what are really the key issues of where Dynamic Coalitions are looking for feedback.

The floor is yours.

>> JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much.

I would like to start by thanking the representatives of the Dynamic Coalitions for this exchange, very useful.

I was listening carefully because the question of how to engage and how to benefit from the wealth of experience and knowledge that the Dynamic Coalitions accumulate in their activities intercessionally was on the Agenda of the discussions of the MAG, we maybe didn't have the sufficient time and we also decided not to change the rules of the game during the game but certainly I feel that there is a need to look at the question of engagement with Dynamic Coalitions when we hopefully start the third set of round of IGF, if that will be decided by General Assembly, hopefully.

The only element that I would like to remind ourselves that IGF is convened by the United Nations Secretary-General. The MAG is acting on behalf of the Secretary-General as an organization Committee and reporting to Secretary-General through United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs which is a focal point in UN system for organization and successful sort of functioning of multistakeholder discussion forum named IGF.

I can promise you, if mandate will be renewed, we will address the Dynamic Coalitions, the engagement question with the Dynamic Coalitions in vet open fashion in consultations as we usually do because MAG as such is not parachuted from somewhere, the MAG is formed by the Secretary-General based on recommendations of different stakeholder groups and making sure that there is a proper balance of geographic representation, gender representation, so on, and certainly everyone will be able to participate and express themselves in the discussion.

The transcripts of today's meeting will be very useful also for us to start.

At the end I would like maybe to say one word of caution, and I plead to the Dynamic Coalitions not to over step the boundaries of acceptable and follow existing rules. I noticed that some are using logo of United Nations and believe me, logo of United Nations, the use of the logo of the United Nations is highly regimented, some may be in breach of that, please use maximum care of that. I'm not saying about logo of IGF, which use of logo of IGF is not regulated, but use of the logo of the United Nations is highly regulated.

Thank you. Thank you all for this conversation.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you.

Thank you all for attending this session. I thought it was a promising start to be continued. Actually we got more outcome of it than I would have expected. With these words, I hand over to our Chair.

>> VERIDIANA ALIMONTI: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for a very informative session about the work.

Thank you to the moderators, to all Dynamic Coalitions that have presented. I would like to invite you to watch a video raising awareness about the threats to Marco da Civil, the Brazilian Civil Rights framework of the Internet approved in 2014, you can access it at br/video. My sincere thank you for all of you being here this morning.

It is now time to close the session.

Human Rights, Access and Internet Governance Roundtable

The following are the outputs of the real-time captioning taken during the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in João Pessoa, Brazil, from 10 to 13 November 2015. 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 event, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

***

>> Thank you for coming so early. Can I encourage you to come a little bit forward and not to sit at the back? This session is really organized more as a roundtable. It will be much more effective if you can sit either closer here and to this side or this side. Not to occupy the rows of seats behind the scaffolding. That will help the dynamic of the room to get everybody talking. If you have an intervention in mind that you really want to come up and speak, you can also sit here.

Please don't sit in this row. This is open. We don't want anyone's backs facing anyone.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Good morning.

I'm from Derecos Digitales, Chile and you're welcome to the main section on Human Rights on Internet access roundtable, with me is Mrs. Anriette Esterhuysen from the Association for Progressive Communications, South Africa. We want to welcome you all.

To start this session, by introducing the Host Country Chair for the opening remarks, Mr. Thiago Tavares from CGI.br.

>> THIAGO TAVARES: Good morning, everyone.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we will now begin this morning's Human Rights access in Internet Governance roundtable.

I would like to welcome you all here today and I'm looking forward to our discussions. The Internet can be a powerful enabler of Human Rights. As a medium of communications, the freedoms fostered by the Internet to express ideas connect and associate with others. This is impressive. This freedom is essential elements of personal autonomy and basic Human Rights.

Internet access is growing steadily across the world and changing the Internet in every aspect of our lives. For more than 3 billion people who have online access the Internet directly impacts of the ability to access news

and information, political speech, religion and culture, markets and trades and libraries of knowledge. It is important to sustain and grow access. It is even more people connecting online every day.

To do so in a way that supports Human Rights, the IGF has become over the years a unique, important platform to facilitate the dialogue on Human Rights and the interlinkage with Internet policy in governance. Each year Human Rights issues have become increasingly more imminent in the IGF with a large proportion of workshops this week, in fact, we're speaking to the different dimensions.

I would now like to give you the floor to our moderators Anriette Esterhuysen from the Association for Progressive Communications, South Africa and Juan Carlos from Derecos Digitales, Chile.

The floor is yours.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you, Mr. Thiago Tavares.

I would briefly introduce the format for this session.

This session will be a roundtable and we aim to have a very participatory session where we will open the floor to questions and ask our discussions around the table to discuss the key questions that will be provided to them. Some collected through public calls within the theme of this session.

The session will be split in three parts that we will be interrupting for comments and questions from the audience and the Dynamic Coalitions as well.

We will have a timekeeper. They'll help us carry this conversation in a dynamic manner.

We also have to announce that some people will have to leave, this is the final day of the IGF, and some have important commitments.

I want to start by asking Frank LaRue to open the start of this session.

>> FRANK LaRUE: Thank you very much.

The idea today is to see what are the key issues we have seen that are specific concerns for Internet and freedom of expression around the world that have come out in this IGF meeting.

I find that all IGF meetings are very diverse in topics and complicated to hone down. In this session, we still have the diversity, but there is a couple of topics which clearly came out systematically and we have seen several panels:

One is the issue of hate speech and prevention of hate speech. The idea of dangerous speech. What can be dangerous speech and what can be defined as hate speech? This is becoming very specific a concern with question of migration around the world and the hate that's thrown verbally by the migrant, different ethnical communities because of the differences in race, culture in general. It correlates with this, this I think is important of this IGF, it is the look at gender-based harassment and problems. I think APC has played a key role in this in raising this issue very strongly, how can we prevent the incitement of violence against women, because they're lawyers, prosecutors, other cases. I have heard about this in other panels. For me, it was a very crucial element, an important element of this IGF. I personally believe, this is only my position, that when we talk about hate speech we talk about incitement to violence, and it seems that the gender focus on women organizations are successful in raising the issue that violence against women doesn't only mean physical violence but psychological violence. Consistent sexual harassment, harassment of women can actually turn them away from a career, can shut their lives, can silence journalists and women that are demanding the right to study or the right to equal access to justice in any country.

In a similar case, hate speech has also been addressed from a perspective of LGBT population and in some areas of the world it is a part of the political debate that's been used during electoral campaigns and it has a

distortion of the democratic process, the electoral process where candidates use anti LGBT population language to supposedly increase their popularity but also to provoke discrimination and in many cases mobs and violence against LGBT Human Rights defenders that had a very brave approach in opposing this, including legislation that in some countries has been proposed and they have had to backtrack.

A similar issue again, this time we're looking at the limitations, whether valid or not, a similar issue has come with the prevention of national security and radicalization of youth. How can prevention of radicalization is the term being used. I think this is a legitimate concern, we had a panel yesterday, but the prevention of radicalization was expressed by many people as very much a multitask approach. It cannot only be seen from the position of speech, can only be addressed through Internet as a key element of counter-speech, yes, of prevention, positive messages, but it also has structural issues in every single country that also has to be addressed. It is a legitimate question, but it is also a temptation to look at radicalization only from the optic of communication and the use of Internet when that is not the real problem and the real problem is who are the messengers, who are the people with credibility addressing the young people what, are the conditions in which the young people live?

Finally, let me say the question of again, link to national security question, question of surveillance, privacy. Which clearly now we have a Rapporteur, this is a very important development, he has come to this session with the Rapporteur, freedom of expression as well and I think that this has been an excellent possibility to get to know him and to address this issue.

Clearly, how fast is technology going? How can we exercise the safeguards of privacy in a world where it even seems that public opinion is willing to give away privacy to guarantee security.

I personally don't think there is a contradiction that we should fall into the idea that privacy and security is in contradiction or the privacy, security, freedom of expression are in contradiction, on the contrary, we should say that they're a complimentary, it is an open debate because the technology is going so fast. We have an element of corporate responsibility, how are corporation pace that handle the software of surveillance or decryption or encryption and decryption using this technology? Is there a registry of who they're selling it to? Selling it to rogue states, authoritarian states? This is a big concern today.

I would finish by saying that the challenge of this IGF is to look at this problem in the complimentary of freedom of expression and other areas of the Internet in the world.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you very much.

>> [Applause].

>> JUAN CARLOS: I will start this part of the session regarding freedom of expression, right to assembly by presenting the Professor Joe Canatacci, UN Special Rapporteur on Right to Privacy in Digital Age, Bishakha Datta from public policy, Ebele Okobi from Google, Mr. Niels Ten Oever, Working Party on ICANN and Human Rights & Article 19, Netherlands, Guilherme Varella, who is not present at this moment, and the permanent representative of Belgium to the Council of Europe and the director of RPD Mexico, the digital rights defense network, Alejandra Lagunes.

I will ask brief questions, and I hope you'll be able to answer for which you have 3 minutes.

I will start with the professor Joe Canatacci, Special Rapporteur regarding the remarks just made by Frank LaRue. What's the challenges regarding privacy regarding the Rights of the use of the Internet and what are the challenges of privacy in the current era of digital rights?

>> PROF. JOE CANATACCI: Thank you very much. I apologize for being slightly late. I was kidnapped in the corridor three times in 100 meters.

Very briefly, I think that in the opening comments made by Frank LaRue and also in the general theme of the session, what is most interesting to me is that there is life beyond privacy. We have to get people accustomed to think in a general framework.

When one asks the question why privacy, right, what is the function of privacy? What's the role of privacy? In the same way as we're asking what is the role of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly traditionally?

On this particular context, I think that it is important that we have a structured dialogue about another right, and that is an over-reaching right which is already recognized in some countries and that's the right to personality. My answer as to the reason why we have privacy is because each of us has or should have a free, unhindered right to the development of our personality. It is in that context that privacy is essential. It is in that context that freedom of expression is essential and other fundamental rights are essential, including the right to protect our reputation and the challenge of the Internet is of course it enables us to do so many new things but it also helps us develop our personality in many directions but it also may provide certain risks to the development of personality by providing choke points. There are areas where the flow of information in our direction and flow of information out of what we do may actually be impeded by a combination of individuals, governments and corporations.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Co-moderator jumping in.

That's an interesting idea. It has been interesting to hear you, Joe, develop this idea.

Do you feel that there are risks worth strengthening and interpreting the right to personality in the context of the Internet and that it could limit freedom of expression in way that defamation sometimes limits freedom of expression? I don't understand that much about the right, doesn't exist in my country, South Africa. It seems that that could be a possible conflict.

>> PROF. JOE CANATACCI: No. Actually, to the contrary, there is a risk if you don't frame the right in that way.

In fact, there are a number of countries which have integrated the right into the Constitution. Germany is perhaps the leading country which has done so, but you have other countries like Romania, a number of the Nordic countries in Europe which integrated that right.

If you -- I suspect that you will recognize this is a discussion which goes far beyond the 3-minute limit which is why I'll take the advantage of this reply to say that we're organizing what we hope would be a major meeting about precisely this subject privacy, freedom of expression, other freedoms, defamation, reputation, protection of reputation and we hope to organize that in October of 2016 and if anybody listening is interested, please contact me directly about it.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

I want now to ask a question regarding this, Partik Hesilius, and what's the role of the private companies in this area. How can ICT companies service providers, infrastructure providers adopt and apply stronger commitments to Human Rights especially when they're in conflicts with one another or perceived conflicts with one another?

>> PARTIK HESILIUS: Thank you.

You know, many times companies are put in a hot spot on this complex, issues related to Human Rights. Sometimes we do it voluntary, other times we have to take the role aspirators to decide how to handle Human Rights. Another great effect of the Internet that brings people together but also more to do with Human

Rights, hear recognized with different jurisdictions in the same time for particular issues. This has to do with catalyzing affects that the senior Internet has on Human Rights. We're seeing the analysis of the Human Rights violation online is not only more complex, but also richer. We try to have a holistic approach when dealing with Human Rights.

I will highlight the importance of self-regulation. When we don't have particular rules in particular we have to deal with issues that, you know, you need to deal with issues immediately. So I talk about self-regulation with a little reference with our friends, that's the community, the greatest example, YouTube, how -- there is no one-size-fits-all solution to deal with Human Rights, and you always need input of the locals, of those that feel this is harming them. By having the early warning system of the user when they flag a video they concern that sure is inappropriate or in violation, in hate speech for example, which is difficult to define what is hate speech and that varies from country to country and different cultures. Those users are flagging the videos, allowing us to take a deeper analysis and to help remove some of the content.

Then we also have an approach for analyzing complex issues that really harm people like what we did with revenge porn. For example, earlier this year we began to honor requests from people to remove nude or sexually explicit images shared with others without their consent. This I think has a very good -- a lot of people, they're relieved that those images are not appearing now. This is the kind of approaches that we are taking now.

However, there are other issues, when we're put on the spot to take the decision that judges or the different institutions from the government should decide. For example, right to be forgotten. We don't want to be there. We don't want to be the ones deciding what should be published and what not. I think that this -- this needs to be rethinked.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

Going on with the standards to be upheld to safeguard Human Rights on the Internet, I want to ask if this Human Rights guidelines, Niels Ten Oever, should be obligator for software developments even further than for private companies, but speaking about the particles of the Internet as well.

>> NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you so much.

We need to realize that technology is not neutral. The implementation of technology is not neutral at all either. If we see the Internet as an enabling environment for Human Rights such as freedom of expression, we have to preserve that, that happens at all levels, for a global network. We need a universal standard and what functions better than this than Human Rights?

Human Rights are interrelated, interdependent and universal, privacy is technically relevant for freedom of expression, right to be presumed innocent, these thoughts are not new. This is thoughts that were made explicit in the WSIS process, and we have the Human Rights Resolution and the Resolution on the Right to Privacy in the Digital Age and the NETMundial outcome document which reflects that Human Rights should underpin the Internet Governance principles.

The Internet standard RFC, 1958, it says that the Internet community believes that the goal is unfettered connectivity and the tool is the Internet protocol and the intelligence is end-to-end, and an organization like ICANN in Article 4 of the Articles says that they're going to respect international law and it is quite likely that an explicit Human Rights commitment will be added to the ICANN by laws. We seem to have agreement for quite a while there now but the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

It is about procedures, standards, processes for application and remediation. We're working with the ICANN and ITF, but eventually all should make this explicit, you can think of the regional Internet registry, exchange points, service providers and hosting providers. How we're designing our public spaces says a lot about our societies.

Do we have broad sidewalks? Are the sidewalks accessible for wheelchairs? The same is the case with technology. Does the technology allow for censorship? Does the technology allow for accessibility and internationalization? We need to decide demand and to make it explicit what we want that to look like and how we get there. It is time to move from policy to practice.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you, Niels Ten Oever.

I want to jump from the development of technical and industry standards to how they apply to what has been mentioned by Frank LaRue and Joe Canatacci about this life and the right to develop one's own personality.

I want to ask Bishakha Datta about this. I want to ask how do the freedom of expression and privacy deal with this?

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: What do we talk about with online freedom of expression, we talk about politics, religion, we tend to talk about protecting political religious descent and journalistic speech under threat. That's how we have come to understand freedom of expression over time.

Conversely, what do we not talk about when we talk about freedom of expression? We don't talk about sexual expression. Either because we don't see or understand this expression or because we don't see this as legitimate expression even though this too is under threat online. It is vital to note that the Internet has emerged as thee space for sexual expression be it providing information, sexual education for personal exploration of claiming sexual rights, so much so that 98% of activists in one survey said that the Internet is an important public sphere for advancing rights in the sexuality domain. That's advancing rights for a wide range of individuals, cutting across class, income, language, other access divides including migrant workers, people with disabilities, et cetera. At the same time, 51% of those in the same survey said that they had experienced violent or threatening messages, intimidation, censorship, that's not from the State but what we call non-state actors and that's having images, information removed from social media platforms which is a form of private censorship, having private information and private intimate images made public without consent neither by the state or private platforms but by other individuals using the platforms.

I guess when we think about the intersections between freedom of expression, privacy, et cetera, we need to ask a few questions: How can we uphold the right to all forms of expression, including those that are stigmatized? How can one expression of one user silence another? That privacy, anonymity is upheld by the State and other users, how do we use consent as a standard to distinguish between sexual standards that are consensual and not, and how do we bring an ethics of online consent allowing all of our expressions, including sexual expression to flower?

>> [Applause].

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

Continuing with that, that one silences another and the perception that there may be some source of not legitimate expression, I want to ask Dunja Mijatovic, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Bosnia-Herzegovina, welcome. I want to ask about the communities at risk and how the Rights of freedom of expression can be balanced with a right to dignity, physical integrity and to privacy.

>> DUNJA MIJATOVIC: Thank you very much.

As the name of the organization serves, security for cooperation and security and cooperation, so we deal with freedom of expression as an element and component of security because when there is no freedom of expression, there is no Human Rights there is no security, vice versa, no security without full respect for Human Rights. That's one of the main points of -- starting point.

When we look at freedom of expression online, I would tackle the point that you made about the balance. I think balance is often a wrong term to be used because it implies a compromise that needs to be reached. All

the basic and fundamental Human Rights need to be fully respected. It is not about balancing one against the other, they're all as important as equal and that's why freedom of expression, the part that I work on, I consider very much important.

We need to also stop looking at social media and new online medias as anything particularly new. These areas have been around now for I would say decades, and become as it has been pointed out, the most dominant platform for us to have access and to also impart and depart information. It is essential to keep them all free and independent as the name of my office. I deal with media freedoms and freedom of. Journalism, this is a growing trend and it brought more people into the profession, more people in the context of the freedom of the media and expression as Frank LaRue pointed out, it brings new challenges and problems that have to be dealt with. In a way we have tools from the offline world to deal with the online challenges as well, issues as hate speech, violence, issues such as threats to violence, they're not particularly new attacks against minority. None of this is new. They're taking place on a different place and different platform.

What we're looking at in terms of our issues, it is important, safety. Safety of people who are expressing themselves online. It is a major issue and it has been pointed out in the conference many times, safety of female journalists is particularly different and particularly challenging in comparison to the male counterparts. That's something that our office deals with and something that needs to be tackled with in a multistakeholder environment. Another important point to make, we need more education, education on how to use the new platforms, how to adapt, what are the codes of behaviors on the new platforms, not just for journalists but for everybody. Can we behave on them the same way as we behave in a street, in a normal discussion or this appearance of virtuality an idea that they can behave inappropriately or may be rude. Those are main points to be considered.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you very much.

I want to ask the room if -- we have a missing panelist. Apparently not.

Then I want to finish this round of questions asking Mr. Garcia, under this discussion, regarding the issues that have been raised and others that have been raised in the IGF regarding the Internet and freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, privacy, considering that Mexico is very likely the next host for the IGF meeting, I want to ask you, what are the key Human Rights issues that you think we need to pay attention to going to that meeting?

>> LUIS GARCIA: Thank you.

As Niels Ten Oever said, Human Rights is a framework which should guide our discussions with regard to the Internet. However rights that we have but rights are violated and often we're told that some rights, for example the right of privacy is dead. It is not dead. It is a right we have but it is violated systematically. It has been denied systematically by several agendas, for example, one is the cybersecurity Agenda that's been developing outside of the Human Rights framework and there is now knocking on our doors for example in Mexico in the form of cybercrime legislation that would literally make you a criminal for using the computer and to give great discretion to authorities to punish.

It is important to take in context how the Internet is being used. In the case of Mexico, it is a country in which the Human Rights Special Rapporteur on Torture, other special representatives from the UN has characterized as a country going through grave and serious Human Rights crisis with the disappearances, torture, killings and that this is affecting particularly certain groups such as journalists and Human Rights defenders. When some agendas such as one on cybersecurity tries to put privacy or encryption in contrast with security, what I would like to tell them is that in my country the line between the government and organized crime is often non-existent or at the very best blurry.

When -- in my context, privacy encryption for journalists, for Human Rights defenders is security, security from the aggressions of the state and non-state actors as well.

In the case of Mexico, I want to mention as well that several surveillance provisions have been adopted that affect the exercise of rights in the Internet and Mexico became inspired by the directive of Europe and implemented that same thing in our legislation becoming uninspired to remove it after the tribunal of the European Union declared it invalid and we're challenging in court, what is not happening, lack of safeguards is a problem, especially the context that I'm describing and often we don't know which authorities can practice surveillance on some people or warrants that are required for the surveillance provisions. We're a big server of a malware hacking team, it was demonstrated how it is not hypothetical that this surveillance can or will be used against Human Rights defenders and political dissidents but something that we can prove out of the league of the hacking team.

There are other parts, other discussion, we're hear discussing this, but in other forums, the discussions is not happening such as the trade negotiations of the TPP, which are happening outside of here and determining how we exercise our rights.

Finally, with no accountability, no accountability here either. There is no representative from Mexican government here, just Delegation of Two people in the session that they held yesterday there was not even a space for questions. We need and we want a Civil Society to discuss this issue with Mexico, but they need to show up for the discussions.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you very much, Mr. Garcia.

Before we open the floor to the questions, I want to ask all of our panelists, both from this part of the session and all others that surround us in this table to ask one another questions regarding what we have just discussed on privacy, freedom of expression and assembly.

Feel free to take the mike to ask a question of your fellow panelists.

>> ROHAN SAMARAGUE: UNESCO, more of a question, a suggestion of how we can integrate this discussion to the broader international and regional Human Rights systems. We have the governing bodies of other convention, child, women, the racist, the people with disabilities convention, and how should we maintain those governing bodies and also inform it and all of us take serious advantage of the universal periodical review of our countries to inform on violations and have good practices related to the protection of freedom of expression, privacy, journalism, other Human Rights defenders related to the Internet, to make this underlying that if we want this broader perspective of Human Rights and using the different systems, to keep them in the loop of the discussions.

Thank you very much.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Any further discussions? Anyone want to respond?

>> KATHY BROWN: I would like to put the question to those of you who -- Kathy Brown -- who are thinking about this every day.

The cross-border nature of the Internet allows speech to go from one place to another in ways that, of course, involve some cultural norms, cultural taboos, political issues that exist off the net but which seem more and more to migrate discomfort to affect and chill speech by individuals. The very nature of the Internet however has no border, human begins has come to be able to discuss issues of human concern of cross-borders in ways that may affect their political standing, their standing in the community. They may be quite innocent in terms of their expression. I'm very interested in how you all are thinking about this issue as we in the Internet Society actually push the very cross-border nature of the technology.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Kathy.

That was Kathy Brown from ISOC.

Before the other panelists respond, I see Rohan has a question too, a follow-up question to that, because picking up on what was said about regional, international mechanisms. Because on one hand there is that, that cross-border nature but then on the other hand there is remedy, how do you seek remedy if you don't do that using the existing framework of national Human Rights instruments then going to the regional level and then into the international level. Is that something -- we often talk about how rights apply across jurisdiction, we rarely talk about how remedy can be provided. Maybe respond to that too.

Let's have -- I think you wanted to add something too.

>> ROHAN SAMARAJUE: Thank you.

As I was preparing for this session, I was going through the international convention on human and political rights, certain and political rights, and in particular when it comes to a positive approach against discrimination, by governments, what that normally requires is the collection of very detailed demographic information so that particular actions that are against discrimination can be targeted properly. For example, I have been asked about the cast composition of my board members by a funding organization which I was appalled by. In my country we don't count these things. We don't collect information of this nature. I was wondering how issues like positive approaches to eliminating the discrimination, are they not contradictory to some of the privacy concerns, particularly in light of our Mexican colleague's important point that governments are not benign, that governments should look at the Rights of citizens and should we encourage them to collect more and more information?

I think we need act on principles and the right for non-discrimination. I think what it practically means is that a strong anonymity, privacy, anonymity, the content, it should be enforced on the network. It means we have to go back to the principle that all packets are equal and should be treated equal, which means that net neutrality should be standard basis.

If we start by differentiating networks, start by differentiating the websites, start by differentiating the protocols, we need to look at the packets, headers, the contents. All of this is protected, the only way to protect rights strongly on a technical level by strong privacy, security, having a very strong definition of net neutrality and content agnosticism.

>> JUAN CARLOS: I know many want to respond.

I want to ask our newly returning member of the panel, Ambassador, and plenipotentiary of permanent representative of Belgium to the Council of Europe, where are the key issues around privacy previously that the Council of Europe is considering and what are the approaches you're considering

>> Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to underline the work that's happening at the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe being a European organization of 47 countries. We were talking about enforcement being the issue on certain fundamental rights. Well, those 47 countries signed up to something, they signed up to the Convention, the European Convention of Human Rights and they have a very strong judge, they have the court, that will create a case law on certain infringements of certain rights that serves not only because, of course, the question of enforcement, it is at hand, but also will be orientation of what we understand about what we understand regarding freedom of expression and privacy.

Why are governments interested? Why should they be interested? Well, for those 47, the answer is simple, it is their obligation, they have to. Why? The state should protect its citizens offline and as a continuation of it also online because we spend more and more time online and we're more and more interconnected. That's one thing.

Another thing I would like to say, you have in an area of 47, a watchdog with a stick. That's the end of the process, enforcement infringement, remedies, but there is also at the start a very important process and this is what's happening here, it is influencing at the start so that companies, techies, so that academia, governments, Civil Society, so that they can take these discussions into account from the onset while developing their business model, while thinking about the new infrastructure where the default option is protecting rights.

The guide to Human Rights for Internet users is I think the most wonderful product the Council of Europe did in this prevention area.

Thank you very much.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

I want to give two more opportunities, please be brief, one minute each,

First, Bishakha Datta.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: I want to try to answer your question.

What's really interesting is that if you look at political and religious -- the sort of typical speech that's considered ledge mitt and protected as freedom of expression you find a lot of culture relativism among countries. If you look at sexual speech and expression, there is very little variation, most countries tend to see this as illegitimate. What I want to say, for this speech to also be protected and to get Human Rights claims, we need, A, freedom of expression in the community to back this, we need organizations like the UN Human Rights Council which passed progressive resolutions on sexual orientation and gender identity to understand the relationship between sexual speech and expression and these kinds of things, and we -- the time has come for this to be made explicitly a part of the freedom of expression for it to be protected.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

>> PATRIK HESILIUS: I also wanted to address the issue with how to ensure freedoms and how to regulate these things.

It was mentioned the various instruments like the European court of Human Rights, super nationals, at the end of the day, most of these things are on a national level. It is the countries that make the laws and have to enforce them. What the international organizations such as the one I work for, what they do, it puts pressure on the countries when they don't abide by the freedom of expression, commitments, you have to you have to act with such cases, not just observer, there has to be action on a national level, an action and international level in terms of supervising and ensuring that the nations abide by the rules they have voluntarily agreed to themselves.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I asked my co-moderator to give me a chance to say something too.

I think absolutely, something that I have been really impressed by at this IGF is how the community is developing new instruments for accountability. We have the ranking digital rights research, for example, and instruments that make the private sector more accountable that provide States with data which the States then can use to hold private sector more accountable and vice versa.

Also data violations committed by governments. That's something and I really having been a part of the IGF from the beginning, I think that's a product of this community, that we not only are relying on the traditional mechanisms which don't work very well in the offline world either, and enriching them with new tools, new instruments and new activism as well.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

I want to open now -- 30 seconds.

>> I would like to reinforce what Anriette Esterhuysen said.

I think we have to watch out by pointing the responsibility to protect Human Rights only on the shoulders of the governments. The UN General Assembly said that the Human Rights, should be protected but offline, rather than cyber defense, proliferation, we see the countries working on the cyber offense and legalizing what's been revealed by Edward Snowden, we have seen more invasive surveillance laws and not a stronger protection of Human Rights. I believe we should focus on strengthen the multistakeholder model there and focus also on the responsibility to respect Human Rights by businesses, operators and people that are actually running the Internet because putting it in the hands of the governments may not give us the area and the rights enabling space that we're so direly looking for.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

I want now to ask the Dynamic Coalition of Freedom and Expression and Media of the Internet, if she's present in this room? Please be very brief, a one-minute comment to the discussions.

The Dynamic Coalition only Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety, Marie-Laure Lemineur? One minute please.

>> I'm not Marie-Laure Lemineur, but I speak on behalf of the Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety.

The position of the Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety is that children have the same right as any other group in society, but due to the vulnerability there are certain rights given to especially to this group and we do not think that freedom of expression and protection of children are in construction but we see a need to ball the Rights of freedom of expression to the right of children's privacy and the right of children to their physical integrity and therefore we should also not think of children as a minority group. Recent research shows that soon to be 1 in 3 Internet users worldwide are children, and when it comes to developing countries, it is 1 in 2 Internet users. Let's not think of children as a minority but a very important group that's got the same rights.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

Finally, I want to ask Andrea Saks to give us her comments.

A minute, please.

>> ANDREA SAKS: I want to raise the profile of the abuse and the discrimination that occurs for Persons with Disabilities when some of their private details are exposed such as employment and even in other areas in countries where it is not well understood that they have rights and they're even killed. It is a very important issue, and that's all I wanted to bring to the attention of this group, to take those people into consideration.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you very much.

I want now to open the floor to discussion by questions from the audience, if you want to ask any of the panelists, please come to the microphones and speak.

You have one minute, please.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. Good morning to all. It is not so much a question as an announcement.

We have during the IGF started a Working Group to study Internet anonymity in Brazil and to discuss the right of anonymity among others. I will be tweeting the link to the group during this panel and later here accepting anyone that wants to take part in the group and that's all I have to say.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

>> Hello. I'm the spokesperson of the Italian Parliament

And I would like to bring here to the attention that on Day Zero we brought and presented the Declaration of the Internet Rights from the Italian Parliament after a year of public consultation in Italy, and it was a first time that the Italian parliament did this public consultation on a platform. The Declaration of Internet Rights was something that came out of the discussion on other rights that need to be considered. It came out after 10 years of discussing on the Internet rights and regarding other rights of the protection and recognition of all rights from other declarations to the right to Internet access, right to online knowledge, in net neutrality, personal data, anonymity, right to be forgotten which is the balanced with the right to be informed, platforms, network security, and the Internet Governance. It is on the -- the declaration is in English and Portuguese and Spanish, and it is on our website and we're hoping that this will contribute to all of the other rights that are being made that's trying to be drafted.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

We'll now close the floor after the next four questions. Please be brief.

>> STEVE SELTZER: Steve Seltzer from LaborNet and we're part of ABC.

We're greatly concerned about the role of these trade agreements such as the Trans-Pacific partnership which include codification and other rights and the danger is that smaller countries have little say really in what goes into the agreements although they're part of the negotiations, it is big countries and particularly big corps corporation was a vested interest, Google, Facebook, major corporations, these are the ones driving this implementation of this language in the trade agreements. If this passes, the TPP, this will affect the entire world communication network. I think that's got to be addressed and looked at seriously. There is really no debate and discussion in the process of what will happen to democracy and freedom of the Internet when these things pass because basically it is a done deal.

I think this has to be looked at, how we'll stop it, how we'll challenge the validity of the process.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

>> MARCOS URUPA: I'm Marco Urupa, Civil Society of Brazil.

The part of my opinion for the discussion is how the big corporations manages all the information, personal, transitionally and to discuss Human Rights without this point and have done this. My question is how you think about this, discussing Human Rights without discussing these matters, it is dangerous. The big heads of corporations, it is very, very dangerous in my opinion.

Thank you

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

>> DEATRIZ COSTA BARBOSA: Good morning.

I would like to enforce the problem with the intermediaries in the field.

News already talked a bit about this. In one hand, we have some States giving up their roles in areas in the platforms to deal with that, on the other hand, even we have many examples and many cases of platforms that said that some hate speech, some Human Rights violations do not go against their principles so they let this

content online all of the time. How can we deal with that and try to prevent somehow man rights violations to continue? I think we should put a bit more strength in the rules of the intermediaries in this process.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

One last comment or question please.

>> ORESTE POLLICINO: Many thanks. I teach media law and Human Rights and Internet in Italy.

I really enjoyed the week in IGF. I have a suggestion for the next edition, I think it is important to reinforce the legal background of many debates. It is very interesting to speak about general assumption, general principle. The Civil Society should benefit also about knowing which is already the balancing that's been struck down by the codes in Europe, for example, in the United States, in the Supreme Court. We cannot just speak of general principle, assumption and just saying that what, for example, what companies should do or are bound to do. We're already having a binding status quo. This status quo is decided by many years of case law that's clearly binding.

My suggestion would be to take more in consideration the legal background instead to just speak about general principle and secondly, this is a second consideration, today if we take into consideration which is the main actors in the legal order? It is really dealing with the issue, the answer is the courts. Let's look more carefully to the reasoning, let's look carefully how courts are balancing the fundamental rights and content. Let's see how constitutions are taken seriously from Human Rights and starting with this then maybe we can start a general debate.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

Before responses, I want to ask our remote moderator it is we have remote participation in the debate? I see a hand waving no.

Thank you. I want to ask the panelists if anyone wants to briefly respond to what's been asked first regarding -- there was suggestions in the first regarding international agreements but also the role of corporations and intermediaries.

30 seconds, please.

>> Yes. I will take the questions on the role of corporations and intermediaries. Particularly in the infrastructure, what we have been doing is investing a lot on encryption and the protection to the users. Encryption as was stated by many Rapporteurs, a key tool for data protection and protection of privacy. We're facing a lot of pressure from not only government but also from other corporations when we try to encrypt traffic because it is really difficult to go to the massive surveillance if we encrypt the traffic. We need the help of the rest of the stakeholders to keep doing this.

Also from other corporations like, you know, we see -- you know, Telecom, telecommunication companies are investing a lot of money in the packet inspection. This also has, you know, a great impact on privacy.

In terms of the intermediary liability question, I think that's not putting more broader in terms of -- it is quite the opposite. What we need to avoid is censorship by proxy.

This is what happened. I'm using a phrase that I heard from a colleague in a panel, I think it is a great phrase, and it was stated in freedom of expression and Human Rights, protecting the intermediaries to avoid the censorship is also key but of course we need to be accountable and we try -- we need to work in self-regulation to avoid the problems that's been manifested.

Thank you.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Okay.

Mr. Garcia?

>> LUIS GARCIA: International Human Rights laws are law, this is binding and self-executing. We need to also discuss that. I think we should be able to discuss what courts do and do badly

In particularly this year, Europe, just emerged with lots of very bad decisions such as the Delphi case making webpages liable for everything that the users do or the right of forgotten case. We take that seriously. We balance those decisions on some regions and impose them on other regions and we have to take the Human Rights and Internet in these discussions. We have to be technical. I agree, we need to look at the Internet and access to Internet as a Human Rights. It is part -- it facilitates with many other rights, with this regard, the States have obligations to affect which means that they need to impede the companies and intermediaries and violate the Rights of the users and have a need to fulfill this right by guaranteeing that access to the Internet and to many people.

My final comment is, courts, these discussions, many other things, they're being bypassed by trade agreement discussions that put Trade Investment Rights over Human Rights. This is something that we can't allow or everything that we're talking here, it is even including in particularly the court decisions, it is just irrelevant.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

Two more responses.

>> Please don't balance fundamental rights, just respect them regardless. The second point on the role of intermediaries, the companies have corporate social responsibilities maybe to be with the Human Rights but not an obligation such as states, states have an obligation and the national Human Rights law to respect that, that's why I have a serious problem with giving this responsibility to implement the Human Rights and principles to the intermediaries such as the right to the index as it is known as to the right to be forgotten. It is not a job, not a role to do this. It is the State's responsibilities that have signed up to international Human Rights law.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: Quickly about the intermediary liability, from the perspective of users, the conversation is really one about platform responsibility.

I want to agree with the speaker who just talked about the difficulties that users actually face. Two things, one, I think if intermediaries took sort of a consumer perspective and understood that a happy, satisfied customer is a loyal customer makes sense, it is complicated. We want to avoid the private censorship on one hand, we want to strengthen the censorial by the private but there is intersessions where the intermediary must be able to observe the Human Rights standard and take down that content. The final thing, the black box of community standards needs to be made more transparent.

>> JUAN CARLOS: Thank you.

Now we'll start the second part of this main session on access to Human Rights and development but not before giving a round of applause to our discussion, this is a discussion that will continue definitely.

[Applause].

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

So the Chilean lawyer is handing over the moderation to the South African Civil Society activist. I do first names, I don't do Mr., Mrs., I'm just warning everybody, that's our culture. No disrespect intended.

Thank you very much, Juan Carlos. Thank you everyone else.

We started this session to focus on freedom of expression and then on access of Human Rights and development. As we have already seen, it is very hard to separate them which is why I don't want the first lot of discussions to leave yet.

I think as has been said by some of the questions from the floor, there is a risk at just staying at the level of general principles. One of the things that I think needs to be done is framing access in a way that we try to frame freedom of expression through the experience of certain communities, people with disability, through sexual rights, access to needs and a deeper framing. To start us on that, I'm actually asking Juan Carlos if he can just share some of the analysis that he's been working on to frame access in a more specific way which then can allow us to integrate it in right frameworks

>> JUAN CARLOS: Yes.

The work that we have been carrying out, Derecos Digitales, Chile has been dealing with the access, as part of the realization of Human Rights, not just political, Human Rights, privacy, freedom of expression, but also to go further into economic, social, cultural rights. For this access to the Internet is paramount to those that want to include this kind of interaction to the exercise of the rights, but what we have seen though is that access to the Internet while it may help the development and may help into the exercise of this rights, it is still something that's not being exactly given to all around the world in similar conditions.

Linkages between Human Rights and the Internet, it is a part of this in the growing layers of this, we mentioned concerning the ICT industries, considering the protocols and practices of the many parts of the digital interaction. In this IGF in particular, we have seen the discussion on Zero-Rating and net neutrality with different views on the value of certain schemes to have access to the Internet or to certain services and whether -- the discussion whether a little access now is better than full access maybe never. Similar conclusions regarding the value of the full Internet, the power and especially the potential.

It is another question on whether a true access to the Internet effectively can help this development goals in the long-term apart from the key examples that we may find in different places of the world.

It is an open question on how effectively this access can be provided where there are also social, cultural norms that may act as barriers to equal access, to the full enjoyment of the Internet as a tool for Human Rights? The following discussion will try to delve into those issues.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Juan Carlos.

Kathy, I know you have to leave. I want to ask you first, ISOC is a champion of access in many ways for many years. From the technical community perspective, or ISOC's perspective, how do you feel access policies and technology development can combine to integrate Human Rights principles?

>> KATHY BROWN: Thank you, Anriette Esterhuysen.

I'm pleased we're having the conversation about access within the Human Rights conversation because where else would it be? It seems to me as we have been saying all week, that the two imperatives for us in the Internet age right now, in the 21st Century is to connect the unconnected and ensure we have trust on the Internet. The last conversation, our conversation in my mind went to this issue of trust.

I'll talk from my one minute on about this notion of access: If you don't have the infrastructure, if there is no infrastructure, you do not have access by definition.

We have right now half of the world -- barely half the world -- who have access and the other half not.

Let's start with the fundamentals. We cannot have a world in which half the world is not connected to what's really become the essential nervous system of the world's economies and we know that as this technology evolves that the Internet is also going to be the marketplace, the service delivery network and also the means

by which people are able to get the things that before perhaps were available offline but have increasingly become only more available online. I'll give you an example of that:

There are payments made by governments, for instance, that are very much what people live on where in some countries right now the only way you can access it is online. It has moved that far. Now let's think about the development challenges with respect to what happens when we all become, first, online, then secondly, what has to be thought of to the point of let's think about access as a very new thing, this is not just to get on and play games, this is actually going to be for the delivery of services for the development of a marketplace in the developing world as well as in mature markets where it already has happened. We have to take these things into consideration as we think about development principles, policies, deployment.

Trust, if we do not trust this tool that we have, if with do not think that our own data identity personality is protected in a way that we feel free to use it, we also self-decide not to get on it or governments decide we don't trust enough, we have another denial of access. Thus, this idea about ensuring ways, mechanisms to ensure trust, restore trust in some ways is hugely important, one without the other cannot be done.

I think as we think of the technology solutions, with respect to how the technology is deployed where it is deployed, what technology ensures the protection of the user, encryption for instance, other technologies that are in the hands of the users, this is going to be part I think of the policy of connecting the unconnected.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Kathy.

I see people around the table agitating to speak. Dynamic Coalitions, do any of you need to leave or are you able to be here still? Good.

Okay. I'm looking at the Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights & Principles, can you leave or --

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: No.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Picking up on that. I would like to -- I will go next to you, I wanted to ask Ron to go next.

So LirneAsia, talking about little access now versus the access never, the fact that Zero-Rating, free service, these services have been discussed at length. What is your view in -- as somebody that's been working in access policy for a long time, how would you like to see access from a rights perspective integrated into that regulatory access policy context?

>> ROHAN SAMARAJUE: I believe that Zero-Rating has been unfairly sucking up all attention at this event. It has been talked to death and I have no intention of talking more about it.

What is important to remember is that without infrastructure there is no access. For the last 20 years I have been involved both as within government, conceptualizing, implementing government policy and also as a researcher, policy advocate from outside of government working with multiple governments in the region of LirneAsia and we have had great success with improving the access with regard to telephone. It is one of the greatest public policy success stories in the world. We have before us a challenge of connecting people to the Internet. I think it is really important to look back at the lessons that we can learn from the past. From a situation where governments sought to engage in a positive rights approach which would require targeted interventions by government which would require collection of information about people, it pulled back to a regulatory role and allowed for decentralized solutions both by the private sector and by the end users.

Just to give an example, prepaid was not a solution that somebody from government or from the private sector came up with. It was innovation at the level of the public.

In this -- this was not clearly a positive rights approach. What are positive right approaches that were adopted by the government, for example, with service funds, they have been extraordinarily failures, throughout the world, the record is clear, that most of the service funds, they have either not succeeded in dispersing the funds or when dispersing they were not dispersed in the most effective manner. I would like to point to the opportunities that are posted by a negative rights approach, we allow the different actors to do what they want, when there are problem, we intervene. To give an example, in Pakistan and Bangladesh, the design of the services, it was changed, when we, among others pointed out that the cultural environment of the places is not conducive to women using these places without the designs being redone, the governments did that. Even with regard to the Internet access, the challenge that faces us, we should place less reliance on a positive rights approach and more reliance on decentralized solutions and negative right approaches.

Thank you

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

Panelists, if you want to respond to one another, wave your hand.

I'm going to ask you, from Facebook, Ebele Okobi, to talk about a positive, a negative rights approach but to talk about efforts to connect women, to connect women in a way that's actually empowering and not just adding numbers to the goal of Connecting the Next Billion.

>> EBELE OKOBI: Thank you.

We all know that access to the Internet enables the exercise of virtually all of the rights guaranteed by the UDHR. We know, however, that everywhere in the world, not just emerging markets when something is scarce, associated with power, women and ethnic, cultural, sexual, other minorities, they're disadvantaged with access. That's the same thing when it comes to ICT, whether talking about women in tech leadership in the U.S., in Europe, in the gender gap in mobile phone ownership across Africa. We know increased access conveys tremendous benefits. Of course, the most important benefit is equity.

I'm weary of conversations where women and other minorities or women and actual minorities are asked for justifications on getting their ecoshare of opportunity. It is like being asked to justify why women should have equal access to air. We know having women creators and decision makers in tech lead to better products and increased access to technology makes women safer and makes them more better be able to unlock economic opportunities and more connected to friends and family which are really important particularly. We know access enables women and other groups to make voices heard, technologies absolutely are a platform to give voice to the voiceless.

Those of us here know the stories that are often told on what I call the country of Africa, in general, aside from maybe one story per year, it is called Africa Rising. They are about disaster, disease, catastrophe, African women as victims, they need to be rescued.

One of my favorite authors did a talk on the danger of the single story. There is so much truth and beauty in the speech, but the best is that Africa is a continent where there are catastrophes, yes, but other stories, and it is just as important to tell those stories. That's a thing that technology does, I think it is powerful. It enables people to tell their own stories.

The danger of the single story about the country of Africa is going beyond bad press impacts the economies, tourism, investment, countless business and policy decisions that directly affect our futures. Given the above, there are a few recommendations for policy that enables this kind of speech and actually enables equal access. One is that national ICT plans should move from rhetoric to concrete, measurable targets backed by specific program, resources, tracked by data.

Governments should provide low-cost free public Internet access. They should ensure that the spaces are places to be safely accessed by women. We know many public Internet spaces that are provided often are unsafe for women. That's a reason why we're partnering with localized ISPs and others across Canada to offer express Wi-Fi. Government should make information about the legal rights and women healthcare available on the Internet, that's reason why that type of content is in free basics. Civil Society and companies should work to address online violence against women. This is why we're working with women groups on identifying ways to make our platform safer.

In Africa we're also in the early stages of looking at initial fives to look at ways that men can change their behavior. A thing that strikes me about the conversation on online violence against women is it attracts exactly the conversation about offline violence against women making women responsible for their own safety. It is important for us to think about ways that men can change their environments so that women can express their rights to free expression.

I'll stop there.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much.

I'm now going to ask you to respond to some of the points that were made from a government perspective. I want you to pick up on something that Kathy said earlier about how public services are available only online, that also create exclusions? Is that perhaps an example where the Internet can enable rights but also deprive those of -- without access to rights that they may have had access to? Particularly, Ebele Okobi's point about public access, safe access, do you have experience in Argentina to share in that regard?

>> OLGA CAVELLI: Thank you for the invitation. I'm honored to be with this distinguished colleagues here.

My comments will be -- I work with the government, but I'm also a university teacher and an activist towards the gender balance and women accessing their rights, especially the online world. I would like to share with you a positive perspective and especially taken from the words made by the professor Frank LaRue that this IGF has had a special focus on gender equality and gender balance and our colleague from Facebook, thank you for your comments. I would build up from there.

I would like to focus on three items, access to information, access to online tools and access to education as relevant elements for women exercising their rights.

Access to information: I think that information gathered together, data collected with all of this fantastic services that we have, it is a fantastic source of information for governments. Now we have recently had in Argentina a very strong public -- when people go to the street altogether, how do you say that in English? Demonstration? Demonstration, not a protest, but an explicit desire of going against violence against women. Now there are new ideas for laws, regulations, rules, this is happening not only in Argentina but other countries in the world. That gathered information, it could be fantastic, a source of data to know what to do, how to address those norms and regulations.

Also governments and other stakeholders like Civil Society, companies that could use that, access to online tools, I'm positive in imagining also in the developing world access for psychological support for women who are victim of violence. Imagine women that cannot go to a place that could access a public center near their -- she doesn't have access at home; but near her home, she has a place to access.

Access to health services, to sexual, reproduction information. How to avoid infections, how to make decisions related to sexuality. That's important for the developing world.

Access to education. Education is relevant for empowering women and allowing women to operate their rights. It brings economic independence and that brings a way to avoid violence. Some women don't have anywhere to go when victims of violence. If they have access to education, then they can do and know what to do.

Finally, from what Kathy had said about the cross-border nature of the access and in the Internet, for those not connected to have centralized or decentralized information centers for women to access the tools. I would like to stress the fact of a project that is for support, it is a fantastic idea, it could be also for women.

Thank you very much.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Olga.

Now I want to ask the Dynamic Coalitions at the table if they want to react to any of the remarks or share some of the reflections that emerged from their meetings here. You know who you are, you can introduce yourself.

The other panelists, also, if you want to react. Then we'll open it to the rest of the floor.

Introduce yourself first.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It may seem a long right from the Human Rights discussion, but the Internet of Things is a game changer that touches us all and also touches on Human Rights. It brings a lot of good things. It brings obviously -- it is currently driven by business opportunity but there is also social needs, societal needs, an example is the tsunami network that's been rolling out to protect the citizens against the natural disasters and there are many more things that I won't expand on.

Sustainable Development Goals that can't be achieved without technology, without connected things to support it. The same time, there is also concerns about it because big data is something that's already big today and will get much bigger tomorrow. It can address privacy issues. It is interesting that the European data protection supervisor there for privacy protection of Europe, they have remarked in the last opinion that beyond privacy protection it is about human dignity.

What it means is that we need societal dialogue. Societal dialogue cannot happen without people knowing what's going on and I can guarantee you too few people know. Initiatives from Information Society to have clear briefing papers, it is very important. The second thing, we need stakeholders to really get an approach, an ethical commitment, we cannot rely on law alone and the current explanations, business will have to take an ethical stand and develop a fairness principle. This is what our coalition is committed to over the coming year as well to deepen that further.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I want to ask you a question.

In return, it is that we talked about positive rights versus the negative rights approach which in layperson language with the Internet of Things I would say we let it happen and then if bad things happen, we intervene or we try and govern it at a corporate level as well as a State level to try to prevent bad things from happening. What do you think should be the approach with regard to Internet of Things?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We need businesses to be aware of what's needed to act ethically and they don't know yet. They have to think of it themselves because of Civil Society, from people, there is no response, no clear understanding yet. That needs to develop. That's one thing.

Law is already there. Law needs to be obtained and in that way Human Rights are clearly part of it. It really requires in that way to step up and to grab that opportunity and to come forward with clear expressions there. It is not a race that's done today.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks.

I will ask the Dynamic Coalition on Net Neutrality & Rights and Principles, do you agree that businesses are not respecting Human Rights because they don't know? I'm putting it crudely, but do you think it is more that they're trying to get away with not having to increase the cost of compliance for as long as they possibly can?

>> LUCA BELLI: Good morning to everybody, Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility, to answer that question, I will not say that businesses do not know, but I would rather say that some traffic management practices are more profitable for businesses and others. The question is not if they don't know, that they could infringe Human Rights but the question is where the profit lay and what's allowed by the law or not.

What we have been working on over the past years of the Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility and we have discussed this during this IGF, is to have a strong principle, this is instrumental to the full enjoyment of Human Rights to freedom of expression in the first place because -- and the restrictions, the discriminations, they have the potential to jeopardize the freedom to impart, receive, to seek information, it is also -- it also entails privacy obligations, net neutrality privacy obligations because the analysis, the depacket inspection analysis that frequently proceeds traffic management could have serious consequences on the privacy and data protection of users. We also have included this in the statement that we have presented this year, the need for precise and strong and meaningful privacy protections.

Finally, the last point I wanted to raise around access, what we have discussed this year about this business model that we have decided not to advertise here at this session, but is that those business models have the potential to fragment the Internet and Internet access is access to all Internet, not to a portion of the Internet. If the goal is to provide an open platform, a global platform for communication and innovation, we should focus on empowering people, allowing them to associate, to build community networks rather than providing the network applications.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

Maybe you can respond to my question, Pedro, when you respond n respond to what was said by Maarten as well, the challenge to Internet of Things: We have the Internet companies here, we have the telecommunications, the companies here, and there is a common discourse around Human Rights and we may not always agree. There is a common conversation. With Internet of Things, isn't the challenge that there will be a whole range of new types of businesses that are implicated and involved in this and they're not yet part of this conversation? Is that a challenge, could you perhaps suggest how the IGF community should respond to that challenge?

>> PEDRO LESS ANDRASE: I would like to discuss more on what we were discussing before, I fully support what was said, I think we have to stop discussing about this -- this is a patch. This is -- in the dynamic of talking about this, we have to discuss -- this is -- this is key. I think that as long as we can provide more connectivity, more abundance of broadband to access the whole Internet that will be much better discussion we have to have.

I'm very concerned about what you mentioned about the depacket inspection, we're seeing now some cases in Latin America and the Caribbean, particularly there, where we see operators doing ad blocking at ISP level, that's a way to have censorship, publishers, they cannot get money for what they put online. This is used to get revenue share agreements from different platforms and it has a very complex effect. Going to Internet of Things, yeah, there is a challenge. We were discussing before about the collection of personal data and that was something that was mentioned also, an issue of discrimination, and the privacy legislation, it was based to avoid the discrimination, as much information as I have for you, I may have more information to another service. We have to focus on how technology is providing you more services rather than deny you services. I think that this is a big differential from traditional privacy discussions and others, there is more services that give you more service, that's why we have to focus less on the collection. I think that the collection is something that is not going to stop and now with censors, the Internet of things, data will be everywhere.

What we need to -- what we need to look very careful is misuse. Those that misuse personal data need to be punished. That I think needs to be the standard. I think if we still try to focus on collection of personal data, we won't win that battle. There is so many sources. It is really, really difficult to do that.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

Rohan you have been waiting, Lisa too. Dynamic Coalitions, they do the work, they do the intersessional work, and we're not giving them the floor enough.

Marianne Franklin, do you want to respond to any of the comments so far?

>> MARIANNE FRANKLIN: Thank you for giving us the floor, Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights & Principles, thank you.

I would like to make general comments. The Dynamic Coalitions have been meeting in the last two sessions, main sessions and we have recognized and -- in a deep way the overlaps in all of our work within existing Human Rights framework by law and also within emerging conversations about Human Rights. So in that sense, there is work to do in the good direction.

This main session marks a huge landmark in the history of the IGF. It is a great leap forward that we're having this conversation in a Human Rights framework. I would like to note for the record and congratulate everyone.

The way that governments use the Internet makes a difference. The way corporations use the Internet, it makes a difference. The way ordinary people are using the Internet also makes a difference. It is these ordinary people that we all are trying to reach.

The Internet Rights & Principle Coalition, they have generated a Charter of Human Rights & Principles for the Internet. We resonate with other Declarations and Bills of Rights that proceeded us and are following along with us -- some will say it is in competition with us, but however, the point is here, more is more. More is more! I celebrate the diversity.

My question to all of the panelists from the corporate, government, Civil Society sector, we have a tool that's being used to communicate to ordinary people, but there are different constituencies, different audiences need different sorts of communication. I would like to ask the corporations, the government representatives here, how do they envisage their legal and corporate social responsibility obligations? How do they envisage the communicating these to ordinary users beyond the terms of use and judicial processes? We would appreciate input there.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

You want to say something as well, then Lisa?

>> GUILHERME VARELLA: Briefly, to support the idea that this is very important to include this discussion that we're having in this session of Human Rights and that said, you all know, probably most of you know, that this week, the UNESCO general conference officially acknowledged the outcome document from the connecting the dots conference, many of our issues we're discussing here was discussed and endorsed the Internet universality concept, a multistakeholder Internet is being discussed. That's good news. This is the next step for UNESCO. We have to have more detailed indicator for those things, otherwise it is difficult to operationalize those concepts and how do we do this with the SDGs, see more and more detailed indicators on all of the issues.

Thank you very much.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance.

>> BISHAKHA DATTA: We can't discount the fact that women have been provided many opportunities be it in the work, studies, community, in their personal lives and it has provided women with information, of course, on the services, productive health, sources of support, freedom of expression, the expressed views and opinions, sexuality, also the freedom to participate in public spaces and associations.

If we look closely, we're really talking about only a certain number of women, a certain segment who are connected and that have access. We also have to talk about the quality of access that they have, the speed for instance and the connectivity that's a barrier to the access and the trust that they have of the technology and skills necessary for women to gain access.

Of course, there are studies. The figures that are available would say that men -- there are more men connected, and what does this mean? We're excluding a large number of women, and often they're the marginalized, underserved, and this includes the poor women, the rural women, Women with Disabilities, Indigenous women, and the LGBT as well. We're denying them information towards achieving healthy life, the opportunity for developing, to raise from their status, to be empowered and to obtain gender equality. Even those who have -- that are connected and sometimes even those that are not connected, even experiencing abuse online and they're subjected to hate speech. Studies such as those done by APC would prove to this.

How can women and the marginalized groups be motivated to be online when the spaces which they think can liberate them can be also spaces where they experience abuse and violence? We cannot talk about the equality, good governance, freedom of expression when women are silenced and if they're not safe spaces for them.

Thank you.

>> [Applause].

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much.

Anyone from the audience who have any questions, lineup. We can only take two. You have to stand up quickly.

Then we need to start drawing to a close and we'll close with Frank LaRue doing a summary for us but I want the panel to respond. Make the questions very brief.

>> MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Thank you.

Marie-Laure Lemineur in my personal capacity.

I would like to hear the views of the panelists on the issue of the costs of access and how prohibitive costs in some countries and regions impacts rights to access.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Language is culture, language is politics, language is economics. I would like to hear the right to expression in terms of multicultural multilanguage understanding. There seems to be a dominant language in Internet or the others, they're understood as sub language. Languages, cultures, politics, it is understanding. I would like to hear a bit about that.

As we have heard in terms of psychiatric research in the University -- in the University here in Paraiba, I'm a psychiatrist by training, and we know there is new psychological suffering in this and distrust because of the limits and new cultural, digital culture that we have.

Thank you very much.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much.

Now I also believe that there are a group of young people in the room. I'm going to -- if any of them want to ask a question, then I'll give them special privilege.

We're going to take one more there, one more there and then this question at the table, then that's it.

>> AUDIENCE: Good morning. I'm from a Brazilian Consumer Association.

I would like to ask among the various types of Zero-Rating plans with limited amount of data and applications, could you talk about the difference between the normal Zero-Rating and free basic concerning the potential damage of the preservation of the non-discriminatory corrector of the Internet and access of Internet and Human Rights and freedom of expression and privacy.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm Maria. I'm a participant of Youth at IGF program.

In Brazil we have a concentrated media in the hands of one group, at election time many heard Best Practice and began execution on the media regulation. It was criticized by many as a form of censorship. How to ensure freedom of expression that contributes to information instead of manipulating people without it being considered censorship?

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Yes.

>> NICOLO ZINGALES: I'm from DCPR.

I walked in late. When I walked in I heard concerns about data collection. I'm from Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility. We'll talk about the work that we have been doing in recommendations on the Human Rights and referring to terms of service as a fundamental and effective way to commit for companies to respect the Human Rights of Internet users and in this regard I want to mention there is a fundamental fight taking place in Europe as well as other jurisdiction over the proper system of protection of personal data.

On one hand, you have users which demand very strict protection over, you know, what possible users of the data will be made in the future. On the other hand you have companies that says we want to collect it all and then think about what possible uses we want to make of this and if you interfere with this model we'll cap down the innovation. I want to suggest this is not a dichotomy. We can embrace responsible forms of innovation and companies can commit to identifying a list of categories of users that will be made in the data of the users.

I want to say if you look at our recommendations in terms of service on Human Rights, we provide principles to guide the way forward for companies that want to be responsible.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much.

I'm afraid I have to close now -- actually, yeah, you have entered with a group of -- sure. Sure.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you.

I would present here, I'm part with the Youth Group of Latin America.

More of a question, this is a special thank you for this kind of program that really gives us the opportunity to have a voice and in a space in IGF. In addition, it helps us advocate for our own rights because we young people. We deserve this space. We deserve to express our opinion. We have never been a part of a group here to present a statement of our youth. We really want young people to have an active participation in this kind of event and conferences.

We would like to urge all of you to invite us to be part of your activities. We young people, we want to be a part of the activities, keep on inviting us. We have here over 50 from participants from Latin America. We have been here for a week. It is wonderful for all of us. It helps us know what we want to do in favor of governance for our country, really giving voice to a lot of young people around the world.

Thank you very much.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much.

A good place to start is joining all of the Dynamic Coalitions that we have heard from around the table. They're all open.

Also one has to work hard as well. I think that's always the challenge about this process. You have to come and give voice and you will need to work.

Please, find, speak to the Dynamic Coalitions organizers.

Panelists, I'm not going to summarize. I think you can all respond to what you feel comfortable responding. Just one minute responses.

I mean, there are -- the issue of indicators, of how to measure whether we are making progress in a rights orientation, the other theme, it is this -- the issue of culture, language, that's come up, and I think when you respond, do think about the next steps, about how we can actually -- I'm going back to a speaker who spoke during the first session, how do we move from just talking about rights at a level of generality of principles to really making substantial progress at quite a specific level.

One-minute responses. We have to leave time for Frank LaRue to summarize.

>> There were questions regarding indicators about women in ICTs and about prices. Price information is available from multiple source, including the ITU and what they report is advertised packages rather than what people actually get. Researchers on the ground, they look for value for money. When you look for value for money, you find that there is a problem with some of the developing countries.

With regard to women and ICTs, generally speaking, with regard to the youths, particularly with telephones, whatever phone-based activity, poverty levels, socioeconomic levels wash out gender effects, when it comes to ownership the against effects are still strong particularly in the early stages of adoption.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

Pedro?

>> PEDRO LESS ANDRASE: Just a quick question from Marianne Franklin and making information to the users besides the terms and conditions, what we have been doing, we put a lot of information on videos, friendly material for kids we have been working with different organizations like TelisSonera and around others around the world, the power of video, that's really, really important to achieve that.

>> ANRIETE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

>> LUIS GARCIA: A brief note, Indigenous People, they're absent, not just the cost and access, coming from a country where I have gone is going to Mexico next year, it is a responsibility not only to approach this on the Indigenous People to impose this but to ask them how they want to relate with the technologies and how to promote and preserve their culture and customs. Just what do we do? I think we need to take discussions seriously. We cannot come here, we cannot make comments and go backdoor and negotiate rights and negotiate rights in trade agreements and push and surveil people all over the world.

I take seriously these discussion, I hope governments, actors, that they take these things serious and not just come here to show and do other things with other forums.

>> [Applause].

>> PARTIK HESILIUS: Whether we're making progress it is a struggle because of new issues. With regulation, self-regulation, one thing I would like to make a quick point when it comes to the Internet our advice to the governments is be very careful, cautious, to regulate with a scalpel not an axe as we have seen some try to do. In terms of how to implement these things. I mean, we have to keep an eye on the issues and not let Human Rights issues be swept under the carpet for other priorities that the governments have. Everybody has priorities, but for us, Human Rights has to be number one.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: That actually reinforces what Luis was saying about not negotiating rights in one context and undermining them in another.

Olga.

>> OLGA CAVALLI: The comment from the colleague from Brazil on language, language is a huge barrier in developing countries. Also culture of things and Indigenous People, so those are cultural issues that must be taken into consideration and we must go back home to have this not only talking here but doing things concrete at home.

Thank you.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much.

Now, Frank LaRue, he was not only the Special Rapporteur in freedom of expression when we got the online, offline resolution, he's very good at this.

Frank, you have the last word.

>> FRANK LaRUE: I promise to do it briefly. A lot has been said.

Let me say that it is very clear, this IGF, some of the problems were marked. I think also I'm pleased to see that Human Rights approach, the Human Rights perspective, it is really caught on. It is holding into all of the debates. This is major progress. What was said, Human Rights is the common standard we have. It is the regulation we have in the world, the common regulation which no one challenges because it is part of the universal consensus.

Secondly, I think what I heard here today, it is that if we deal with Human Rights, we are trying to redefine Human Rights from protection of privacy, protection of children, accessibility from people with disability to non-discrimination against everyone. My feeling today, it is that people feel empowered now to begin establishing what are the mechanisms of enforcement of these principles and these rights. In a way I think that the IGF next year will be also marked by that. What are the mechanisms, the regional mechanisms, the domestic mechanisms, international mechanisms, how do we make this effective? Often we're told the technology is going faster than the debate and certainly much faster than the law. We cannot allow that to be an excuse for systematic violation of these principles like on surveillance, on the breach of privacy, many other rights.

My feeling is that we have to retake control of the protection of our rights. Here we all talked about the States having an obligation to protect and promote Human Rights, they cannot delegate that, they have to assume their own responsibilities, the States, with the collaboration of intermediaries and the collaboration of Civil Society. They cannot necessarily resign their responsibility which is the case of the two court cases that we were mentioning here in Europe, the Delphi case and the other, I think they're that they're worrisome because of that phenomena.

In that sense, we have to solve the question of volume. I know there will be many requests and many states say they can't handle it. This will be a problem and there has to be a dialogue between states and platforms and technical Facilitators, there has to be a solution to that.

Secondly, we have to assume our responsibility is very important to reemphasize corporate responsibility. We talked about the questions of the surveillance technology and many technologies that are going very fast.

We don't even know that are being used or done. They're being sold to authoritarian regimes, jailing bloggers and persecuting journalisms, assassinating the journalists or allowing harassment of women, this is a crucial question, we have to have a series dialogue between Civil Society and the corporations to enable our mutual responsibility in a society in a more proactive role in finding that.

The second part, I think, I'll say the question of access, I was really moved because I think that that is a crucial issue. Access was seen as a given before. It isn't. Access is very complicated. From the connectivity, which in developing nations is not happening. To not only connectivity but the types of services or the quality of broadband and the quality of services and the Internet that people receive that may create two types of citizens and sort of a digital gap which we should not allow to the question of illiteracy, whether women are discriminated versus men or as was said by our young colleagues, that there is a language barrier, cultural barrier, one question is paramount in the IGF next year, it is cultural diversity and Internet. How do we balance those? I don't believe in balancing rights by the way, I agree, there is not balancing rights but this is trying to link the two, the use and access of Internet with total recognition of the wonderful diversity that we have in the world and guaranteeing full accessibility to all sectors and benefit to all sectors.

Thank you very much for your participation in this panel.

Thank you.

>> THIAGO TAVARES: Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for a very informative and substantive session.

Thank you to the moderators and to all of the speakers who have intervened and made the discussions so lively and so informative.

I also would like to highlight the presence here for many young people. They're here at this IGF to make their voices heard, to take part in this substantive discussions that will impact the future. My thanks to all of you sincerely for all of you being here this morning and for your valuable contributions into our important discussions.

It is now time to close the session. The meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

The NETmundial Multistakeholder Declaration and the Evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem

>> PERCIVAL HENRIQUES: Let's get started. Let's have your phone on silent mode. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to welcome you all to this last and main session, and to the IGF 2015. We would like to really thank you all, after a very long productive week, to still be here to really give us attention to this specific theme that for us, as Brazilians, is quite significant, is something that has been a milestone to us, and to the society of information as a whole, that is NETMundial, and also through the signing of our President of the Marco Civil. And once again I'd like to thank you for your participation, and also giving us the benefit of your presence, and to really be here. And I know we have been since Day Zero discussing all the topics. I'd like to pass the floor to Mr. Demi Getschko, who will get started with the words for this session. Good afternoon once again.

(no audio).

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Good afternoon, everybody. As the chair has said, thank you very much for your participation in this session. Thank you to the speakers. And I guess being at the beach is better here than being here discussing Internet Governance matters. So it increases the value of our presence here.

Let's speak a little bit about the NETMundial and what is the objective of this session.

We will be not only discussing about how it was conducted the NETMundial process, but what was the, what has been the impact of the NETMundial outcomes, and where we are today one year and a half after that historic meeting.

Everything started with the Montevideo statement. That was a statement issued by the Internet organizations in a meeting in Montevideo. And there were two main aspects in that statement, that was a call for accelerated decision of the stewardship and a call for organizing new environments, or provoking and conducting general discussions on Internet Governance matters.

So it's after the meeting, there was a meeting between the CEO of ICANN and Dilma Rousseff, the President of Brazil. During some coincidence also with the speech that President Dilma Rousseff has made in the general, in UN General Assembly, so this idea came up of organizing a meeting in Brazil for having the general discussions.

The process from the beginning was followed with a bottom-up manner, and some committees were formed. One of them was the executive committee. That was a multistakeholder committee, chaired by Demi Getschko and myself. And it was very interesting, because there was no precedence of a meeting like the one that we were trying to organize as we started to work from a blank sheet, and there was no procedures and process. We have to define everything on the way. There was no agenda. We took some, a couple of important decisions. One of them was that we built the agenda together with the community. We didn't start from a document prepared by us. That could have been one option. But we preferred to start from the contributions from the community.

It's important to mention that here, you have in this slide a very quick view about the contents, contributions received from countries. You can see the number of countries that, from which we received comments. In total we received 188 contributions to the contents of the document, and 370 comments to the first draft. You should add to that all the discussions that we had during the meeting itself. We didn't arrive to the meeting without -- discussions in the meeting were meaningful, and they were considered in the preparation of the final outcomes.

You can see in this slide how many contributions were related with the principles, and how many with the roadmap, and some overall contributions, and from which stakeholder groups they came.

Finally I would like to share with you -- I have it here. This is the participation in the meeting. We have more than 900 participants in the meeting coming from different stakeholder groups. I would like also to pass the floor to Demi for making some also comments with regard to the work on the contents of the document.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Okay. Just to add a little bit more, this meeting produced two documents. One is some way a proposal of principles for Internet Governance, and it was divided in two sessions, the governance process, principles of the governance principles. You have here just to remind that you have the full documents on the Web. You can consult that.

But anyway, just to remind the principal points, we have a very strong position in human rights, shared values. We have also a position protecting the intermediaries, the chain of value of the Internet in some way.

We of course stimulate culture and linguistic diversity, and keeping the Internet as a unfragmented space, with free end-to-end communications regardless of content and so on.

294

I will not spend more on that. But of course, the Internet Governance process has to be multistakeholder, transparent, accountable, distributed and so on.

That is one of the documents. Both documents was applauded by some minutes in open, in the ending of the Forum. We don't get the full consensus, of course. We have some positions that, dissents from the content of the document.

But as a really multistakeholder process, I think we did right in having this two final documents. The other one is the roadmap, yes, the roadmap. And as the principles, so we can see that this document in the Montevideo meeting about the position of iStar, the community, technical community about some points out of the curve that has to be in some way make it in right international community hands. This is the principal points of the roadmap. I think we have an excellent occasion here to discuss between us with this very interesting panel, and populated with very main and important persons in this process, to hear from them, and see if there are, something going on because of this meeting, and how is the scenario we can see now, one-half year after the NETMundial initiative.

I pass again to Raul to our first panel.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you. First of all, I forgot to mention at the beginning that we thank very much to the members of the multistakeholder advisory group, Flavio Rech Wagner and Ana Cristina Amoroso Neves, for preparing the session. It was a lot of work in advance of the meeting.

The discussion will be based on the three questions, policy questions, so there will be three segments. In each of those segments, we will have one main speaker that will have up to ten minutes, and a comment that we will be able to use up to five minutes for making comments on their own statements and on each topic.

The first one is strangely enough IGF, and you will see the policy question in the -- sorry, I forget that -- I will not read all the policy question. But it is about, based on the outcomes of the NETMundial meeting, what has been the improvements in the IGF, and how they reach, how they meet the recommendations from the NETMundial statement.

We will have our main speaker, that is Benedicto Fonseca. He doesn't need too much introduction. But Benedicto Fonseca is the Co-Chairman of the IGF multistakeholder advisory group, the MAG. He is the director of the Department of Scientific and Technological Affairs of the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil. Since 2010 he has participated in several international and related Internet Governance issues, such as state and governance Forum, WSIS process, CSTD, ICANN, and in particular he had a relevant participation in the NETMundial meeting of which he was a member of the Executive Multistakeholder Committee responsible for organizing the event, including the agenda discussion and execution as well as for coordinating the process that led to the creation of the NETMundial statements.

Please, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca.

>> BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you very much. I thank you for your words, Raul. I have the pleasure and privilege of working at the NETMundial at the Executive Committee, side by side with Raul and Demi and so many other peers, so it's really an honor to talk about this experience, and to look towards the future and see how this will strengthen IGF.

Before going into the main topic I was invited to talk about, I'd like to make some comments about the importance we give to IGF and to NETMundial. IGF for us, for the Brazilian Government, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Brazilian Government, and I think I have the same feeling that other sectors have, other industries, is an unreplaceable Forum. It is a unique Forum to discuss Internet topics.

And we are very enthusiastic about IGF, because IGF is globally what we do in Brazil. Our model shows what IGF is. Internet management committee which is celebrating its 20th anniversary is based on the same IGF

principles, being a space for articulating and expressing these ideas. This is a committee where we have some aspects decided upon, aspects relating to the Internet at the CGR -- CGI.

NETMundial was for us an experiment. I think NETMundial is defining itself like this. It's not linked to any process. NETMundial had or did not follow any predefined rules. We had to create NETMundial within the spirit of providing a space for discussion of principles and to think about what would be required to enhance the Internet ecosystem. So in order to wrap up this first part, I'd say that NETMundial gave us very important lessons.

First of all, the idea to be respectful of the fact that each area needs to be in line with the other areas, be respectful of the other areas how they make their decisions. This process took a while to occur. And this was due to the fact that we needed to have some adequate time for the private sector to appoint its representatives, so there was a great effort along these lines, because we were talking about global Civil Society, where they were appointing four or five people for this private sector seats.

This was really necessary so that the results or the outcomes would be considered legitimate. Clear lesson we learned was that all the stakeholders should be respectful of each other, and even though the outcome document as Demi said was endorsed by the vast majority of stakeholders and participants, the process also taught us how difficult it is to go from a discussion level to a decision-making level. Even though the final outcome document does indicate that it's not binding, in spite of that it was very difficult for many participants to endorse such a document and its outcomes.

This shows this difficulty we have, difficulty to find a format, a shape so that we can make decisions at the stakeholder levels, and that they are enacted upon or accomplished.

Now, talking about how the Internet community has been advancing to enhance IGF, and to make IGF a platform to discuss emerging issues and issues which are still not adequately discussed, so we are talking about the way of dealing with these topics, and providing information on these topics.

This is an ongoing work. And it's clear to us that, in this IGF, this is happening. Brazil as the Host Country is very happy to see that the works are towards enhancing IGF, and from here, we will have not compromise documents, not recommendations which are adopted by consensus, but very relevant information, very relevant information for the ongoing Internet processes.

The document on policies, initiatives for the next, for Connecting the Next Billion people, which is being launched here, is a pioneer document. And this is the result of a wide consultation process. And one main session here in Joao Pessoa, and the Map preparatory committee, supported by the whole community, is hereby offering this document which will be a very useful tool for all those who are dedicated to the connectivity policy. This is a proof of how we are strengthening and enhancing IGF to arrive at concrete outcomes. In addition to this document other documents are being prepared by the best practice forums and by the Dynamic Coalitions, about ...

 (no audio).

Process, so I'd say there is a whole body of documents, and inputs which are going to provide quality information for the ongoing processes.

IGF should also be enhanced in order to become a platform, so that these topics can be forwarded and discussed.

There is a lot to do along these lines. And NETMundial showed us how difficult it is to go from a discussion Forum to a Forum where we make decisions where we forward information. So I think IGF can be enhanced. The global community can get organized, so that in this space, a Democratic space, space that is very transparent and space that is not ruled by very strict guidelines, as is the case in other United Nation

agencies and processes, so that we have the opportunity to experiment with innovative forums. Internet Governance is the stakeholder that will require no leadership paradigms. We don't have a one-size-fits-all model that is good for all situations for all circumstances.

One of the outcomes from the international community, and I'm here referring for an exercise of science, technology and development, which is about mapping the issues and mechanisms to deal with these issues, shows that there are many different issues regarding Internet Governance, from human rights to security and safety. And you only need to look at the IGF agenda to see the breadth of topics. So we think that IGF could not only think about these topics to discuss but also to have, create a framework to deal with these aspects.

I think this still needs to be enhanced as far as the IGF is concerned. I'd also say that the vision that was created by NETMundial, especially when we talk about the roadmap, and this vision points to some issues to be forwarded at the ICANN level, but also some issues regarding safety and security, cyber crimes, many topics, it shows that we need to have better knowledge of some topics, like jurisdiction, the role of the stakeholders in the multistakeholder format. As these processes which are not directly related to IGF but which are advancing, I think the vision that we had with NETMundial, this vision is being accomplished, and we are enhancing the discussions regarding safety and security, regarding crimes.

So the roadmap, the principles that we had at NETMundial are still valid. And it's a challenge for the global community to find ways to deal with it. So I reiterate this understanding, and I say that IGF has a very important role, perhaps a unique role, not only to discuss these topics which are not mature enough, which are not really discussed by the communities, but also it has a responsibility to point to ways how these topics can be dealt with.

This will require the stakeholders to work in a mutual respect, mutual acknowledgment environment. This is my fourth IGF, and I can say, I can attest that this is something that has been becoming stronger and stronger as IGF goes.

So, we are opening to different opinions, because we want to find our way ahead. And I think this is the way to the future. Thank you very much.

  (applause).

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca. So on this same issue we will invite Jacquelynn Ruff to make comments on this. Jacquelynn is a Vice President, international public policy and regulatory -- sorry -- affairs for communications, she leads the group that is responsible for global public policy development, advocacy and guidance. She directs activity in U.S. and international forums, such as the International Telecommunication Union, the OECD, AfiCTA and the Internet Governance Forum. She is a member of the advisory committees to the department of state and to the U.S.

So, Jacquelynn, please, welcome.

>> JACQUELYNN RUFF: Great. Thank you very much for this opportunity to be here. One of the characteristics of the multistakeholder approach is to have business represented at the table, so I'm pleased to have, carry out that role today, and also particularly pleased to join in this opportunity with Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca because you have been such a leader for many years around all these issues.

The only thing that came to mind as you were talking, where I thought, well, I can say I might have done more, is that I've been to all of the Internet Governance Forums. But otherwise your leadership is truly admirable.

And I was a participant at NETMundial last year. So all of those experiences are very direct for me. And as I said, the reason I've been to the IGFs is because our company, Verizon Communications is very engaged. We are an Internet service provider in many different ways. And so from the beginning of the WSIS process and

through the IGFs, we have thought this is a very important place to be, and the format of multistakeholder approach is extremely important.

So, I will, many of the points that you covered were not surprisingly the kind of strengths and trends that I had in mind, but I hope I can just add a bit on the topic.

In the principles themselves, they do -- sorry, in the roadmap, in the institutional improvements for the IGF, that we discussed 18 months ago, there were a couple of specific things or ways of thinking about things that were written in the document, and specific improvements for the IGF included to have more outcomes and analyses of policy. So as the Ambassador mentioned, the best practices forums to me have been an excellent tangible result in that regard.

They included strengthening multistakeholder participatory mechanisms, spam or unsolicited E-mail which has been an issue we have been discussing for many years, and this was the first time to actually have practices out there.

 (no audio).

IPv6 and then search of computer security, and finally there has been one on the online abuses against women. I think that one is particularly important. It is not an easy topic and great work was done around that. Another specific guidance that was given is to do more work intersessionally, and again, the excellent project on Connecting the Next Billion was specifically developed in between the IGFs. It was selected. It was developed, extremely useful papers. The main session was recognized some said as one of the best in years. It's an overall initiative that exemplifies the core values and mission of the Internet Governance community. I can say from a business perspective, that is something that we really think should be a focus. We are very much looking forward to working more collaboratively, and doing even more on that.

It is a great match of course with the launch of the Sustainable Development Goals, where we need to have this close integration with the expanding Internet and its multistakeholder governance framework in order to optimize success in that area as well.

Regarding the others, another thought that I had is that the MAG planners worked very hard to encourage sessions on highly relevant topics with meaningful results. So, there we had as examples the WSIS+10 session, the main session on Sustainable Development, and on Cybersecurity. I think we had two days on Cybersecurity or maybe it spilled over and so on. These are key issues for today and the future.

I would also note the value of the workshops, which again, I think we are just deeper, more engaged than any year that I've seen. I always try to make a point of participating in a number of those. I was in two of them. In both cases one was increasing accessibility for persons with disabilities, and the other was about crossborder data flows, trades, inclusiveness, economic growth and those things.

In both cases the emphasis was to have case studies and to come up with ideas for solutions, not a policy paper, but everybody was encouraged to do that.

So, I would throw those out as a little bit more of a detail on the points that were covered previously. So thank you again.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. Thank you for being indulgent with the moderator. I think that we will have more opportunities to speak later during the public comments from the audience.

I would pass the floor to Demi Getschko for introducing the policy question 2.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Now we will have the question that is related to the principles. I read the question. It is the policy question number 2. Are organizations, processes and fora that form the IG ecosystem working according to the principles of Internet Governance as proposed in the NETMundial

statement. How do their operating principles align to those principles? Are there efforts to improve alignment where needed? And the first speaker, ten minutes, is Miss Anne Carblanc from France, OECD, Government organization, head of the digital economy policy division of OECD and the directorate for science, technology and innovation, STI. Her division develops a better evidence base and more effective policy framework to promote the growth of digital economy and its contribution across society. Prior to joining the OECD, she held the position of Secretary-General, director of services in the French commission national de liberty.

She also served ten years in the France judicial system. The floor is yours.

>> ANNE CARBLANC: Many thanks for the invitation and for the introduction. It is a pleasure to be in this main session. I don't know whether someone has the -- thank you so much.

You mentioned the origin of the NETMundial, but I wanted to go back to IGF in Baku, 2012. There was a main session, and I remember excitement in Baku about perhaps beginning to think about principles for Internet Governance and policy, and building on principles developed by different stakeholders, whether governments or business or Civil Society or international organizations, among which the OECD, from different perspectives.

I would like to quote, we have a proliferation of principles, but if we had a set of principles, if there were very high level nonbinding and include all stakeholders, they could give us a guideline. They could strengthen the commitment of the various stakeholders to follow certain very general rules, like Internet should promote human rights, Internet should be free and open, Internet policy should be transparent, and based on the multistakeholder model, the architecture should be end-to-end, Internet should be safe and secure.

In other words, in 2012, in Baku, there was a call for general principles with which everybody could agree. 2015, the NETMundial conference attempted to do just that and produced a multistakeholder statement which was finalized during the conference.

The event was recognized as a success by the OECD and the statement was welcomed. Today in this session, we want to generate a discussion on the implementation of the NETMundial statement, and we want to take stock of progress made in different organizations and NGTs to align with the principles.

I will try to do this for the OECD, as clearly as possible. As you may know, the OECD mission is to develop evidence-based policies in a broad range of topics, to help governments fight poverty and pursue prosperity, through economic growth and financial stability. This is ...

  (no audio).

Social prosperity, in the respect of human rights and fulfillment of values. In 2011, the OECD council adopted a important recommendation on principles for Internet policymaking. This recommendation supports multistakeholder approach to Internet policymaking, and strengthen Internet cooperation. It calls for policies and practices to obtain use when managing security ...

  (no audio).

Internet policymaking principles, which will be made available on the Web site. And we can see that many of the development principles reflect the OECD ... but the OECD...

  (no audio).

If we go to the human rights agenda values, in the NETMundial Internet Governance principles, human rights are intrinsic to the convention, which says economic strengths and prosperity are essential to the attainment of the purposes of the United Nations, the preservation of individual liberty and the general well-being. Human rights and shared values are also mentioned in several OECD legal instruments including the policymaking principles. They are also included in the ...

(no audio).

Through a reminder that countries are committed to values ...

These are referred in several OECD instruments but we do not conduct -- privacy as well, more than 30 years, been a focus area of the OECD, the 1980 guidelines which was a first set of international principles for privacy protection has been revised in 2013. The privacy guidelines include with respect to surveillance a specific provision, and this provision says exceptions to the principles of the guidelines, including those related to national sovereignty, national security and public holder should be first as few as possible, second, made known to the public.

Accessibility, this is an important issue on which we can certainly improve, but currently considering adding a reference to accessibility in the draft ministerial declaration. Freedom of information and access is referred to in several instruments, and specific work on the communication infrastructure and services touches directly on this issue as did work in cooperation with UNESCO and local content.

Development is one of the objectives of the OECD, and is included in the founding convention, the goal being to contribute to the development of countries and specific members. Specific work has been done. For instance, we had in cooperation with the World Bank a conference on ICT 4 development. We have streams of work on digital innovation and development. There will be a reference to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals in the draft ministerial declaration.

In summary for this, a strong point I would say is privacy. A weak point at this stage is accessibility. But we can certainly progress on this.

In terms of principles like protection of intermediaries, we showed a large report in 2011 which could certainly be updated today. We have a principle on limiting the liability of Internet intermediaries in the 2011 Internet policymaking principles. Culture and linguistic diversity is not an area of focus for the moment, but our work again with UNESCO on local content proved this important aspect. Our current work on the open Internet, economic benefits of an open Internet also looks at this issue.

Unified and unfragmented space, this is where the current work on the benefits of Internet's openness which builds on the Internet policymaking principles is important, because it aims to provide evidence on the Internet's catalyst role for economic and social growth. In particular, the relationship between Internet openness and international trade, innovation and entrepreneurship, social well-being and economic performance. We trust that this work which is complex, which will take years but is very important, will demonstrate the relevance of the NETMundial and the OECD Internet policymaking principles.

Security, stability and resilience, we just released a new recommendation of the council on the management of digital security risk for economic and social prosperity. It was presented in one of the workshops this week.

Open and distributed architecture, the Internet policymaking principle refer to the need to promote the open distributed interconnected nature of the Internet. And there is a lot of work around this principle.

Enabling environment for sustainable innovation and creativity is the same. We have a lot of work in this area and principle as well. In summary, our strong points are the work, and our strong point is our work on the principles for a unified and unfragmented space and security. I would say that our weaker points are on cultural and linguistic diversity. Finally, to go quickly through the Internet Governance process principles, I checked all of them, because we are all implementing them putting them in practice.

In conclusion, one could say that the focus of the OECD is on economic growth, not so much human rights or, it's true, but social prosperity and well-being are important objectives in the convention for the Secretary-General of the OECD and OECD council. Again we trust that our work, qualitative and quantitative work will demonstrate the relevance of the principles of NETMundial at OECD. We can strive

and we will strive to improve on accessibility and cultural and linguistic diversity. We hope that our ministerial meeting which will gather OECD ministers and partner ministers will provide the opportunity to indicate us the road ahead in this area.

Thank you very much.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you for this comprehensive explanation. We call for comments. Miss Carolina Rossini, member of the Public Knowledge, Civil Society organization based in U.S., Carolina Rossini serves as Vice President of international public strategy. She is a Brazilian lawyer. Alongside her work in public knowledge, she is also a global partner, digital international associate, and a ex lab fellow. She sits in the advisory board of Open Knowledge Foundation for UK and Brazil, Institute of digital, Internet lab, IDRC, research and open education research for development, and the research network.

Carolina Rossini, the floor is yours.

>> CAROLINA ROSSINI: Thank you, Demi. Thank you, Benedicto Fonseca, for your important intervention. First I would like to say how honored I am to join this discussion table today.

I think Brazil exercises important leadership to balance some of the Internet Governance narrative of the last past years. I think that was really important to actually bring a development perspective to all of our discussions, and actually to call attention for those development-based principles, and how they should actually influence and impact on these discussions, not just here in Internet Governance Forum, because at the end of the day we cannot take decisions here or make policy here, but also how we can use those NETMundial principles to develop some accountability from a Civil Society perspective, but also actually partner with countries and companies on exercising peer pressure internationally on countries that are actually more repressive than others.

So from a Civil Society perspective, I was also at the NETMundial initiative, and I was very glad to see how creative and organized the meeting was in terms of really receiving thoughts from all stakeholders. That was a wonderful experiment and it was a very exciting experiment.

It is really interesting to look at that and then compare it to lot of other fora where actually we are regulating Internet, even if some folks do try to not label that fora, that Forum as Internet Governance Forum. I'm talking about foras like multi-lateral trade agreements. I'm talking like the OECD, and I'm also mentioning ICANN, and other things.

A lot of folks do see those elements as part of Internet Governance. ICANN is the most obvious one. But a lot of folks don't see, for example, trade agreements as part of Internet Governance Forum. Me and research colleagues, we did a mapping of ten years of trade agreements that the U.S. has with some other countries, so bilaterals that have then led to the trans Pacific partnership agreements.

We used the layers framework to identify every class that would impact and every layer of the Internet. And everything that we are discussing here is there, from DNS to spectrum to youth to consumer rights, Internet, to cross data flow and to privacy.

So I would always, and I think I've been, folks probably are tired of me saying that, because I said that in a lot of panels I participated this week. I think finally this community is paying attention more to that.

On another related topic, I went again through the NETMundial principles, and I was actually trying to compare where those topics were appearing. I took the liberty to address some of the OECD comments right now. As you all know, in June, the week of 23rd of June next year, we are going to be, the world is going to witness the OECD ministerial. I will not refer to the WSIS and UN process because my colleague will do that. That is in December. We have to keep a look on that time line.

But the OECD regarding privacy, some of the privacy work there, first I want to thank you, OECD, because actually OECD is one of the foras that early on have opened a discussion for multistakeholderism. I'm part of CSISAC for many years now, and I think there are a lot of CSISAC founders in the audience. They are all around here. While it's true that they have allowed that, I feel that the draft declaration coming out for the next ministerial is worse than some of the discussions we had in 2002 and before than that.

So I would hope that in the declaration, that will come out of OECD, we actually take into consideration the NETMundial principles, even with all the stakeholders not being extremely happy, Civil Society for example was not happy with us via liability, a lot of folks were happy with privacy. So let's take that advantage to actually move forward, and let's try to do that.

Another interesting thing, I see my time just ended, again, are trade agreements. One of the things I do want to mention regarding trade agreements is that a lot of issues regarding access to acknowledge and freedom of expression, and trade, and in terms of crossborder data for trade, that's also being dealt with in OECD and that also appears in the NETMundial principles, they are not at the same ground of what I called consensus among stakeholders.

I would invite everybody to try to look at this comparisons, and think if we did a great step towards the future and towards a great consensus in NETMundial, why are we doing, why are we taking steps back in other fora.

I think that is my role here, to really call attention for this much broader set of places, where Internet regulation is being discussed and made. Thank you, everybody.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you, I'll pass rapidly to Raul to the next.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Demi. Let's move to the policy question 3. This is about how are the items in the NETMundial roadmap being covered by the current Internet Governance systems. We will have as a speaker Dr. Jeanette Hoffman from Germany, political scientist with a focus on Internet Governance. She heads policy at Berlin Social Science Center, co-director of the Hamburg Institute for Internet and society and professor for Internet policy at a university, her research interest including multistakeholder process and the role of social norms in Internet regulation. I will ask the speakers and commenters to be strict with the time because we are running a little behind the schedule. We want to open later to have some time for public participation.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: Thank you, Raul. I'm clearly aware that there is time pressure. Still, I would like to use the opportunity and say that NETMundial clearly was my personal highlight in 15 years of Internet Governance participation.

I met a lot of great Brazilian experts both in public sector, Civil Society and the technical community. I learned a lot from them and towards the end, it really moved me to tears; hasn't happened often in this year. So thank you for the chance I've been given to participate to that process.

Now, when we look at the roadmap of NETMundial and what happened over the last year, I would say it's clearly a mixed bag. There is progress in some areas, for example, in the area of strengthening the IGF, perhaps also extending its term beyond the usual five years that we now had for two, twice.

There is also, there are a lot of areas where there is still a lot to do, and there is clearly room for improvement. I want to focus on two aspects that I find very crucial. One of them concerns what is mentioned at least twice in the roadmap, and that is meaningful participation.

Meaningful participation, I would say, depends at least on two conditions. One concerns resources. What we see in Internet Governance in general is a clear imbalance in terms of resources people have for meaningful participation, that concerns on the one hand the difference between the global south and the global north, but it also concerns differences across stakeholder groups.

These differences, imbalances in terms of resources is not only a matter of money. It's also a matter of expertise, of organizational skills, on staff, on all sorts of things.

So if we really believe in meaningful participation, that is clearly an area where that needs improvement. But I think there is also another dimension to meaningful participation. And that concerns the topics under discussion.

We need to ask ourselves whether all the relevant issues that impact Internet Governance are really subject to multistakeholder processes. Carolina Rossini already pointed out this aspect.

I would say the answer is clearly no. And the two examples that immediately come to mind are trade agreements and Cybersecurity. Both of these issues are discussed elsewhere in closed fora. If we believe in the future of meaningful participation and in the multistakeholder approach, then we need to also discuss areas that are so far treated behind closed doors.

I would also say that opening closed policymaking fora to meaningful participation may increase the chance that another recommendation of the roadmap might benefit from it. And that is the collection and processing of personal data by state and nonstate actors, in accordance with international human rights.

If we open mass surveillance practices to the scrutiny of multistakeholder approaches, we will see other benchmarks for assessing these areas.

That was the first aspect, meaningful participation.

The second one concerns the recommendation that all Internet Governance organizations should develop and implement principles of transparency, accountability, and inclusiveness.

This area is still work in progress. It's now common sense that the institution architecture of Internet Governance is very distributed and heterogeneous, and not suited to intergovernmental or centralized solutions.

On the other hand, Internet Governance processes seem to still be in a state of infancy, struggling with the intention to be different from governments and Intergovernmental Organizations. But nonetheless, having to be answerable and to sort of provide due process to all people participating.

An example of this seems to be the IANA transition. The effort needed to get this done shows really such high transaction cost that we need ask ourselves whether we want to carry on that way in the future. It is my belief that Internet Governance needs to undergo a process of constitutionalization. This process would consist of at least three elements, implementing rule of law, making sure that there is a respect of human rights, and that all policy measures are grounded in human rights, and that we apply Democratic principles.

I think these three elements need to be really shared by all Internet Governance organizations, even if they implement them in different ways.

Even if the practices in Internet Governance are very different, I do believe that principles of multistakeholder approaches might have to move a bit closer to what we developed in the words of intergovernmental processes.

Thank you very much.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, Jeanette Hoffman, very organized speech, and you used less time than you have. Maybe it's because she is German. (chuckles).

Okay. Our comment on this topic will be Ambassador Chris Painter from the U.S. State Department. Mr. Painter is the coordinator for cyber issues of the U.S. State Department. In that position he coordinates and leads the United States diplomatic efforts to advance an open, interoperable, secure and reliable Internet and information structure. Prior to joining the State Department, he served in the White

House as senior director for Cybersecurity policy in the National Security Council. He coordinated the development of the President 2011 commission on strategy for cyberspace, and chaired high level inter-agency groups devoted to international cyber issues.

Please.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: Thank you very much. I want to echo what many have said that having been at the NETMundial meeting, that it was one of the most exciting and empowering meetings that I've been to in 23 years, so that is saying something. Certainly everyone came away from there really very energized.

I suppose I have a more positive outlook than maybe the last speaker, in terms of what I see as some of the movements since then. The NETMundial principles, as many recall, and the roadmap captured not only what was aspirational to be done, but also some of the things that were being done in a multistakeholder manner. Of course, depending on the topic and the organization, that might have a different feel.

One place it's worth pointing out that could better reflect the items in the NETMundial roadmap is the WSIS+10 review, that is currently under way in New York.

I fear that too much of the conversation there is looking backwards to 2005 and focusing too much on the role of Governments, instead of focusing on a new consensus that was reached that emerged in Sao Paulo last year, which clearly discusses the role of all stakeholders, and the vision and the roadmap in the current WSIS+10 outcome I think needs to take a closer approach to each other. That is one place where the NETMundial principles and roadmap can have greater impact and hopefully will.

On the other areas though, I think across the board, we have seen a lot of discussion, a lot of work. All this is indeed a work in progress, as other speakers have said. But I'm also very optimistic. I would say even an area like Cybersecurity, this is not just a discussion among governments. We have discussed in some of the sessions here at the IGF where there are many stakeholders and even governments recognize that they can't do everything in the space. They need the business community, the Civil Society community. What I would say is that as governments are architecting new Cybersecurity strategies, which is important, we certainly say, the U.S. says and many other countries say, you need to do this, need to be consultative, do this in a multistakeholder way.

That only makes your strategy stronger, and it also makes it more legitimate, and buy-in from all those different communities, that is very important. But for instance, I've seen in the global cyberspace conference that took place in the Netherlands, it was a multistakeholder event and constructed for precisely that purpose, and each one of those conferences have been even more participatory. That is important. That launched some important things that are -- we have seen the meridian process, Cybersecurity conference that has a lot of different participants in that, and the first Forum for incident response and security teams is not just governments, it's people throughout the community.

GCC launched the global Forum for cyber expertise which we talked about, and one of the things in the roadmap was capacity-building and the importance of it. Here, although there is more to be done, I'm happy that there has been a great push and momentum around this issue, both in terms of connectivity, but also in terms of policy. And the GFCE was again multistakeholder. It wasn't just governments doing it; was governments partnering with the private sector and civil society to do several projects. We were proud to be a member of that. ICANN, the transition, we announced we were willing to make this transition with the IANA contract. We only would accept a multistakeholder solution. And although multistakeholder enterprises are always messy, I think there has been tremendous progress made there, and there continues to be. And it's really been a very interesting conversation with many stakeholders. I agree in all these Forum that we need to find ways and we are looking for ways to make them more inclusive and participatory for everyone. That indeed is a challenge, but that is one challenge that NETMundial did very well, with remote hubs and other issues.

We need to be creative in thinking about that going forward. I think there are ways certainly to do that. I look across the board at all of the different NETMundial roadmap principles, and I don't have time to go through each one of them. But I'd say that they are reflected in the real growth that the panel talked about in the beginning in terms of the strengthening and vibrancy of the IGF. And all the discussions we have had in the last couple days and the more effective means of discussion have taken place going forward even between IGFs.

I'm hopeful that the IGF's mandate will be renewed for a long time, not just for a short period of time, so there is predictability, and we can have these discussions in this Forum. But this is not an exclusive Forum, it's a great Forum for them.

There is more work to be done to be sure. But we have done quite a bit since Sao Paulo. We should be proud of what we have done and build on it and work into the future. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. I will pass the floor to Demi for coordinating the fourth segment of this debate.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: In this segment we will hear additional comments in these questions. We have five minutes for each commenter. I will call first Dr. Nii Quaynor from University of Cape Coast, Ghana to say some words. He pioneered Internet in Africa, for two decades, establishing Africa first Internet connections, and helping set up key organizations including the African Network Cooperation Group, and also was founding Chairman of AFRINIC. He has taught since 1979. He was the first African to be elected to the board of ICANN, director of ICANN for the Africa region from 2000 to 2003. He is also a member of the United Nations Secretariat General Advisory Group on ICT, Chair of Organization on African Unity, Internet Task Force and President of Internet Society in Ghana.

He was awarded the Jonathan B. Postal Service award for his pioneer work and also was inducted into the Internet Hall of Fame in 2013. The floor is yours.

>> NII QUAYNOR: Thank you very much. I think it is indeed true that the experience at NETMundial was really invigorating. And the outcome was also very realistic in the sense that it did capture much of the practices from some of the communities that are associated with it. My comments will be mostly on balance, the need for balance and also accepting increment outgrowth.

The good thing about NETMundial was that not only did it capture existing processes making it realistic, but it also attempted to capture the needs of development, and that of course rings a good bell to me.

In regards multistakeholder mechanisms at a national level is occurring partly because of the IGF national, IGF program, and I think that is very commendable. The focus on the needs of the developing countries and the building of capacity is currently being mainstreamed, and you can see it appearing, all the different issue topics that have been addressed at IGF while we are here. I thought I might make the following caution. It is indeed true that culture and linguistic diversity is extremely important in improving access, and in fact I myself am actively involved in trying to capture the local IDG in my country so they are preserved and so on. However, if one needs to be successful, one needs to think global as well. When we are coming up with our solutions, we should be thinking about how it would benefit the whole world, and if we don't, then the solutions will not thrive, and it may turn out to be a problem in itself.

One other issue that I thought I might raise has to do with a workshop which I enjoyed attending, and this was workshop 52, and it attempted to capture a sense of the global public interest in critical Internet resources.

It is interesting to note that perhaps several months before the Sao Paulo event, ICANN, that had been mentioned in the statement that says that it should be working towards leading to a truly international and global organization, serving the public interest, was also defining what public interest was to be. So it turns out that ICANN in fact can be the only organization that made an attempt to define what public interest might

be. I suggest that every other organization in the ecosystem internalize the same thing, and hopefully, we might discover that either we have one good global definition or scope or statement as to what public interest might be, but it will be interesting to do a bottom/up thing and see if we can get what public interest is for everyone.

I also would like to note that it is difficult to plan, if a multistakeholder activity is bounded. If it is unbounded, then you can make real investments in the resources that are required, and so discussions of five years for IGF, ten years for IGF and so on, for me, it's not very constructive. It should be just no limits.

Thank you very much.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you. The next speaker will be Dr. Anja Kovacs. She directs the Internet democracy project in Dellhi, India, engages in research on projects and challenges that the Internet poses for democracy and social justice in India and beyond. She works especially on questions of freedom of expression, Cybersecurity and architecture of Internet Governance. She is a member of the Investment Committee of the Digital Defenders Partnership of the Steering Committee of best bits, global society members, and she is very active in the WSIS revision. She also worked on Internet issues including for the United Nations development program Asia Pacific and for the United Nations Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression, Frank Larue, and has been a fellow at the center for Internet Society in Bangalore, India --

>> ANJA KOVACS: Thank you so much. I too found NETMundial a great inspiration, and I'm grateful to be able to be part of the session, trying to assess progress we have made since then.

The first thing that really struck me when I read through the outcome document again in preparation for this session, was how relevant it remains and how much value there still is in that document today about one and a half years later.

In terms of process, I agree with others that perhaps we are seeing the most progress in the IGF, and if they have chosen this IGF I'm sure it's partly thanks to the outstanding Brazilian Government organization, but also thanks to the many changes that the MAG has been making over the past year, especially making the IGF much more outcome oriented. I do think that contributes quite a bit to its value, and for small Civil Society organizations from the global south like ours, significantly increases our reasons to actually come to the IGF.

I also want to flag here something that hasn't been mentioned yet, namely efforts to bring human rights concerns into organizations like the IETF, initiatives that have been undertaken by colleagues of ours, and from what I understand has actually been received with quite a, has gotten a very positive response.

Since the NETMundial, one trend I think we have been seeing is that slowly there has been a greater recognition of the fact that there is also a space for multilateralism within the Internet Governance. I want to flag that here because when I was trying to map out progress in different institutions, where I think we have the greatest cause for concern in general is sadly the processes where our Government state delete because especially in these processes the outcomes are so often against the principles as well.

I think that is true at a national level, in countries in all parts of the world, where we see that legislators are considering to consider and adopt legislation that goes to the principles outlined in the section on human rights. And I think we have discussed quite a few of those proposals in this IGF as well.

We also see that at the global level, Carolina already flagged concerns in the OECD ministerial draft statement. I disagree with Mr. Painter on the extent to which Civil Society is included in Cybersecurity debates. With the global conference on Cybersecurity, we were grateful to the Dutch Government for actually making an effort to include us. But I think we were also very conscious that in most of those fora the processes that really, the decisions that count are taken in rooms where we are not invited. I don't think that has really changed.

Finally, I want to make some comments about the World Summit on the Internet, on the Information Society, which I think many people forget is not just about Internet Governance. It is an Internet Governance process. In the draft outcome text we see some really positive language around a cause for stronger developing country participation, and also a call to provide stable and secure funding for that, and this comes back to a point Jeanette was making earlier.

But I agree with Mr. Painter, in there hasn't been enough recognition what we have done since 2005, and the document does the opposite from what NETMundial principles did. Rather than looking forward, it wants to take us back.

It is a Government-led process. There are individuals who are working very hard to make sure that other stakeholder groups have considerable input, but it's not been easy and the final parts of the process it seems will remain closed.

All references to human rights language are balanced by references to the UN Charter on sovereignty and noninterference, and the affairs of the state. On enhanced cooperation there is a proposal for a intergovernmental working group that is not very encouraging, if we see how the WSIS review process itself includes other stakeholder groups on certain parts, etcetera, etcetera.

So it feels, seems as if the references to the contributions of other stakeholders in documents like that are mostly lip service, and not a genuine recognition of what different stakeholder groups bring to the table.

Not having more governments on board to endorse the NETMundial principles is then a disappointment, but I think what it also does is contribute to a growing distrust between governments and other stakeholders in processes where perhaps we might even recognize that governments take a legitimate lead. Thank you.

   (applause).

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you. Now, we will hear Markus Kummer, member of Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigning Names and Numbers, ICANN, and the secretary of the Internet Governance Forum Support Association. He is an advisor to the Chairman of the IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group, and has been involved in functions since 2002, working first in the Swiss Government and then in United Nations IGF Secretariat, and subsequently in the Internet Society.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for the introduction. It is my pleasure to be part of this panel.

Like others I found it very exciting to be part of NETMundial, although I was not in tears like Jeanette at the end of it (chuckles).

I would like to start by, Demi and Raul, thank you for leading the preparatory process for NETMundial. The draft document that was the basis for NETMundial really exceeded all expectations. I never expected such a solid document coming out of the preparatory process, and the true innovation you both applied was applying rough consensus methodology to policy development.

This is unlike a U.N. process where you usually have what we call a Christmas tree approach. You add decoration after decoration until the tree is overloaded, and then you start the process of tidying up and taking off decoration, and usually that process is extremely difficult, as every delegation is very much attached to their little Christmas ball they put on the tree; whereas here, what you did, leaving looking for commonalities and leaving out outlying proposals.

Now it's understood that some governments found this difficult to accept, and I know that some governments did not sign up to it because of that. But it was a real true innovation, and thanks to this, it allowed us to get the substantive outcome, positive outcome that we in the end had.

The second point I'd like to make, what I call the cross fertilization between the IGF and the NETMundial. My thesis is that NETMundial would not have been possible without the IGF. The IGF had created a climate of confidence among stakeholders that allowed us to at the NETMundial meeting, that allowed us to put governments in the queue behind the microphone and governments actually accepted it.

At one point, in chairing a session, there were so many people behind the microphone that Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca came to me and said, you have to do something to let them all speak. And what we did then, we reduced the time slot from two minutes to 30 seconds. You had senior Government representatives who accepted that and who played the game. I don't think this would have been possible without six, seven years of IGF practice in living multistakeholder cooperation.

But now, the NETMundial has also announced, cross-fertilized the IGF, building on Ambassador's Benedicto Fonseca and Jacquelynn Ruff's comments, I agree. It created IGF participants to move forward towards more tangible outcomes in an IGF context, and the best practices forums is one element of that. And the thematic priority we had, intersessional priority of Connecting the Next Billion is another one. We find it more difficult in moving to intersessional processes with a Dynamic Coalitions, but it's part of the same process.

We are not at the end yet. But we have ten more years to refine this. I think we can build on this methodology, also to take the IGF step forward. With that, I thank you for your attention.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you very much. Now I think it's time for open mic. But before opening the mic, we will use this minute for comments on Cybersecurity. Carol.

>> CAROLINA ROSSINI: I'm glad you said Carol. (chuckles.) Any time you call me Carolina, I know you are mad with me for some reason.

I want to comment on the Cybersecurity issue which is another thing that came out many times here. Cybersecurity is something that is happening, Cybersecurity regulation is something that is happening at accelerated rate in Latin America. The organization for American states, through one of their departments, is actually touring the region and training policymakers and enforcement on how to develop Cybersecurity technology and groups, and groups of experts and also their country Cybersecurity strategies and agendas.

Why do I say that? It's because sometimes countries believe that that is not the space for Civil Society. One thing that I want to express is that Civil Society is very sensitive and open to the legitimate interests of Cybersecurity. All of us have kids or most of us have kids. A lot of us, we use online banking. A lot of us have our identity on line. A lot of friends that are journalists and activists do suffer cyber attacks, DNS attacks all the time. We also want Cybersecurity, but for that, we also want to be included on those things.

One of the good steps that did happen at OSF, OES, is that actually the Special Rapporteur for freedom of expression was finally included in discussions and trainings. But we need more attention and more careful crafting of those agendas, so in Latin America there is a bunch of countries actually drafting their agendas and strategies.

Those countries are Colombia, Mexico, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Brazil. Brazil is very advanced. Thankfully the Civil Society has already contacted the military for those conversations. But I think we still have a long time to go.

That is it. One minute. Thank you so much, Demi, for that.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, all the speakers. We will invite now comments from the audience. There are four mics. Please be strict. You have two minutes, but we appreciate very much if you are as concise as possible and use less than that time.

>> SUBI CHATURVEDI: Thank you. Subi Chaturvedi, for the record. I do want to start by congratulating the NETMundial process. You have truly inspired many new changes, innovation and practices. You have

taught governments and other stakeholders as to how we can limit interventions to 30 seconds. You have taught us how we can queue up around the mic, and you have also taught us how often issues can find a solution, and the ideas of rough consensus.

I have been personally involved with the NETMundial process, so I feel very passionately for it. There are many lessons that the IGF has learned, but like some of the others, because on the panel, I come back with the sense of a mixed response as to where we could have taken those learnings. I know there are challenges and difficulties. But when we look at where the NETMundial initiative traveled to, whether it's the WEF NETMundial initiative, we want the processes to remain open. We want them not to be intimidating, overwhelming spaces.

Now there is a Web site for collaboration, but whatever we have gained in terms of ground, we don't want that to be lost as a lesson. Just reinforcing the very principles that NETMundial started out with, the three issues which remain unresolved, the questions on mass surveillance, question on necessary and proportionate, difficult and contentious issues like net neutrality, it has been a safe space, and we want to see that same spirit reinforced and nurtured. A lot of us will take more and greater participation as far as that is concerned.

A special shout out to Carolina for saying that there is always space for Civil Society in Cybersecurity. Thank you for reinforcing that.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. We take one speaker from here and we go to the remote participation.

>> AUDIENCE: Gunela Astbrink, Australian chapter of ISOC. I share with many people here the excitement of being part of NETMundial. I was delighted to have contributed to the human rights principles, specifically accessibility for people with disabilities.

I'm presuming that when accessibility was discussed by Anne Carblanc, she was relating to disability, and mentioned that the OECD has committed to doing work on accessibility principles in preparation of a draft ministerial statement, and we welcome this initiative.

As this is new work, we urge in the spirit of NETMundial to consult with the disability community in its preparation. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. Please our remote comments.

>> REMOTE MODERATOR: Thanks, Chair. We have a question from Mr. Muthusamy, Internet Society, India. He says NETMundial complements the work at IGF and follows the less formal format for discussion. It is a visionary initiative. His question is, why is there delay in NETMundial's event roadmap? Thanks.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. I will take, because we have time constraints, all the comments and questions from the audience, and we will give one minute to each of the speakers for making their remarks and answering, so pay attention, please, to all the questions.

>> AUDIENCE: Jose Eduardo Rojas.

  (receiving no English interpretation).

Which is a Civil Society, and in my country, we articulate between Civil Society and Internet Society, allows to generate models and answers to human rights and Information Society.

So, it's not enough to talk about Internet rights, because with the perspective of technological intervention, the centrality in human rights leads us to defend the rights, not the heritage but the human rights. The Bolivian initiative today allows us to articulate all the actors at the traditional level to promote some associations to defend human rights in the Internet.

This also envisages a new role for Civil Society. Civil Society defending human rights can have inputs to talk about economic differences of private operators, ISPs and governments, and in order to build a society, and be respectful of human rights. How do you see the perspective of creating national associations to defend human rights in the association, in the network, like ISOC, in order to ensure that global principles are doing at the national level?

>> AUDIENCE: Marilia Maciel, I'm a researcher and coordinator of the Centre for Technology and Society of a foundation law school in Brazil. I was part of the organization of NETMundial. I had the pleasure to work in the Executive Committee and be Chair, and it was an amazing experience.

The strength of a document that is nonbinding, it is a soft document like the outcome document of NETMundial is the number of times that this document is quoted and mentioned and referenced. To me it's disappointing to see how scantily this document was made reference to in the process of reviewing towards the summit on the Information Society on the last part of the year in December, and how governments could not quote this document or make reference to this document in documents that have been approved throughout the process. So maybe we could, if you could react to that, I'd like to hear your reactions.

This document could have been made a reference to as well by NonGovernmental Organisations, and maybe this is something that we could do more coordinatedly in the future. In order to carry out the comparative spirit of NETMundial and based on the fact that NETMundial was a one-time event, NETMundial initiative has been created by some actors. It has now a Multistakeholder Coordinating Council, and the role of the platform is to take this document, completely anchored on the NETMundial outcome document, and to work with other organizations and stakeholders to try to find ways to implement the goals that were set in that outcome document. We had a very interesting session on Day Zero. I encourage you to look at the recording and transcripts. I think it was really constructive.

In terms of the methodology, the methodology of the NETMundial was one of the greatest outcomes of the meeting. This methodology has a lot of lessons to be brought into the IGF. A lot has been done this year in terms of progress, in terms of making the IGF more outcome oriented. I would like to suggest that the amazing work that has been done this year is made better than next year. Exercises suggest the one conducted by that Dynamic Coalitions should not be conducted in the fringes of the IGF, but should be something really brought to the core of the process with much more publicization and advertisements. Among the challenges, many of them has been mentioned before, but I still think that one issue that triggered NETMundial, although it was not the main issue in the agenda, was mass surveillance.

What we have seen since NETMundial is a very worrisome trend in terms of countries trying to put forward laws that would neutralize or legitimize mass surveillance, and this is really something that we should look into, not only develop technology like encryption, this is amazingly important, but laws are very important too.

Thanks.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. Do we have a remote comment? Not yet. Okay.

>> AUDIENCE: Good afternoon. My name is Carlos Guerrero, and I came here as part of the initiative, Youth for 2015. First of all, I'd like to thank for the opportunity. It's really first time that someone from Peru comes to participate in the debates which have happened throughout the week.

I participated in many workshops. There were very interesting topics and controversial ones like net neutrality and Zero-Rating. But the general view, and what I've known from this and other events, we repeat the same ideas. We talk a lot but we get nowhere. We repeat the same discussions over and over, the same speech.

But when governments start to deploy the policies of the Internet and human rights which are discussed in these platforms, where they discuss new technologies, we don't see what is discussed here deployed, implemented. We have many people from Latin America, many youngsters. This is a huge opportunity.

It was a great opportunity to participate in these events.

We are a new voice, a voice from the youth. It is very important to have the youth voice in these events, for people to know our concerns and our perspectives. It's something unique. It had never happened before. I hope it will go on for the next events. And among all these stakeholders, stakeholders should also support initiatives, so that the voices that people who are not included in these debates, their voices can be heard. I thank you very much. I hope that youngsters will participate in the next editions.

(applause).

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: For your first time, you are very good at the timing issue. Thank you. Next speaker.

>> AUDIENCE: Jutta Croll.

(no audio).

I've been pleased to see that the rights of children and the safety of children have played an important role in all the debates on the Internet Governance Forum this year. But also, I have to mention that the community of child protection people have been very disappointed that children and youth have not been mentioned in the NETMundial statement, and I wanted to make that point.

If you carry on with that work, I find it very important, and I speak for the community of child protection people, that the rights of children for their dignity, for privacy and physical integrity have to play a role in that statement. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. Do we have any other speakers? If not, we will move to the last round of comments. Do we have a remote participant? No? Okay. Thank you.

We can start maybe for you, Anne Carblanc. The challenge is one minute.

>> ANNE CARBLANC: First, it was a very rich discussion. There is a consensus on the importance of the NETMundial principles. I heard what was said, that perhaps we should consider adding reference in the ministerial declaration, and also the need to work on accessibility, for access for people with disabilities. I will bring this back to the university, and to our members. I think that there will be probably, they will be receptive to these suggestions. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you. Chris.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: That is twice, 30 seconds, that is a lot of time. I'd say a few things. First of all, one comment has said, in some ways, to be thinking we have the same conversations again and again, but I've seen those conversations over the course of the last ten years, and the conversations have become much stronger. And what's happened is, all the stakeholders including governments are listening.

It does help to have the conversations, and continue to have the conversations. On Cybersecurity, I'd say, look, there are times when governments are making policy. But the more open they can be about those policies, the better. That is something that we model, and the capacity-building we do, when I have bilaterals with many countries, including Latin America, that is always one of the things I talk about. We built a lot of our policies in the messy multistakeholder way, and that is important, because they make them more legitimate at the end. That is important.

Finally, on issues like on the last comment about youth, I attended some of the youth session. I will tell you that is one of the greatest parts of the IGF is getting that perspective. I spoke last year at the closing after a 14-year-old from Macedonia, I thought was the best speaker in the entire Closing Ceremony probably. I think it's important to get that perspective, because they are the ones who are going to own and operate and use the Internet in the future.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much.

>> NII QUAYNOR: I'm very pleased to hear development described as a human right and a shared value. On surveillance, sympathize on the subject and I wish you had more surveillance. Thank you.

>> JACQUELYNN RUFF: I would like to echo the comments about the richness of the conversation today. I think that one of the things we need to emphasize, even more, taking away from this type of activity, is the value of the multistakeholder approach to things in general. We have not talked a lot about local, national developments, etcetera.

But there are so many things going on around the world that are either enhancing the global seamless Internet or posing some risks to it. I would just say let's have as one take-away to try to take the structure of using a multistakeholder approach for good policy outcomes, and apply that as we go back to our areas around the world in just that way.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Ambassador.

>> BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you. My last comment, I'd like maybe to reaffirm something we have been saying that we believe in dialogue and discussion. And one thing as a diplomat that I have been witness is that different process ignore each other. What is taking place here is largely ignored by most of the representatives in New York and Geneva, and vice versa.

I think that a key for improving Internet Governance is to build bridges among people that are working in different context, in different configurations to better understand each other, to seek ways to working mutually reinforcing ways. I'm not naive. I know it's not just by putting people together that you come toward peace and everything.

But I think we can improve if people can better understand what others are doing in different contexts. I think there is a role for IGF in doing this. As I have said in my previous intervention, IGF works under rules of engagement that are flexible. We can make experiments. Because of this IGF we made a very important experiment that I think will be further reflected upon later on, that we brought here the two co-facilitators of the WSIS+10 process that is taking place in New York, and they committed to receive a report, a summary of the discussions here and take it to New York. I think that is the kind of thing that IGF could do and improve and look into ways in which it can put people together, because otherwise I think we will be discussing here a few things, people will be discussing there a few things, and they will be largely ignoring one another.

I think if I can, I know I expand my time, but if I can briefly try to reflect on why NETMundial statement was rejected by so many governments. I think this reflects that difference of cultures, because governments, for an outcome to be legitimate, most governments would think that we need multi-lateral, and by multi-lateral I'd like to indicate not unilateral, not something that is a side by one Government, two governments or a group, but the whole community coming together.

And governments, may we like or not, are in principle and by design, those who represent their peoples, who have a mandate. I think for most governments, for many governments, there was a difficulty in NETMundial to be negotiating a context in which you were not clear about what kind of mandate people have on the other side. Some people represent a country. Some people represent themselves. You have a country that that is a billion people, and they have a representative that has a mandate to represent. Maybe we should think about that, kind of how to address that kind of legitimacy from the perspective of the various stakeholders.

For the multistakeholder approach, the work, again, it must respect the cultures that each stakeholder group has and also substantially different. If we do not understand what the other side thinks and how legitimatizes the outcomes, we will be talking to each other, having consensus among ourselves, but being largely ignored by the other group and vice versa.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Carolina?

>> CAROLINA ROSSINI: No. I didn't ask.

>> JEANETTE HOFFMAN: I'd like to echo Chris Painter's comments. If one listens, one will notice that we don't have repetition of debates in a strict sense. They are moving, even if on a snail's pace. What I find striking over the last years is the increasing amount of expertise that we see brought to the table at IGF meetings. Both people come who would not have come earlier, but IGF also inspires people to really get smart and into the issues, to make a difference. As an academic, I do believe that strong evidence, good arguments and high quality debate do make a difference in societal self-determination.

>> ANJA KOVACS: For me one of the big themes throughout IGF has been the issue of distrust between governments and people and in a way I feel accruing this trust when it comes to the Internet Governance processes. We should think more about how we can bridge that gap, also from our side.

I think Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca made quite a few suggestions on that as well, including about respecting the culture of all the stakeholder groups and mentioning the visit of the co-facilitators and also things were mentioned, NonGovernmental stakeholders too should refer more often to the NETMundial outcome document.

But it's valuable to start documenting this kind of suggestions, and start thinking about what that means in practice. Like if we want to respect other cultures, if we want to respect what governments do, what does that mean for how we should move forward? I'd be really interested in thinking about this more. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I share the frustration of the lack of mentioning of the NETMundial outcome experience, that a few weeks after the Geneva meeting of the Commission of Science and Technology for Development and some governments steadfastly refused to have any reference on the NETMundial. But I also share Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca's assessment of the reasons why. I think the procedure was simply too advanced for many governments to accept.

Also I'd like to build on Jeanette's and Chris's comments. Yes, in the past ten years we have been discussing the same issues over and over again, but I will maintain it was each year at the higher level of understanding. I think in education, you call that spiral learning. You revisit the same issues, but you move up a spiral and you are higher up in the level of understanding.

Really, the quality of the discussions this year was extremely high. I think it was, in terms of substance, really a very very good meeting. Compared to the very first meetings, we have come a long way.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. While this is not an official report, because there will be the report done by others later, I would like to share with you some of the things that I have heard in this discussion. In general, I have heard positive evaluations of the NETMundial process and NETMundial meeting, even if we have to recognize some disappointments that have been expressed in the room.

Some of the words that were associated with the NETMundial was highlight, inspirational, invigorating. That is, that speaks by themselves.

There was comments also in the use of rough consensus processes for policy discussion. The cross fertilization between IGF and NETMundial, the progress that has been done in other areas, like IANA position, on IGF improvements, best practices forums were mentioned, and also the intersessional work on Connecting the Next Billion, very positive remarks about the discussion, the legal and the session held this week in the IGF, progress that has also been made in other forums. There were mentions to the need to continue improving participation of all stakeholders, in all Internet Governance and other related processes. That has been mentioned in some cases where the participation of stakeholders is not good enough,

that principles are really visible in different forums and organizations, and we have to remember that presentation from OECD in that regard.

The NETMundial documents are being referenced in the many places, there is an indication of the success of the NETMundial. There is a need to bring the NETMundial principles to other Internet related forums. My final remark is, I think that there was, Ambassador Painter mentioned something like there is a lot to do, but a lot has been already done since the NETMundial meeting. This is a good way to close my remarks.

And I would, please, ask Demi to take the control.

>> DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you very much. It was very enlightening discussion. I'm happy to be here and honored to be here. I want to thank very much our MAG facilitators, Flavio Rech Wagner from Brazil and Ana Cristina Amoroso Neves, the Rapporteurs are doing the work of carrying out this information in this room, Diego Canabarro, Rafael Prince. And before passing for the closing words of Percival Henriques, I found a note, article from a Professor related to the NETMundial. I will read two paragraphs of that. Never before there was a document with Internet Governance principles which has such a broad political support from key players, from all stakeholders groups, and there is no mechanism to bring our own tour to a Internet court, but NETMundial document allows naming and shaming if a corporation or of a Government those behave badly in cyberspace.

Thank you very much. I pass to Percival Henriques for the end words.

(applause).

>> PERCIVAL HENRIQUES: Before closing, I'd like to thank everybody. But before that I'd like to reinforce what was said, what has been said more than once here, which is the importance of the documents generated by NETMundial, the roadmap and the principles which have been having an impact on all the discussions to a greater or lesser degree, but all the discussions having to do with Internet Governance. So thank you all for all of those who have been conducting this process, all of those who have been making an effort to follow up with this document in the last two years. I'd like to thank all those who attended here or remotely. Once more let me say that on Friday we still have people discussing, debating, been doing this since Monday. So some people started on Saturday. So thank you very much. We are very glad for this session, and we are very glad to have you all here in Joao Pessoa.

And just like NETMundial which happened a couple of years ago, the ideas and the debates and text are still alive. I hope that this session and the other sessions which made up IGF 2015 will continue beyond the closing of this Forum. Thank you very much.

Thank you for the remote attendance, for the people here in the panel, for everybody who helped create this session of the IGF.

Closing Ceremony

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: We will just wait for the Deputy Minister and the Governor, and also Mr. Ivan Koulov from UN DESA to take the stage. Are they here? Yes, thank you.

Thank you very much.

Yes, please, I'd like to invite them on to the stage and to take their seats where their name tags are. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to invite the chair of the meeting, Ambassador Jose Antonio Marcondes de Carvalho, and Secretary-General of Environment, NEG, Science and Technology, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, to start the Closing Session of the 10th meeting of the Internet Governance Forum. Mr. Ambassador.

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it is my great pleasure to open this Closing Ceremony of the 2015 IGF meeting in the City of Joao Pessoa.

We will now hear from eight speakers drawn from all stakeholder groups, who will make some closing remarks. It is my honour to introduce the first speaker, Mr. Ivan Koulov, Executive Officer of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, UN DESA, speaking on behalf of Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Montiel, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development for UN DESA. You have the floor.

>> IVAN KOULOV: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to deliver the closing statement on behalf of Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, Mr. Lenni Montiel.

We would first like to thank our host. As the United Nations Secretary-General recognized in his opening message, Brazil is the only country that has twice hosted IGF.

The United Nations is deeply grateful for Brazil's global leadership and commitment, and for President Dilma Rousseff's inspiring message, as well as the personal participation of the Governor, Ricardo Coutinho, Minister Andre Figueiredo, and yourself, sir.

Your warm hospitality, your dedicated professional high standard support have made this Forum an unforgettable experience. Paraiba has welcomed the world to its beautiful capital Joao Pessoa.

Thank you, Paraiba. Thank you, Joao Pessoa.

 (applause).

We thank CGI Brazil and we thank the Brazilian stakeholders for their vibrant contribution and participation. During this 10th meeting of the IGF, more than 3,000 on-site participants from over 100 countries came here to Joao Pessoa to share their extensive knowledge and experience. More than double that number actively participated remotely, bringing additional insights and perspectives to our workshops and main sessions.

The IGF also featured a WSIS+10 consultation session. We deeply appreciate the participation of WSIS+10 co-facilitators, His Excellency Mr. Janis Mzaeks, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Latvia to the United Nations in New York, and Her Excellency, Mrs. Lana Nusseibeh, permanent representative of the United Arab Emirates to the UN in New York.

We are very glad with the active participation of all stakeholders in this consultation.

We heard loud and clear that the 2015 IGF is foreseeing the 2030 agenda for Sustainable Development and the ten-year review of the World Summit on the Information Society. The 10th IGF once again saw increased participation from stakeholders from the developing countries.

Upon the renewal of the IGF mandate, we hope that to further enhance the diversity of participation from stakeholders, from developing countries, including youth and women, among others.

In keeping with the IGF inclusiveness, this gathering in Joao Pessoa addressed both opportunities and challenges under the following sub-themes: Cybersecurity and trust, Internet economy, inclusiveness and diversity, openness, enhancing multistakeholder cooperation, Internet and the human rights, critical Internet resources, and emerging issues.

More than 150 sessions were convened during this week, organized by interested stakeholders to facilitate comprehensive debates among participants from across the world.

We also witnessed the fruits of the intersessional work, the IGF policy options and best practices for Connecting the Next Billion. Its bottom up community-driven approach has proven to be a successful initiative.

We benefited from the presence of two United Nations Special Rapporteurs, who invigorated workshops with key insights. We also appreciated the work carried out by our UN partners, the agencies, including the regional commissions, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, ITU, UNCTAD, UNESCO, WIPO and others.

We recognize the contribution of more than 40 national and regional IGFs, initiatives that have taken place over the past year. We hope the number of national and regional initiatives will continue to grow and that their work will feed and become an even more integral part of the global IGF work.

We wish to take this opportunity to thank the many donors for their financial support to the Forum, as well as the financial contributions to the United Nations IGF fund.

We count on your continued support. Your commitment to strengthened IGF will be crucial as we look forward to the renewal of the IGF mandate.

Finally, we would like to thank the multistakeholder advisory group for its tireless efforts in preparation of the program of the session.

Our appreciation also goes to the group of moderators, panelists, online participation, facilitators, and all live transcript experts for their outstanding work, and to our event team for their hard work.

This Forum would not have been possible without the great local members, staff members. I would like to invite a round of applause for them.

 (applause).

Mr. Chairman, in fact, the fact that I use almost the entire speech to acknowledge the contributions of all these people and organizations demonstrates that the IGF is a team effort. It is a multistakeholder effort. It's a global partnership.

Let us continue this partnership. As the UN Secretary-General said, let us turn the digital divides into digital opportunities.

Let us leave no one behind. Thank you.

 (applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much indeed for your remarks, and kind words referring to my country.

Our next speaker is Governor of the State of Paraiba. It is my great pleasure to invite the Governor to take the floor. Governor, please, I pass the floor to you.

>> RICARDO COUTINHO: Thank you, Ambassador. Mr. Chairman, to close the sessions, I'd like to greet Mr. Ivan Koulov from the United Nations that represented here Lenni Montiel, I'd like to greet Ms. Izumi Okutani from Japan, Ms. Nadine Moawad from APC, Mr. Chris Painter, the Cybersecurity representative for the United States, Mr. Chengetai Masango, Secretary of IGF, and also Mr. Hartmut Glaser, Executive Director of CGI Brazil, Ms. Yolanda Martinez, Secretary of the Public Department of Mexico, and I'd like to greet all Internet users that for these four days were individuals present here in this event, and also were able to open the eyes and hearts to the state of northeast, State of Paraiba and its capital Joao Pessoa, and I'd like to greet you all here present in this closing session for the 10th IGF. We were very grateful to be able to hold this in the City of Joao Pessoa.

I'd like to also congratulate organizers and participants for all the significant advancement that was able to be reached throughout the week.

We can say that this 10th IGF meeting closes a multistakeholder approach, when it comes to the strategies and initiatives, in terms of Internet Governance. I'd like to stress and support another cycle of IGF forums, and expecting that the December meeting with all the members involved will bring the confirmation of its continuity, because we need to keep advancing to this participative and multistakeholder discussion.

So I hope that in 2016, we will have the 11th meeting of IGF in Mexico that is here represented. I find it essential, the focus and the emphasis by the present leaders and the high level meeting of the zero in terms of the role of digital inclusion and the SDGs, and the dialogue among all the stakeholders has been incentivized, and we are part of the whole challenge.

The State of Paraiba wants to keep being connected and being challenged, and all of us, specifically those who live here can count on us. I would also like to greet all members of the academia and technical communities, representatives of the Civil Society, Government, private sector, of all the discussions brought with relevant themes to have a more and more accessible, neutral, Democratic and inclusive Internet.

The future of democracy in the world must also go through the digital inclusion in all different population segments. I had a great opportunity during perhaps the moment not only in a meeting as this one, but through interviews, a certain contradiction in terms of what the planet is going through.

We have a level of technology that has been accumulated that is very strong, and we have to bear things from two centuries ago. It is not possible to go to the semi-arid regions around the world and see the like of good fellowship, productive experiences of human beings with their own regions. So we must use technology.

We need to make technology available so that people can be more than what they are and live happier.

(applause).

We cannot just sit and see the migration around the world that embarrass mankind, because most of the immigrants are not migrating for their own wish, but they are being forced to it either because of war or hunger, and one that controls this level of technology, specifically the developed countries, and many of the developing countries as well have no right. That is how I see it sincerely, to really impose this type of situation to mankind, we must wake up to the situation and to the problem that can become even worse.

I think that the academia, I would say that technological community has great contribution to be given in terms of a very firm decisive voice to bring on peace and harmony, so that we can actually have that in the plan, in our planet.

So, otherwise, we will not have basic equality. It is not possible to think about peace, it is not possible to think about justice, and it seems like the big inventions of mankind should serve first to foster peace and justice.

I do believe in such thoughts.

(applause).

And we do also understand that interactivity in an open manner as we experienced this week is one of the core pillars for the legacy that we all get at the end of this IGF meeting. We should all be committed to the cause, and that this IGF meeting can bring great aspiration when it comes to the regulation of the Marco Civil in Brazil.

Because there is still a long path ahead of us, but it's important to recognize what has been done. I only believe in the future if we do understand the steps taken in the past. Brazil has taken great steps in this field, and Brazil is a role model to the world when it comes to Internet Governance, and in terms of including everyone, not considering the Internet just a matter of status itself.

Internet is much more than that. It belongs to society, to the academia and also I believe to the general population, more and more. The Internet has to belong to the general population.

And finally, I would like to invite you all to just remain a few more days in our state. I can assure you that you haven't seen much. The type of things we have here are much more appealing than what you were able to see. This state has many attractions to offer, either through its natural beauty, or through our culture.

We are a very rich state culturally speaking, and since this is a Friday, Saturday seems like nobody will be working on Saturday, let alone Sunday. So going back Sunday, I can tell you that you will feel a warm welcome by all here in Paraiba for this long weekend.

  (applause).

And I hope that through this opportunity, you can enjoy the beauty of our beaches, of the hospitality of our people. Joao Pessoa and the State of Paraiba would like to see you back some other time. And I have a little notion, and that is why I'm really thanking the Brazilian Government, CGI, the United Nations, for holding this event here.

We once decided to hold the event here, and to carry on the responsibility to propose the State of Paraiba that is not very much known by others, to hold an event of this magnitude, we understood that we had to do our best, and to really have all the responsibilities on our back through all these days. There were some situations where we thought that some individuals had to be there, but for some reason they could not be because the State of Paraiba was able to hold up, and I'm not going to be very modest here, IGF was not even able to see. So I can tell you that this was the best IGF that we have had considering all ten IGF meetings that have been held around the world.

  (applause).

And that is why I'd like to publicly thank you all for giving the State of Paraiba this capital to hold this meeting to be included in a world that is still opening to us, which is the world of technology. And this world is writing the history of our future.

We must be in the living the present, and still look out into the future, because that is where we will see a bit of what I said before in the middle of my speech. That is where we will find justice, peace, and then minimum in terms of equality among all the different, differences in this planet. Thank you all for being here.

And please come back and again a warm welcome.

  (applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much, Governor.

So I would like to then pass to our next speaker, Coordinator for Cyber Issues of the United States Department of State. Mr. Painter, please welcome to the rostrum.

>> CHRIS PAINTER: Good afternoon. As we come to the close of the 10th Internet Governance Forum, I'm honored to share thoughts and observations about this unique annual gathering of the global Internet community. I thank and congratulate the many people who made this event possible, in particular our Brazilian hosts, the IGF Secretariat, and the multistakeholder advisory group. Your efforts have paid off tremendously, as we have heard at this important juncture in the life of the IGF.

Whether this is your 10th, fifth like mine, or your first IGF, I trust you agree that it is a rich opportunity to discuss the spectrum of Internet related issues in a dynamic environment. The week of workshops and other engagements represents many hours of work and preparation, as well as thoughtful and candid discourse.

As this IGF draws to its close, three elements stands out. When I spoke at the closing of last year's IGF in Istanbul, I said one way to make the most of its success was to connect conversations. This past year has seen remarkable connections, including further work on best practices throughout the year and showcasing them here in Brazil, the connection also with the national and regional IGFs and compiling policy options to help bring the next billion people online, and the connection with the processes taking place in the UN General Assembly on the ten-year review of the World Summit on the Information Society.

I want to thank, we want to thank the co-facilitators from Latvia and United Arab Emirates for coming to IGF to participate and hear the views of the global stakeholders who came here.

Second, the engagement of youth programs in the IGF was tangible this week. I had the opportunity to join the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance session. I was struck by their passionate discussion on the issues and their perspective that they bring to the broader discussion.

One Brazilian college student noted that the discussions here at the IGF have, quote, broadened his horizons. There are young people on the MAG helping to build the program, partner with stakeholders and bring their perspectives. I hope the young people that have been here this week have learned from being here with the experts from industry, Civil Society, the technical community, the academic community and Government and with such figures as one of the fathers of the Internet no less.

But we have very much to learn from our young people as well. They are the future of the Internet, after all, and they are the ones who will take all these policies forward. Third, the power of the multistakeholder dialogue on these issues and often difficult questions is palpable here at the IGF.

We may stand at microphones with different labels on and to make our points, but we are in the same room at the same table every time we come together here at the IGF. That is one of the IGF's great values. The discussions at IGF have matured and deepened and foster more effective solutions to the challenges we face.

Even if we keep having conversations, those conversations always get richer and better. Where do we go from here? First let me reflect on the comments here this week regarding the conversations at IGF and whether they matter in other forums. Simply, yes. They do.

Let me assure you the United States Government comes to IGF to engage in this discussion, hear from the global stakeholders and incorporate your views in our work in New York, Geneva and around the world. To sustain that effort, we first must ensure that the IGF conversations continue, and the multistakeholder model continues to be recognized and supported as the best approach to Internet Governance.

This was affirmed at NETMundial, which we need to continue and take forward in all our discussions.

The United States Government has called for an extension of the mandate of the IGF, and we are pleased that many others have echoed that call, and we trust the UN General Assembly will affirm that rousing support from governments and other stakeholders that we heard this week to renew the IGF mandate at the high-level meeting in December.

We must also ensure that these conversations continue throughout the year, intervening year between IGFs. We must continue to capture these conversations and package them in a way that makes what happens here at IGF an accessible and valuable resource for the entire global community.

Remote participation, transcripts and workshop reports are all important ways we are doing that already. We can collectively and creatively find more ways. We must include more people from all stakeholder groups from all countries, and from more countries around the world in these conversations.

The IGF by its nature is an inclusive environment, as are the national and regional IGFs that we heard about that emulated in their own circumstances.

Let's leverage that inclusiveness and continue to strive for greater participation, particularly from developing countries. By doing these things, we can help foster an open Internet, that has seen tremendous growth and innovation, provides an engine for economic growth, serves as a platform for expressing ideas, thought and creativity.

Thank you for your contributions to the IGF, and to the Internet community overall. We look forward to continuing to work with you and seeing you all again soon. I hope to be at my 6th IGF next year. Thank you again, Brazil. Thank you all.

(applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is going to be Ms. Izumi Okutani, policy liaison at the Japan Network Information Centre. You are invited to take the rostrum.

>> IZUMI OKUTANI: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. My name is Izumi Okutani, and I'm here today to speak on behalf of the global technical community. As the Chair of -- sorry -- (chuckles).

As the Chair of the team that has worked on the number of resources component of the stewardship, I have experienced all the hard work and commitment that has been involved in the global or multistakeholder process. And this proposal which has developed on the IANA stewardship position, I see this as a concrete example, excellent example and a product of how this multistakeholder process has worked and produced in addressing a policy question that has been put to be addressed in a specific way.

I'm very proud of what we have produced so far. At the same time, the Internet is growing and evolving so quickly, and we often see that these policies, that needs to be addressed, is catching up with quick fast-moving development, with fast-moving technologies.

This is accommodated by the creativity of developers and users. And one of the most important contributions the technical community has made is that we actually have helped enhance a better understanding of all stakeholders to understand the technical realities, and in addressing to make better policy decisions.

IGF is the most valuable platform where we actually are able to engage with all stakeholders in addressing these issues.

This year is the 10th point of the IGF. And we have actually reached a milestone in terms of the global community working together, in a way that tackle all sorts of fast evolving issues around the Internet.

The value of the IGF is not just about meeting up and having dialogues at this physical meeting, but we have actually ten years worth of archived discussions, presentations, debates. And this is actually something that all of us can actually take a look, and it's valuable in tracking, what are the discussions that have taken place in these ten years, and the changes that has been made in these past ten years.

This year, we have reached further improvements in IGF in compiling the expertise and dialogues by stakeholders. We have better record of the best practices forums for six themes on access, critical infrastructure, security, online abuse and multistakeholder mechanisms.

And, sorry ...

(applause).

Thank you.

I'm not able to receive ... (pause).

The need for the Internet Governance to reflect the latest technology realities is the heart of the IGF and the multistakeholder approach. The technical community is a willing contributor and bringing in its expertise and which enriches the quality of the quality outcomes and help ground the technical reality.

On day one, we have talked about the upcoming review of the World Summit of the Information Society, including what the review will say about the ongoing mandate of the IGF.

Clear from what has been said by all of us here at the IGF, it is that the IGF must continue driven by people who have made it such a success, this is a clear message for New York. We thank the WSIS and co-facilitators for the WSIS review for joining here in person. No question that the WSIS has been a landmark in recognizing global multistakeholder nature of the Internet Governance, and now we are in the ten-year review. It is vital and fitting that the UN listens to the voices that has been raised by the IGF.

The technical community supports the continuation of the IGF and the multistakeholder model. We would like to thank Brazil for hosting this excellent IGF, which has turned real value for all stakeholders in all parts of the world and working together to address the latest issues on the Internet Governance.

Thank you.

(applause).

(cheering and applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much, Izumi Okutani, for your remarks.

I invite our next speaker, Ms. Nadine Moawad, Coordinator of the Association for Progressive Communications Sexual Rights Program. You are kindly invited to take the rostrum.

>> NADINE MOAWAD: Thank you.

(cheering and applause).

This is an opportunity for me to take this with my own head so I will use the last ten seconds.

Thank you very much. I'm happy to be speaking today on behalf of the Civil Society, and I'm happy for this opportunity and quite honored. I want to tell a personal story because as a kid who grew up in a small Lebanese town in the '90s, the issues that we discuss here today of Internet freedom, access, freedom of speech, gender and sexuality, these are very personal issues to me because they reflect my own struggle for freedom, for knowledge, for community and for love.

So little did I imagine when I was a kid, teenager growing up, that one day I would come to multistakeholder settings and to the UN and discuss these issues as political issues. I wanted to invite us in this last Closing Ceremony to remember that moment where we first connected to the Internet, and that infinite feeling of possibility, because that I believe is the feeling of liberation that has to guide us as we make decisions about how we govern the Internet. So we have heard these amazing technological developments in the last few decades, mostly driven by capitalism, and I think the greatest advancement has been the Internet. But we also know that capitalism as an economic model will not last forever, that it is eating up our planet. It's widening the gap between the rich and poor. The one percent get richer, the rest of us get poorer.

We have to ask ourselves, if we believe that the Internet is a facilitator for equality, for justice, empowering people, why is it that in the last ten, 20 years, we have seen the greatest inequalities of our time? We have to ask ourselves that, because we all come here with the belief that technology is an equalizer, and we come here with the belief that the Internet will bring good to people.

Right? That it will lift us up somehow from these models that aren't working, and take us to better egalitarian equitable systems. We have to ask how come the Internet that we used to log into, and those of you who are a bit older will remember, logging in, in late '90s and 2000s, when everything was possible, and yet now, every interaction is monitored, regulated, surveilled, and every virtual point of our identity is sold for profit and is monetized and is privatized.

These are the questions we have to grapple with. When we come to spaces like the IGF, and talk about human rights and about the right to privacy, right to human dignity, human anonymity, sometimes it's strange to sit around the same table and discuss things that are such fundamental human rights. We have to ask ourselves, how are we framing the questions around these issues?

Because you know the saying in debates that those who frame the question win the debate. Right? So I'll start with a first question, for example, freedom of speech. How are we framing our discussion on freedom of speech? Freedom of speech is not the freedom to offend people who are weaker than you. It's not the freedom to push down people who are already battling against complexes of military, of war, racism, of genocide. It is not the freedom to see someone who is struggling because of structural issues, and then bash them and say, look, freedom of speech.

Freedom of speech is our right to offend those who are untouchable, those who are in power, those protected by media, banks, armies. It's our right to offend those people.

 (applause).

That is what we understand as freedom of speech. Otherwise, it's called hegemonic speech. So it is our right for example to demand of Arab governments to release immediately people like Hala and all of the bloggers that are detained because of tweets and blog bots.

 (applause).

This is what we believe freedom of speech is. Also freedom of speech is the right of African-Americans to say loudly and clearly, Black lives matter. One of the most beautiful campaigns --

 (applause).

-- happened on the Internet recently, was Black Lives Matter, and they had to say it a hundred million times to get people to listen to them. Yeah? And freedom of speech also is the right for persons and activists to come to the IGF and carry a banner that says, free basics.

 (cheering).

Free of basic human rights, that is what we defend as freedom of speech.

We see, my friends, it is not the governments who protect freedom of speech, not the corporations, not the police. The only people who will protect it is us, by our relentlessness and our sheer insistence that we will not shut up about our rights, to say what we want to say.

A further example I want to talk about is access, because we have talked about access in this Forum. Remember how we frame the question, those who frame the question win the debate. Right?

The debate about access is mostly controlled by those who have access, deciding on behalf of those who don't have access what they need. I'll tell you a story about my mother. She joined the Internet because she heard from her neighbor in the town that she could raise a virtual Forum with animals, crops, she could feed things, she could look after them. She got excited about the idea of a Forum.

She plays on the Forum all day, tells me about it, sometimes sends me photos, etcetera. My mother is not interested in using the Internet for information, because she doesn't trust it. She would actually be an excellent

content producer. She could populate the Internet with better content than most of the information that is out there. But yet when we talk about access, we don't think of my mother as a content producer, as someone engaged in this Internet. We see her as someone who will use the Internet, for example, to talk to her local Government. It so happens her local Government is her cousin. If she wants to talk to him, she stands on the balcony and yells across the street.

But since we frame her, when we frame the discussion as these poor people who are not connected, we need to bring them Internet, we are disempowering people, instead of empowering them, and instead of putting the agency where it belongs.

Technology by default is a product of creativity. People understand technology, but somehow when we make it into this cryptic complicated issue, we are disempowering them. I also want to talk about anonymity. I can't see my timer. Anyway, I want to talk also about anonymity.

  (laughter).

Anonymity, the debate is framed in a way where anonymity causes crimes, which is also such a strange debate. If I go to my, I get my bag stolen, run to security, I say my bag is stolen, he will not say, I'm sorry, your criminal is anonymous. Right? He won't say, oh, damn it, anonymity, we should have scared everybody and put chips in everyone to monitor where they went, otherwise we have crime.

Crime by default is anonymous. We figure out ways to work around it without saying, because of crime, we have to rid people of anonymity. The fact is, my friends, anonymity saves lives. A lot of people are free and alive today because of their right to be anonymous.

Now we have to go to extra lengths.

  (applause).

It's getting harder and harder to be anonymous. And they are talking about making encryption illegal. We have to fight for these things. We have to retain these things.

Finally, I must speak a little about sex, because that is my main job with APC. I look at the intersection of sexuality and technology. If we think about sex, sexual rights, as fundamentally your right to have good sex, this is what you advocate for. What does it mean? It means you can have healthy sex, you have all the information you need, you can talk about it openly, you are having consensual sex, nobody is forcing you. You have access to contraception. You can choose your partner. You have access to abortion, etcetera. We are talking about rights that are sexual rights.

We fought hard for decades to get the United Nations and get local Government to recognize that sexual rights are human rights, including the right of LGBTs and rights of queer people and people of diverse sexualities.

So we come to think about the Internet in relation to sexual rights, because the Internet has a lot to do with sex. We all have sex online, we all use the Internet to look up sex information; it's a political act, particularly for people whose sex lives don't make it into the mainstream. Yeah? For women, for LGBTs, for people with disabilities, people with color, all categories of people whose sexuality are still taboo and don't want to talk about it, the Internet enables us to discuss them. We have to keep having these conversations about sex at the IGF, in Internet Governance spaces, because we have to unpack the complexities of the relationship of sexuality with technology.

For example, who decides what is harmful content? Who decides what is pornographic? Why do we rid young people of their agency to decide of what is harmful for them and what is not? Why do we put young people under the blanket and say protect them, protect them. What do we censor using this blanket because we want to protect young people, instead of recognizing the young people use the Internet better than any

other generation can use it, and can make decisions about what to say for them and what is healthy for them and what is right for them. Embedded in this is the question of consent.

We started talking a little at this IGF about consent. I think we have to move forward and discuss more, how do we embed the idea of consent, meaningful consent into our technology, design, structures and discussions and our politics.

To summarize, my friends, I think it is a time for us to be braver, be bolder, and to demand what we want to demand, what we believe is right, and to up our efforts to keep the Internet an Internet that we love, an Internet that can transform our lives. And if there is anything we know about the Internet, it's that it always has amazing surprises for us.

Finally, I want to name, I was asked to name a Civil Society colleague who was in IGF for a long time, Ronnie Coven from the World Press Freedom Committee, who is not with us anymore. Keep fighting for a free and open Internet. If you are not going to fight for it, we are going to lose it. Thank you.

  (cheering and applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much indeed. Our next speaker is Mr. Jimson Olufuye, chair of the African Information and Communication Technologies Alliance, AfiCTA. You are invited to take the rostrum.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Your Excellencies, distinguished stakeholder representatives, distinguished ladies and gentlemen. As was mentioned, my name is Jimson Olufuye. I'm the chair of the concerned private sector-led Africa ICT Alliance, AfiCTA, founded in 2012, and currently with member associations and companies in 23 African countries.

Our vision is the fulfillment of the promise of the digital age for everyone in Africa. We are a member of the Chamber of Commerce Business Action Support of the Information Society, which is the global business focal point for constructive engagement on WSIS and the IGF.

It is my pleasure, therefore, to deliver this message on behalf of ICC BASIS.

We have come to a crucial moment for the future of Internet Governance, before the conclusion of the WSIS review process next month that will determine the fate of the IGF.

As we consider the future, we should acknowledge how far we have come in ten short years, and recognize the value of all the IGF has achieved in this time.

Across the range of IGF stakeholders, we have witnessed strong support for the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. We are pleased to see the support translate to the WSIS draft document as a proposal to extend the IGF mandate for another ten years. It is now vital to maintain momentum and continue to develop ways for the IGF to add value across all stakeholder communities, and to ensure that the future IGF mandates are adhered to in a way that preserve and protect all the things that have made this unique Forum a huge success.

Sincerely speaking, Your Excellency, we are not here to negotiate. Dialogue, unconstrained by negotiation of a text, is an essential element of the IGF. We come together to freely share experiences, ideas and practices. This helps form inputs to policy and practice development in other organizations and across geographies.

We come to pool our views and good practices, so that every community can better understand the needs and ideas of others.

We meet so that no individual or group misses out from these benefits, or from expressing their own views that may help others form their own ideas.

We are here to build two-way bridges that inform policymakers and enable the further beneficial use of these ideas and practices.

Everyone at the IGF benefits from hearing different perspectives from every vantage point. This approach has received widespread support from the Internet stakeholders represented here, who recognize the value of collaborating on an equal footing and in an open and free environment. This approach is not only a requirement for a sustainable Internet, but one to leverage for achieving Sustainable Development Goals, for improving people's living standards, human rights and for ensuring good governance.

Looking ahead, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, we must strive to build on the strengths of the IGF. We must wrap up our collective effort to reach more people in more regions particularly in developing and least developed economies. This effort will expose those in developing or remote regions to the elements of the IGF that can best serve their needs. In turn, it will also enrich our discussions.

The engagements of regional and national IGFs in countries including Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Paraguay, Mexico, Costa Rica, and the innovative sub Senate IGF that took place in Nigeria about last week, are tangible success stories from this annual meeting which should be sustained. We have already seen the benefits of this two-way communication. The IGF is a Forum not about the future of the IGF, but about the future of the Internet itself. The Internet is here to stay.

But it can only thrive if we continue to pursue the evolving, multistakeholder process, the process based on principles of collaboration, openness, transparency and inclusiveness.

Again this approach is necessary for a sustainable Internet. Across stakeholders, it is also considered a valued tool for improving governance and human rights for sustainable development. We truly look forward to securing the future of the IGF, so we can meet again in Mexico next year to continue the conversation we have started and to benchmark progress.

This will allow us to focus discussions on ways to, one, expedite access for the remaining unconnected 4.3 billion; two, to narrow access gaps in relation to gender and disabilities; and three, to exploit the full potential of ICTs and the Internet for social and economic development and progress.

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, finally, I'd like to say that on behalf of the global business community represented here, it is my pleasure, deep pleasure, with sincere and gracious thanks, we appreciate the Government and people of Brazil, and the IGF Secretariat, UNDESA and all those involved in making this event a success and for the hospitality you have shown to us. Obrigado.

  (applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much for your remarks.

It is now my privilege to call upon Professor Hartmut Glaser, to say a few words about the youth at IGF program and to introduce our young next speaker. Professor Glaser, you and your guest are invited to take the rostrum.

>> HARTMUT GLASER: Last year in Istanbul, we have the idea to include more young people in our IGF meetings. We have a kid, children with 14 years, in Istanbul. We developed a project, CGI and ISOC chapter in Latin America together. And you will see some nice interviews on a video. But before, I'd like to introduce Kimberly. She was selected by our 73 to be the speaker at this moment.

  (applause).

>> KIMBERLY: Hello. My name is Kimberly. I'm from Brazil. I'm part of the Youth of IGF program for Latin America and Caribbean, together with the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee. I turned 20 years old this year. This means I carry with me the whole development of Internet Governance in my countries. As my

fellows with the youth program, I was born when the Internet was already running. And we watched the Internet grow around us from waiting for our own video game to actually run to sharing our first viral video, downloading our favorite series and creating the next innovative app. For us, all that was natural.

We were born and raised based on the open Internet, built on the collaboration of great women and men, some of them that are here today. We are native youngsters from the Internet environment, and not afraid of change, nor of the future.

Since we were not there during the Internet in its beginning, we are not attached to old fears raised in the process; therefore, we are transforming the Internet promises that were not fulfilled into new solutions. That is why we are here today, conquering space in the IGF, letting our voices be heard, aiming for more interaction and youth participation within IGF sessions. We are living the youth declaration and building a Youth Observatory. We maintain the need for open, collaborative Internet. We value privacy and freedom of expression, and we fight for gender equality inside the Internet system. We are fighting for the real and full connection of both our generation and next ones.

Specifically, we Brazilians are also fighting for the maintenance of the democracy view. The youth is coming to IGF. As Vint Cerf said, the Internet was designed to change. We are the ones changing it. Therefore, we want to see the youth actively engage in every IGF to come. Quoting my fellow friends, we are not the future, we are here. We are already present. Obrigada.

(cheering and applause).

>> The video, please.

(video playing).

(no English interpretation).

>> Let me ask the 73 young students from Brazil and Latin America, please stand up and give applause.

(no English interpretation of video).

>> VINT CERF: If we don't take their ideas into account, whatever Government principles we might adopt will fail to capture what they know or what they do. If we fail to do that, eventually, whatever rules we make up won't be relevant.

(video continues, no English interpretation).

(video ends).

(cheering and applause).

>> HARTMUT GLASER: As I am on the floor, I will mention how hard it is to work to do the preparation of a conference as IGF. You saw around a lot of yellow shirts, green shirts, probably other colors. I only like to mention that more than 400 people worked full time to support everything that you received this week here in Joao Pessoa.

The secret of any event is never one person. It is a teamwork. IGF is the best model that we can work together. For me it was a privilege to coordinate more than 400 people supported by CGI, supported by ISOC, supported by you. We are friends.

Let's stay together, and see a one-minute video now. Please, the next video.

(video plays).

>> HARTMUT GLASER: Thank you very much!

(applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much indeed, Professor Glaser, for your remarks, the videos presented, and a very special thanks to you, Kimberly, for all of those you represent. You are not the future, you are the present. Thank you very much.

  (applause).

I would now like to call to take the rostrum our prospective hosts for the 2016 Internet Governance Forum, certainly pending on an extension that we all expect to happen in the month of December. Ms. Yolanda Martinez, Head of the Digital Government Unit of the Secretariat of Public Administration of Mexico, welcome.

  (applause).

>> YOLANDA MARTINEZ: Wow. If there is one word that I can use to describe what I witnessed the entire week, that word is passion; the passion from all the multistakeholder IGF community that believes in the principles and values that gather us together, as well as the passion of all the people behind the scenes that work very hard to make sure that we have food, transportation, a smile when we arrive into an airport after 20 hours of traveling. It is amazing.

And this is why, first of all, I would like to congratulate all the hard work and passion of Host Country Brazil, the Governor and people of Paraiba, UNDESA, CGI, and the IGF Secretariat, all the volunteers, and the multistakeholder IGF community, that together made possible this great IGF.

  (applause).

Openness, inclusion, Cybersecurity, privacy, open data, gender equality, net neutrality, and more, were common themes over the last four days' conversations, within the main sessions, Dynamic Coalitions, best practices forums, and workshops.

This is a conversation that in our opinion should continue, and we really hope that the mandate is renewed this coming December, since there is still a lot to be done in making sure that Internet remains open, free, neutral and governed by a multistakeholder participatory model.

Internet is the most powerful tool we have to democratize access to information, to public services, to enable human rights, to promote freedom of expression, in short is the most valuable asset to end digital poverty, to create more equal societies, to make the 2030 Sustainable Agenda feasible, and where no one shall be left behind of the benefits of an Information Society.

Mexico is committed to IGF principles and values. We have innovated our legal framework with a telecommunications reform that not only recognizes access to broadband Internet and ICTs as a fundamental constitutional right, we have been making this right a reality through increasing competition in the telecommunications sector, the deployment of Telecom infrastructure, and establishment of a Universal Digital Inclusion Policy as an obligation of the state.

We continue working in an innovative and collaborative way in important matters such as Internet Governance, net neutrality, privacy and data protection.

If the mandate is renewed by the United Nations General Assembly, we are ready to host all of you and more in Mexico. As the beginning of a new IGF era, we need more actors from all of the stakeholders coming from least developed and developing countries to join this conversation. We need more women, more persons with disabilities, more elder, more indigenous people, and more youth to come and join this Forum. See you all in Mexico, 2016.

(applause).

(Video:)

>> Something big is happening in Mexico. Mexicans have made a bold decision to transform all of the country's main structures. In 2013, 11 key reforms which allow us to achieve our maximum potential were enacted and are now being implemented. Among those, telecommunications reform is the cornerstone to insert Mexico into the Information Society and the one that is allowing us to build an ecosystem in which the cyberspace, Internet and ICTs become true enablers of our development goals. For Mexico, cyberspace means limitless potential, for growth, innovation, education, health and citizen participation, among other goals. To achieve these goals, we aim to use the Internet and cross-hand tools to drive the nations and people's development, a tool which means freedom of expression, privacy, data protection are fully guaranteed, at the same time that we protect crucial information for governments, citizens and organizations.

Mexico celebrates that the Internet Governance Forum is focusing in the principles in which the Internet has been founded, a global network that is free, neutral, open and decentralized, principles previously convened in the Geneva and Tunis World Summit on the Information Society agendas. Over the last two years, Mexico has led key digital trails that are relevant worldwide. The open Government partnership, digital agenda for the Latin America and the Caribbean region, the international open data Charter as enabler of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, and we will host the OECD ministerial on the digital economy in 2016. As a result of the transformation that Mexico is witnessing, our country is the ideal place to discuss the future of the Internet Governance of the next global Forum in 2016.

We are ready to welcome all of you in Mexico, as we are proud to offer ourselves to host this important event because today, a common understanding in a global context of the opportunity provided by the governance of the Internet demands a new dialogue. We are ready to welcome you at the 2016 Internet Governance Forum.

  (end of video).

  (applause).

>> JOSE ANTONIO MARCONDES de CARVLAHO: Thank you very much indeed, Ms. Martinez.

We shall all be in Mexico next year, but in New York we will formally hand you the baton of the IGF hosting country. Thank you very much.

  (applause).

I would now like to revert to my mother tongue to deliver our closing remarks.

Brazil, Brazilian Government, is honored for having hosted for the second time the Internet Governance Forum. I thank deeply for the hospitality of the Brazilian State Government here represented by its Governor. Without the support, this event would not have been possible. Thank you very much, Mr. Governor.

  (applause).

We are deeply convinced that the Forum in Joao Pessoa has exceeded the expectations when it provided us a rich debate and exchange of experiences regarding some of the most important topics related to Internet Governance.

Thousands of people around the world have followed the words of this Forum through remote hubs or their personal computers.

Along the last five days, more than 2500 representatives from the Government, Civil Society, private sector, international bodies, international organizations, and the technical academic communities could exchange their point of view about different topics such as right to privacy, digital economy, openness, digital inclusion, safety and security, Cybersecurity and other topics.

Along these lines, we must acknowledge that 2015 IGF was most of all a great celebration of multistakeholder principles. Just like NETMundial, which occurred in Sao Paulo in April 2015, IGF 2015 was a clear demonstration that the global community can organize itself collectively and promote debates that will have a very great importance for the future of Internet Democratic governance. IGF in Joao Pessoa has also contributed a lot of steps forward, like the report on policy options for Connecting the Next Billion, together with the outcomes from the best practice forums, BPFs and Dynamic Coalitions has shown that IGF can still evolve and produce tangible outputs, that it can, thus, have a more substantial impact on the future evolution of Internet.

Also, regarding public policies, Joao Pessoa so far also convenes an unequivocal message about the importance of IGF's legitimacy, and its relevance, and how relevant its continuity is. As we all know, in little more than a month, we will have in New York a meeting, high level meeting of the UN assembly, in order to review the ten years of WSIS, World Social Information Society, WSIS+10. In this context Brazil is very honored with the presence in Joao Pessoa of co-facilitators for the negotiators for this important outcome document, which will be adopted in the meeting in New York.

We believe that the participation of the co-facilitators and their request for us to provide a summary of the discussions here established to be distributed as an additional input to the people in New York for the meeting. We are sure this will contribute to enrich and strengthen difference of opinions in the process of reviewing WSIS. In light of the discussions kept at Joao Pessoa, we are very confident that the international community will strengthen its conviction regarding IGF's maintenance as a Forum for dialogue and for discussions. This is the reason why we are very convinced that this feeling regarding the IGF shall prevail in New York's meeting, and that in 2016, all of us together with our Mexican friends will be able to have yet another celebration of this Forum.

I echo the words of thanks that have been proffered to all of those that contributed to this Forum, through Professor Hartmut Glaser, Executive Secretary of CGI. Without his diligent action, his knowledge and his leadership, this Forum would not have been as successful as it was.

And on behalf of the Brazilian Government and of President Dilma Rousseff, I make this public acknowledgment to all through you, Professor Glaser, to all our friends who participated in this meeting, all the UN friends who came to this event to support us, and also our thanks to all of those who worked at this meeting, the volunteers included.

  (applause).

With their participation, they made this 10th issue of IGF a meeting that was effectively memorable. Thank you very much on behalf of the Brazilian Government, for the participation of all of you. And with these words, I would like to defer to English to close the 10th Internet Governance Forum. See you all in New York and later next year in Mexico!

Thank you all for coming!

Glossary of Internet Governance Terms

AfriNIC	Regional Registry for Internet Number Resources for Africa (Member of NRO)
APC	Association for Progressive Communication
ASCII	American Standard Code for Information Interchange; seven-bit encoding of the Roman alphabet
ccTLD	Country code top-level domain, such as .gr (Greece), .br (Brazil) or .in (India)

CoE	Council of Europe
CSIRTs	Computer Security Incident Response Teams
DNS	Domain name system: translates domain names into IP addresses
DRM	Digital Rights Management
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
ETNO	European Telecommunications Networks Operators Association
F/OSS	Free and Open Source Software
GAC	Governmental Advisory Committee (to ICANN)
gTLD	Generic top-level domain, such as .com, .int, .net, .org, .info
IANA	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
ICANN	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICC/BASIS	ICC Business Action to Support the Information Society.
ICT	Information and communication technology
ICT4D	Information and communication technology for development
IDN	Internationalized domain names: Web addresses using a non-ASCII character set
IETF	Internet Engineering Task Force
IGF	Internet Governance Forum
IGOs	Intergovernmental organizations
IP	Internet Protocol
IP Address	Internet Protocol address: a unique identifier corresponding to each computer or device on an IP network. Currently there are two types of IP addresses in active use. IP version 4 (IPv4) and IP version 6 (IPv6). IPv4 (which uses 32 bit numbers) has been used since 1983 and is still the most commonly used version. Deployment of the IPv6 protocol began in 1999. IPv6 addresses are 128-bit numbers.
IPRs	Intellectual property rights
IPv4	Version 4 of the Internet Protocol
IPv6	Version 6 of the Internet Protocol
IRA	International Reference Alphabet
ISOC	Internet Society
ISP	Internet Service Provider
ITAA	Information Technology Association of America
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
IXPs	Internet exchange points
LACNIC	Latin American and Caribbean Internet Addresses Registry (Member of NRO)
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAPs	Network access points
NGN	Next generation network
NRO	Number Resource Organization, grouping all RIRs – see below
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

Registrar	A body approved ('accredited') by a registry to sell/register domain names on its behalf.
Registry	A registry is a company or organization that maintains a centralized registry database for the TLDs or for IP address blocks (e.g. the RIRs — see below). Some registries operate without registrars at all and some operate with registrars but also allow direct registrations via the registry.
RIRs	Regional Internet registries. These not-for-profit organizations are responsible for distributing IP addresses on a regional level to Internet service providers and local registries.
Root servers	Servers that contain pointers to the authoritative name servers for all TLDs. In addition to the "original" 13 root servers carrying the IANA managed root zone file, there are now large number of Anycast servers that provide identical information and which have been deployed worldwide by some of the original 12 operators.
Root zone file	Master file containing pointers to name servers for all TLDs
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
TLD	Top-level domain (see also ccTLD and gTLD)
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WGIG	Working Group on Internet Governance
WHOIS	WHOIS is a transaction oriented query/response protocol that is widely used to provide information services to Internet users. While originally used by most (but not all) TLD Registry operators to provide "white pages" services and information about registered domain names, current deployments cover a much broader range of information services, including RIR WHOIS look-ups for IP address allocation information.
WSIS	World Summit on Information Society
WITSA	World Information Technology and Services Alliance
WTO	World Trade Organization

The IGF's tenth annual meeting took place during an important time for not only the future of Internet governance and the IGF in the ongoing process of reviewing the progress made on the World Summit on Information Society (WSIS) outcomes, but also for making sure that Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and the Internet will support and help to enable the recently adopted 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The tenth annual meeting of the IGF was held from the 10th to the 13th of November 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil. More than 2,400 registered participants from over 116 countries attended the meeting, with thousands more actively participating online. The overarching theme for IGF 2015 was: 'Evolution of Internet Governance: Empowering Sustainable Development'.

Part 2: Transcripts of the Proceedings contains edited transcripts from all of the high-level main sessions that took place during the 4-day meeting, as have been traditionally presented by the Secretariat since the first edition of the IGF proceedings. Transcripts of the High-Level Opening Ceremony, Opening Session and Closing Ceremony are also included. Transcripts contain both verbatim records of participants who spoke in English as well as English translations of those who spoke in one of the other UN official languages and Portuguese.

IGF Internet Governance Forum