

Final report

LACIGF - 2017



Panama City – August 2 to 4, 2017

Table of Contents

Background	3
Program Committee.....	3
Government Representatives:	3
Private Sector Representatives:	4
Civil Society Representatives: j	4
Representatives of the Technical Internet Community:.....	4
Agenda.....	4
Topic: Digital Economy	5
Topic: Internet Governance and Human Rights.....	8
Topic: Cybersecurity: progress, setbacks, challenges and trends from a Human Rights perspective.....	14
Topic: Access concerns: Beyond connectivity, what we need to connect more users - Challenges to promote Competition in the Digital Environment.....	18
Topic: Local Spaces for Internet Governance Dialogue: Progress in the Various Discussions..	21
Topic: Internet in Panama in the next five years.	23

Background

The drive for the creation of the Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Internet Governance Forum was led by LACNIC, NUPEF, and APC. The goal of the Forum was to help identify relevant and priority topics for Latin America and the Caribbean to be considered and discussed at the Internet Governance Forum and to promote the regional community's participation in those debates, thus bringing discussions closer to the region.

All LACIGF's meetings were organized following the same model, seeking to improve the quality and horizontal nature of the discussions as well as to increase participation. A key element in achieving this goal has been –and continues to be– the Financial Assistance Program, which guarantees that a large number of regional stakeholders are able to obtain the financial support they need to attend the meeting.

Program Committee

The forum's Program Committee was created, a multistakeholder coordination group comprising representatives of the various actors and aimed at managing the process in representation of the Latin American and Caribbean community.

The Program Committee is the forum's general coordination body and is made up by 3 members appointed by each of the following interest groups:

- Regional organizations representing the private sector.
- Latin American and Caribbean government representatives, appointed according to the eLAC follow-up mechanism.
- Civil Society organizations.
- Regional organizations representing the technical Internet community.

Each sector plans its own course of action and selects its representatives based on its own criteria.

For 2017, the Program Committee was made up as follows:

Government Representatives:

- Chile: Denis González / Unidad de Relaciones Internacionales (SUBTEL)
- Mexico: Jimena Sierra / Instituto Federal de Telecomunicaciones (IFT)
- Uruguay: Alejandra Erramuspe / Agencia de Gobierno electrónico y Sociedad de la Información y del Conocimiento (AGESIC)

Private Sector Representatives:

- ALAI (Latin American Internet Association): Gonzalo Navarro.
- ASIET (Ibero-American Association of Telecommunication Companies): Andrés Sastre.

Civil Society Representatives:

- APC (Asociacion para el Progreso de las Comunicaciones) / Valeria Betancourt.
- Derechos Digitales (DD) / María Paz Canales
- ADC (Asociacion para el Derecho de las Comunicaciones) / Valeria Milanés

Representatives of the Technical Internet Community:

- ICANN: (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) / Rodrigo de la Parra.
- ISOC (Internet Society) / Sebastián Bellagamba.
- LACTLD (Latin American and Caribbean TLD Association) / Eduardo Santoyo.

The current Program Committee has begun discussions to establish mechanisms for deciding the Committee's composition and how its members will be renewed. These discussions are open to the entire regional community and the mechanisms are expected to be approved during this year's LACIGF meeting. Among other aspects, these mechanisms should establish number of members representing each stakeholder group and the process for their selection and renewal, as well as the Committee's attributions.

In addition to appointing the Program Committee, it was also necessary to assign the role of Secretariat in order to have a stable structure that would support the process over the years and to cooperate with meeting logistics in close consultation with the Program Committee.

The Secretariat has been entrusted to the Internet Address Registry for Latin America and the Caribbean (LACNIC), one of the three process's founding organizations.

Agenda

The process to define the agenda issues for the LACIGF was done through an open public consultation where the participants rated the relevance of the topics identified as important to discuss within the forum.

In this sense, several topics of discussion with panelists were defined by the program committee, where the progress and challenges of each of these topics were analyzed under an environment of multiple stakeholders.

Some of the topics discussed are:

Topic: Digital Economy

Panelists: Gonzalo Navarro (ALAI); Guillermo Cruz, Eli Fashka (CAPATEC); Kemly Camacho (Sula Batsú); Javier Pallero (Access Now); Víctor Martínez (Federal Telecommunications Institute -IFT- MX)

Moderator: Melisa Gorondy Novak – LACTLD

Rapporteur/Remote Moderator: Carlos Guerrero

First Round: The moderator asked panelists to express their views on the digital economy and what it implies within the framework of Internet governance.

- Gonzalo Navarro: For the past 15 years there have been discussions on the implications of the Internet on the economy, and although progress has been made, much remains to be done. The regional regulatory framework is asymmetrical, lacking coherence and harmonization to be effective. It is paramount to envision a friendly and relatively consistent regulatory framework in the region in order to promote the digital economy. As an example, Uruguay has recently signed a modern treaty which includes innovative clauses regulating intermediary liability, data protection, harmonization of customs regulations and e-commerce.

- Guillermo Cruz: There is great potential for digital economy in the region. However, the issue of productivity in digital environments prompts us to think of ways to improve certain aspects, such as competition and capacity building. There are several examples of other countries seizing these opportunities. Finally, it is necessary to consolidate digital industries in our countries which generate innovation and become global stakeholders offering digital goods and services.

- Eli Fashka: Education is vital for the promotion and growth of the digital economy. Education requires work at multiple levels, including Higher Education, but above all, on technical courses that are shorter than regular

5-year degrees. To that end, universities in Panama have reevaluated their syllabi.

- Kemly Camacho: In Latin America the digital economy is dynamic and growing. It is a concentrated digital economy and one of the possibilities is that education plays a key role in the decentralization of the digital economy. The digital economy goes beyond digital business models and technology consumption. An inclusive digital economy requires an appropriation of business models, as well as technologies and algorithms. Staff specialization falls within the competence of local businesses (SMEs) and large corporations alike. In addition, women in the technology sector must be included in the construction of technology, particularly excluded populations.

- Javier Pallero: Regulatory challenges with regard to digital economy are still unresolved issues in the region. A digital economy cannot exist without minimum respect for the rule of law. The challenge of connectivity (digital divide): What kind of Internet do we want for these future creators and consumers of digital economy? Rights such as freedom of expression, personal data protection or net neutrality need to be reinforced. Government transparency and efficiency must be a priority. Mass government surveillance of activists affects trust in the system as a whole, including the digital economy.

- Victor Martinez: A new strategy that includes institutional changes is required to promote different digital roles. In Mexico, IFT has been commissioned to grant spectrum concessions for different indigenous groups in order to promote access based on their specific needs. This allows people to connect and promotes the digital economy. Consultation processes have taken place within the regulatory model for concessions. Currently, the government coordinates a national digital strategy which includes the digital economy as a core issue in order to promote digital growth in the region.

Second Round: The moderator asked panelists to discuss the social impact of the digital economy and how they expect it will transform work and social relations, among other aspects of life.

- Gonzalo Navarro: The Internet is a catalyst and a platform for development. Through the Internet, social development is strengthened and progress

towards inclusion is made. In Chile, 100% of companies with Internet presence are exporters. There are similar efforts in Mexico, Peru and Colombia. Regulatory efforts in the region regarding business models and the digital economy are diverse. There are examples such as the Pacific Alliance and its different components. We need to shift from an Internet of consumption to an Internet of creation.

- Guillermo Cruz: The development of the digital economy within an environment of commercial and economic integration may be an advantage for our region (Latin America). As the region moves forward, all countries will benefit in terms of income and social satisfaction.

- Eli Fashka: Most companies in Panama are SMEs, usually due to a lack of funding. The digital economy will bring success and funding for these companies. It is crucial to promote knowledge and tools. There is great need for small business ventures to solve local issues. Economic integration, the movement of people and capital will be consequences of proper development.

- Kemly Camacho: Implementing the multistakeholder model is crucial to obtain favorable dividends in the digital economy. Inclusive development of countries with regard to the digital economy is a matter which still needs to be addressed. Multistakeholder discussion of critical issues is a necessity.

- Javier Pallero: Transparency and participation of the various stakeholders are essential for a favorable social environment. An unresolved issue is the application of the multistakeholder model in different spaces and not merely to Internet governance issues. The impact is potentially negative unless certain aspects such as telecommunications regulations, data protection and cybersecurity are re-examined.

- Victor Martinez: The international dimension of the digital economy needs to be reevaluated. Governments must facilitate investment and deployment. It is now the private sector's turn to invest to move forward. Users must generate and consume the digital economy on the Internet. The ecosystem needs to build trust and also a functioning and adequate multistakeholder model.

Topic: Internet Governance and Human Rights.

Panelists: Juliana Soto (Fundación Karisma); Carlos Britos (R3D); Maricarmen Sequera (TEDIC); Marina Pita (Intervozes); Joana Varon (Coding Rights); Martha Roldós (Fundación Mil Hojas).

Moderator: Melisa Gorondy Novak – LACTLD

Rapporteur: Fátima Cambroneró

1. Pyraweb – Paraguay - Maricarmen Sequera – TEDIC

Traffic data is being retained.

Mass surveillance through IP addresses.

Providers are keeping connection data for more than 12 months.

They have formed alliances with international organizations.

Rejected by the House of Representatives. Could not be discussed by the Senate.

Discuss standards such as personal data and other standards for companies.

A campaign for the return of Pyraweb was launched in 2017.

There is evidence that governments have purchased surveillance software.

Biometric data are being processed but there are no policies governing how they are treated.

Joint campaign with another organization.

2. Sharing is not a crime. Case of Diego Gómez, Colombia - Juliana Soto

Diego Gómez uploaded a thesis he found online to Script. This action resulted in criminal charges for sharing knowledge on the Internet. He quoted the author, he was not driven by profit, he simply believed it would be beneficial for his classmates.

This affects the right to education, access to culture, freedom of expression, and due process (he was led to self-incriminate).

Regional importance: Diego was not reported by a major publisher. He was reported by a colleague dealing with a local issue. This may

set a bad precedent for the issue of access to knowledge in Colombia and the region.

The case also shows the need to update copyright laws, fair use, and lack of proportionality.

Diego was acquitted this past May (2017). The first instance ruling recognized that the document he uploaded was already available online, that the action was not driven by profit, and that there was no intention to harm the author, but simply to share some information. Sharing is a common practice in academic environments.

The author of the thesis appealed this resolution and the process may continue.

They prepared a campaign titled “Sharing is not crime.”

They continue to work on this campaign.

3. *Government espionage and the systematic violation of the human rights of journalists and human rights activists in Mexico* - Carlos Brito – R3D

They have documented the issue of mass surveillance.

“If you want security, you will have to give up your privacy.”

Surveillance is out of control.

There are discrepancies between data obtained from the authorities and the CJF (judiciary).

Transparency reports prepared by telecommunication companies do not match or else they report “others.”

Requests are not based on court orders.

Companies always issue requests without a court order (Telcel).

In most cases where information is requested, no judicial proceedings are initiated.

Illegal surveillance in Mexico is also out of control.

Hacking Team: Mexico is their main customer.

They sell to authorities through intermediaries who are not authorized to conduct surveillance.

Government espionage: Citizen Lab report. Targets include journalists, scientists, etc.

Surveillance is systematic. Common infrastructure, same domain for everyone, same text.

NSO malware attacks.

SEDENA NSO client: does not have powers for surveillance.

There is absolutely no control over this. Number of crimes detected. There is a demand for a clear investigation to determine responsibilities.

4. Censorship of social network content in Brazil - Marina Pita - Intervozes

Cultural rights on the Internet.

The National Library Foundation (Fundación Biblioteca Nacional) with ties to the Brazilian Ministry of Culture published on their Facebook account images of natives, including those of a bare-breasted woman. These images were removed from the Ministry's webpage and there was no notification provided by Facebook.

The Ministry submitted complaints to Facebook. Facebook replied that no nude images are allowed and that the images had been removed because of that rule.

The Ministry made the situation public. They published them again and again and Facebook would continue to remove them.

This violates:

- The promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions
- Freedom of expression
- The Internet Civil Framework
- Brazilian cultural heritage

Impact:

- Questioning of cultural autonomy as well as the capacities of the State within this environment
- The Ministry of Culture brought the case before the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

- Broad discussion on cultural rights

Questions:

- Public order vs. private applications?
- What are the limits to the terms and conditions of the application?
- Which is the most appropriate place for dealing with these issues?
- Must companies respect human rights?

5. Online violence, privacy, and freedom of expression - Joana Varon – Coding Rights

The Anti-Surveillance Bureau reported several cases.

- Black female blogger
 - Involved in the black movement. Published a photo on Facebook as a fat, black, lesbian woman. Men commented attacking her for these attributes. Her Facebook account was blocked.
 - Blogger, professor and feminist, attacked. Men were offering rewards to have her killed. They were reported to the police, the police know who they are, yet nothing has been done.
 - Miro, trans activist. Photographs of her performance. These photos reverberated through social networks. Photo montages were used aggressively.
- Chupadatos

The government is trying to address these issues. Bills dealing with gender rights have been drafted.

Systemic issues, how to advocate for these issues (activism), how to continue with the counter-discourse, transparency, how to enforce existing laws, etc.

6. Use of DMCA in Ecuador - Martha Roldós, Fundación Mil Hojas

Internet as a space for people to exercise their rights.

Many journalists and social activists had to migrate to the Internet to publish their research.

What the government did was to start using the United States Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). In Ecuador, everything was placed under copyright protection (the president's image, government logos, etc.).

Thus, any publication which, for example, criticized someone and had a photo of the president was required to be downloaded because of infringement of copyright of the president's photograph.

This was replicated in other countries.

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act was abused to limit freedom of expression, etc.

Multisectoral Panel

Panelists: Sebastián Bellagamba (Internet Society ISOC); Agustina del Campo (CELE, Argentina); Thiago Braz (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil); Adela Goberna (ALAI).

Moderator: Valeria Betancourt (Association for Progressive Communications APC).

Purpose of the panel: To address the scope and implications of human rights and the consequences of certain practices.

Types of responses needed to counteract limitations to the exercise of human rights.

- Sebastián Bellagamba: The Internet must enable the exercise of human rights.

ISOC's mission: To promote Internet use and development for the benefit of all people throughout the world.

The Internet should be open and for the benefit of all people. We must preserve the Internet for the exercise of human rights.

The IETF develops Internet protocols and standards. By default, browsers are not encrypted (ie, without security). The IETF is working on protocols that incorporate encryption.

We should enjoy the same rights online as we do offline. The exercise of our rights online must be guaranteed.

Another guiding principle: openness. Important components: privacy and security.

Technical restrictions must not prevent the exercise of our rights online.

Game between security and privacy: balance must be maintained. One thing does not necessarily go against the other. There is no zero-sum game between the two.

We must generate a framework for open, multistakeholder dialogue and discuss these basic guiding principles.

Challenges: content blocking and weakening of encryption.

- Agustina del Campo: There are major three cross-cutting issues:

1. Lack of access to public and private information. Follow-up on supervising and monitoring existing legislation.
2. Lack of access to information: many laws are not enforced. Relevant in cases of surveillance.
3. Cases of censorship, self-regulation of platforms. Regional standards are not reflected in global policies or terms and conditions.

What can academia do about this?

1. Offer training for judges, regulators, legislators, etc.
2. Regional research. There are few regional initiatives to analyze these issues. Little reflection on global issues from a regional perspective.

- Thiago Braz: The government has an important role in listening to the positions that are presented, so when they return to their countries they can share what they have learned with the different actors.

From the point of view of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it is important to protect privacy in digital environments. The same rights people have offline must also be protected online.

Jurisdiction and censorship are also important issues. In the case of Facebook, global rules were followed. Under local legislation this is perceived as censorship.

- Adela Goberna: The problem poses tension between different rights (intellectual property and privacy, freedom of expression and access to information).

Chile: Right to infringe copyright. Might be a solution. Also court decisions.

Rights should be balanced.

Importance of court orders to be able to make these decisions.

Importance of transparency reports.

This includes self-regulation, which also implies user participation.

In general, expedited systems should exist to settle cases where there is international consensus that rights have been violated.

Once again, stress the importance of court orders.

Issues:

- Protect users
- Mechanisms for the exercise of rights

The Internet is the exact conclusion of these two rights.

Tension because something that is global requires local solutions.

Conclusion: encryption. The issue of jurisdiction will not be solved for the moment. Mechanisms for the exercise of rights. Company transparency reports. Importance of cooperation at multilateral and multijurisdictional level. Training for judges and legislators.

Topic: Cybersecurity: progress, setbacks, challenges and trends from a Human Rights perspective.

Panelists: Martín Borgioli (Hiperderecho); Shernon Osepa (Internet Society ISOC); Maureen Hernandez (Internet Society ISOC Venezuela); Ernesto Ibarra (Presidency/MX); Maria Cristina Capelo (Facebook).

Moderator: Diego Morales – IPANDETEC

Rapporteur: Alejandra Erramuspe – AGESIC Uruguay

Remote Moderator: Youth LACIGF

The aim of this roundtable is to encourage dynamic, interactive dialogue to assess both the priorities and the implications of cybersecurity in our region, in its various dimensions: technology, Human Rights, governments and other stakeholders' roles.

There is still a long way to go with regard to building trust, managing cyber threats, sharing local experiences and offering capacity building models. The need to align cybersecurity policies and strategies within the international Human Rights framework remains one of the key issues and further multistakeholder discussion regarding the matter is needed.

Cybersecurity is still present in the LACIGF agenda, as well as in local and global discussions regarding internet governance. For the past few years, we have focused on surveillance and privacy issues when talking about cybersecurity. Recently, there has been a growing trend in our region of cases of limiting access or shutting down the Internet, limitations on anonymity, encryption and indiscriminate expansion of surveillance, often invoking reasons of national security.

Session Structure

- Roundtable
- 3 key questions, each with 2 minutes for each speaker, including questions and comments from the audience.

Key questions

- Which has been the most important cybersecurity progress, setback or challenge in the region?
- What is the current scenario with regard to Internet restrictions and shutdowns?
- How will users' trust in the Internet affect the future of the Internet?
- What examples of good practices in cybersecurity do we have in the region?
- Which areas should the region work on in order to ensure that cybersecurity policies and practices take into account the recommendations of UN and OAS rapporteurs as well as existing international frameworks?
- Which would be the most effective way of counteracting the tendency of governments to apply restrictions or shut down the Internet?
- How can we advance in building trust in the internet? What can LAC do to create an environment that will strengthen Internet trust?

Panel Discussion

The moderator began by presenting the main progress and greatest setbacks regarding cybersecurity in the region and how far it is possible to go.

It was pointed out that the main progress is that different voices are being increasingly included. Also, that participatory models have contributed to these issues being better addressed, not only with regard to technology, but also with regard to cultural and legal aspects.

The main setback observed in the region is the emergence of mass surveillance. It is hypocritical to demand a multistakeholder approach to solve this problem. We must acknowledge our responsibility and ask ourselves what we are doing to improve our cybersecurity.

Attention must be paid to Human Rights issues: privacy, freedom of expression, the right to search for and receive information. A crucial point in this regard is that we are seeing the blocking of Internet content, something that must be avoided.

One aspect to consider is the blocking of content. ISOC is working on this. Governments often want to put an end to certain things that can happen online. These web phenomena include gambling, the violation of intellectual property rights, the protection of children and adolescents, and national security. ISOC may help find solutions to these issues.

Five types of blocking currently observed by ISOC:

- a. Blocking at IP address or protocol level: addresses can be included on a list and blocked.
- b. Deep packet inspection with specific attack techniques.
- c. URL: knowing the location of the information.
- d. Platform biz: Search engines. Google for example. There's others.
- e. DNS blocking

It was suggested that we must take as a reference the suggestions of independent rapporteurs, which need to be heard. There are differences between what governments believe and what Human Rights organizations say.

Governments often collect information about their citizens without asking for authorization and without informing them. There has to be a purpose to these actions, and they must be in line with Human Rights.

Civil society argues that it is difficult to speak of trust in a context of violation of rights. Participation of civil society needs to occur within a reliable framework. At present, such trust does not exist.

A good practice which can be exported to the region is to address cybersecurity with a strategic vision, as a tool for the development of innovation. To promote the adoption of these exercises in collaboration, not only in planning, but also in the implementation of cybersecurity strategies. Cybersecurity challenges are global, so we all need to work together.

We need to aim at building trust. In order to build trust, the paradigm that cybersecurity is "dark" must be abandoned, we need to demystify it, so that users

can keep their mind open and become aware of these issues. Such awareness may stem from knowledge of the tools.

Cybersecurity requires government to commit to defending the population not only from external threats but also in the adoption of technology.

We are not aware of the lack of security of many of the applications we use on a daily basis.

How can we build trust? Building trust is not easy. An open data system would be useful. In countries which collect data, there should be laws to protect such data. If there were more information on these issues, users would have greater confidence. Also more interaction to strengthen legislation and institutional frameworks. Before implementing any policies, before passing any legislation, it would be necessary to hold a discussion with civil society on the matter.

Moderator: Which conditions are you observing in the region that might damage trust?

The three levels of the Internet were discussed: infrastructure, DNS and applications. The need for a holistic solution and concrete measures was stressed.

It was mentioned that often users do not know when they are placing their security at risk, which is why it is necessary to work with the education system, so that users will be cautious. The actions of civil society play a key role in this regard.

Some politicians or policymakers are not trained in technology issues, which is why it is important that these stakeholders have the ability to give citizens the confidence they need. In past decades, the appearance of digital policies has created division with regard to the responsible use of the Internet and ICTs. It is therefore necessary to have an alliance of different stakeholders in order to influence this process. Internet governance initiatives developed in each country are important.

Further open and transparent work on these issues would help, as cooperation and co-responsibility bring greater value.

Audience Participation

- How do governments adopt public policies and what process do they use? Sometimes there is a lack of commitment on the part of governments. There is genuine concern about what is secure, what is private and what is open. We need encryption to protect data. How can governments integrate these concepts?

- Citizen participation and the construction of evidence that will allow public agencies to create a more appropriate public policy. Empowerment of civil society and academia as well as their participation, all part of a cycle constantly serving as input for public policy. Need to strengthen jurisdictional work.
- LACRALO: In Latin America we have a network of 52 organizations in 21 countries conducting training sessions for Internet end users. Given that governments do not issue guidelines, we need to do that ourselves, from the bottom up.
- Technology will help improve security. At the same time, it is important to work on the cultural aspect.
- Cybersecurity is presented as something “dark,” but this is not so. Cybersecurity needs a specific approach, a closer perspective.
- There is a personal data policy in force in Peru. It includes a police department for dealing with specifically these issues, as well as a CERT. There is a need for close cooperation, as cybersecurity needs to be addressed keeping everyone in mind.
- Often disregarded, online security for women and activists must be addressed.
- Users are not familiar with encryption and how it works.

Topic: Access concerns: Beyond connectivity, what we need to connect more users - Challenges to promote Competition in the Digital Environment.

Panelists: Pablo Ruidíaz (National Authority for Government Innovation AIG Panama); Joao Brant (Observacom); Oscar Robles (LACNIC); Andrés Sastre (ASIET); Renata Aquino (e.i.research); Denis González (Chilean Undersecretariat of Telecommunications)

Rapporteur: Jimena Sierra – Federal Telecommunications Institute (IFT), Mexico

Remote Moderator: Víctor Martínez, Federal Telecommunications Institute (IFT), Mexico

Representatives from AIG Panama and the Chilean Undersecretariat of Telecommunications (Government), Observacom (Civil Society), LACNIC (Technical Community) ASIET (Private Sector) and Academia shared their views —as representatives of each sector— on the public policies which should guide the resolution of emerging and persistent access challenges,

the role of new internet stakeholders in closing the digital divide, regulatory measures for promoting competition in the digital ecosystem, current regulations and the role of governments and regulators.

It was highlighted that the OECD report shows various trends in the digital economy (e.g., industrial consolidation in the telecommunications sector; convergence of fixed, mobile and broadcasting networks; and the emergence of zero-rating) and how these affect the potential for competition. According to the study *OECD Digital Economy Outlook*, policy makers have addressed these challenges to economic competition through regulatory tools such as the disaggregation of local facilities or measures such as structural or functional separation of operators. In other cases, governments have opted for public investment in networks, usually related to access requirements. According to the OECD report, Brazil —represented by Observacom— shared charts showing national connectivity, fixed and mobile broadband connections, neutral treatment of packets, and Internet fragmentation.

The panel focused on increasing digital connectivity, closing the digital divide, regulatory measures needed to foster innovation and competition in the digital environment, as well as on obstacles hindering effective competition in the digital ecosystem. The advantages that a competition policy offers final consumers, the role of regulation in guaranteeing effective competition with quality of service for consumers, and the principle of net neutrality were mentioned as part of the conditions for ensuring such competition.

Panelists agreed that the quality of connectivity and service are key elements for an active digital economy in the region, beyond the mere consumption of services. Moreover, during this session the private sector shared their outlook on how the region can close the digital, including

aspects such as connecting more users, and added that in order to do so, and in case of achieving progress on this issue, investment is needed, infrastructure needs to be improved, et cetera. This means it is necessary to digitize the economy. The importance of innovation in conjunction with regulation as a facilitator was highlighted.

The importance of governments as catalysts for the education of citizens was discussed. Training needs to be digitally inclusive to help communities develop their digital skills. When markets become productive it becomes a profitable business, and that may serve as incentive for operators to deploy infrastructure.

From civil society, reference was made to ITU percentages regarding barriers to interconnectivity, broadband, affordability, lack of devices, culture and access rules, inclusion of more vulnerable people and regions, as well as to the report on gender and access.

The technical sector talked about the unconnected, and it was mentioned that this does not always have to do with the economy but rather with simple geography, as is the case of islands or vulnerable societies located far from urban areas, isolation due to the economic level of people who cannot afford services, and isolation due to gender. This gap may be tackled through competition, for which cooperation strategies among all sectors shall prove helpful.

The Chilean government representative discussed language barriers and encouraging the creation of regional content. A project is being carried out in Chile to lay an underwater cable to China in order to lower prices and have another connectivity line.

As for regulation, several ways to achieve effective regulatory measures for pending challenges were mentioned, with each sector offering their point of view, not only on connecting the unconnected, but also on maintaining

those who are already connected. From the point of view of the private sector, the importance of creating quality content, complementary and non-substitution services was emphasized. The role of the regulator must be to facilitate cooperation.

Panama's government representative talked about the programs implemented with Internet providers (wholesale) and noted the need to revise the country's access points and thus solve the problem of points with no connectivity. One of the benefits of this program is that operators have achieved synergies by sharing last mile links and thus helping networks grow.

As for civil society, Internet programs for indigenous populations were mentioned and the importance of broad and diverse dialogue to create digital competition and increase access and global conditions was discussed. Likewise, the technical sector highlighted social networks and how they have made communication more attractive; they also discussed the needs of people, which facilitated access, without of course implying that this is the only purpose of the Internet. Regulation needs to analyze the discussion models adopted in various forums which, while not binding, do generate ideas and innovative solutions.

Topic: Local Spaces for Internet Governance Dialogue: Progress in the Various Discussions.

Panelists: Manuel Haces (NIC.MX Technical Secretary of the Internet Governance Initiative Group (Mexico); Miguel Ignacio Estrada (Argentina/ MAG); Rodney Taylor (ISOC-BB/ IGF-Barbados Program Committee); Julian Casasbuenas (APC-Colombia / MAG); Beatriz Rodriguez (IGF Uruguay / Internet Society ISOC); Lía Patricia Hernández Pérez- (IPANDETEC, Panama).

Moderator: Raquel Gatto: Internet Society, Brazil Chapter.

Rapporteur: Jimena Sierra – Federal Telecommunications Institute (IFT) Mexico.

Remote Moderation: Alejandra Erramuspe – AGESIC Uruguay.

During this session, representatives from Mexico, Argentina, Barbados, Costa Rica, Colombia, Uruguay and Paraguay shared best practices from various initiatives (not only those initiatives discussed by the panel but also by the forum). This strengthened the exchange of experiences aimed at increasing and promoting the different forums and national spaces of the region.

The panel focused on generating a space for sharing and discussing national experiences that have reached higher levels of consolidation and those which have not yet started or consolidated their process. The most consolidated initiatives offered a vision on how to help new initiatives increase their greater participation in global governance processes.

The Colombian representative shared their national initiative with the “Colombian Internet Governance Committee,” highlighting the initiative's development. He also noted they have issued a statement identifying people’s needs, opinions and suggestions and that this statement is open to all parties to engage in non-binding dialogue. Through the regulator and TIC Minister, there have been several discussions on regulation and public and private projects. One of the items reported was an action plan prioritizing responsibility, working mechanisms and actions to deal with different topics and discussions.

Mexico’s representative explained the origin of their initiative and emphasized that the group does not have any institutional ties. On the contrary, it is an association of individuals from different sectors who encourage dialogue on Internet governance issues. The development of Internet governance in Mexico was presented, mentioning LACIGF and IGF, both held in Mexico.

In Argentina’s case, there was special emphasis on how IGF Argentina is funded and a discussion on how to fund these projects through regional organizations. The reason the government was not involved in the early stages of this initiative was because they did not want the government

agenda to have any influence on topics which were mainly addressed by civil society.

In the case of Uruguay, representatives explained how the Uruguayan initiative came to be and the events that have been organized.

In the case of Barbados, this was their first year organizing an event. Representatives shared the challenges and funding issues they had faced. Barbado's representative explained that they'd met with international organizations to obtain sponsorships. They were also backed by the government, academic associations and many private companies, as well as by the Caribbean Telecommunications Union.

IPANDETEC, the meeting's host, organized its first governance dialogue together with Panama's LACIGF. They mainly shared the experiences of the various initiatives and the elements needed to organize national IGFs. The existence of a "tool kit" to guide the process was also mentioned.

This session sought to create a community which will sponsor or support various governance initiatives that are just starting to develop as compared to those in more developed countries.

It was concluded that national initiatives have their own processes. Also, the MAG representative explained how to take part in initiative coordination groups, where local initiatives can register their information and it will be uploaded to the MAG portal's initiative section. Sometimes, webinars are held to discuss such information and plenary sessions might also be approved within the global IGF for these initiatives.

Topic: Internet in Panama for the next five years.

Panelists: Elsa de Herrera Universidad Tecnológica de Panamá (UTP); Irving Halman, Autoridad para la Innovación Gubernamental (AIG) Panamá; Nicolás González Revilla (Cable Onda); Edwin Castillo, Autoridad Nacional de los Servicios Públicos (ASEP); Lilia Liu – Cámara de Comercio e Industria de Panamá (CCI); Hamzah Hajee, ONG IPANDETEC.

Moderator: César Díaz, LACNIC.

Rapporteur: Dr.Raisa Urribarri, ISOC Panama.

Professor Elsa de Herrera (UTP) highlighted that, while access and quality of access are crucial, key issues, a training effort which promotes the good use of digital tools is required, as "we must take advantage of the benefits they offer, but at the same time, know how to assess and circumvent their risks". With regard to University, the professor envisioned a future with a greater number of virtual classrooms which guarantee the expansion of services and, at the same time, the updating of programs offered according to social demands. She stressed the importance of turning scientific production to an open web repository, so as to make it accessible for consultation to a wider audience.

Engineer Inving Halman (AIG) stressed the need to establish alliances between government and the private sector in order to achieve the deployment of telecommunications infrastructure. He noted the achievement of taking Internet penetration to 43%, currently at 51%. The National Internet Network (RNI), he stated, intends to reach, through the Universal Access Fund, an 80% by 2018, through the installation of free Internet access points. He informed that data traffic within Panama, and to the US and Central America is currently under examination, with the purpose of creating a Data Exchange Center, seizing advantage of the 7 fiber optic cables that run through Panama. The project seeks to reduce traffic costs and positively impact the end user in terms of tariff reductions and improvement of connection speed.

Nicolás González Revilla(Cable Onda) highlighted efforts made by the government of Panama to achieve greater connectivity, and drew attention to the need for greater bandwidth to meet the needs which the Internet of Things (IoT) shall demand. Furthermore, he argued that the need to address cybersecurity issues should not only be seen from the public and business point of view, but also including the perspective of the citizens themselves.

Edwin Castillo (ASEP) stated that Internet penetration in Panama is 52% (not including public access centers, and based on figures provided by operators). To close the gap, however, is a very ambitious goal, he added. In order to facilitate the achievement of this goal, and to ensure connection reaches unprofitable sectors, he claimed that further wireless deployment, through mobile cellular telephony was needed.

He reported that ASEP had cleared the digital dividend, i.e. the 700MHz band, offering each operator 30 MHz, without auction and at the same price. From 4 operators, 3 bought it. "Voice has lost meaning, and data prevails now," he said. Therefore, given the demand, the 1.7-2.1 GHz band was also cleaned to enable each operator to access 140MHz and increase bandwidth, at no excessive cost for them. He mentioned, as Halman did, the possibility of establishing a Data Exchange Center (HUB) to lower traffic costs. He also emphasized that to develop the IoT it is necessary to deploy IPv6. "That is urgent."

Lilia Liu (Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Panama) stressed the importance of the change in business mentality triggered by digital transformation and the urgency to understand changes in order to continue serving - and reaching - consumers. She also mentioned the risks posed by new digital technologies and, in that regard, stressed the importance of developing cybersecurity policies, in connection with the legal environment and within a governance model involving multiple stakeholders.

She stated that the CCI had a security policy document for entrepreneurs, and stressed the need to train professionals capable of undertaking the challenge. She also reported on two studies carried out by Panamanian experts; one, on prospects regarding the Panamanian digital environment to 2050, and the other, prepared in collaboration with Senacyt, on Panama's scientific data projected for 2040, as there is not enough knowledge about what is being produced in the country in that regard.

Hamzah Hajee (IPANDETEC) referred to quality of access, to differences in Internet service provided in the eastern and western sections of the city and to how these differences impact on education and business. With regard to regulation, he stressed how cumbersome it was to file complaints with the regulatory body and highlighted the urgent need to train citizens to defend their digital rights. It is necessary, he stated, that the legal and judicial spheres be updated and adapted to current times. Regarding digital economy, he noted the impact of ICTs on business models in almost all sectors. An innovative approach to "digital economy must aim at the achievement of equity to reduce, not only the digital divide, but the social divide."