

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

Taking stock and looking another desirability of the continuation of the forum  
(Part II)  
Wednesday, November 18 2009  
IGF Meeting  
Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt.

[Gavel]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Let me call to order the session on taking stock and looking forward on the desirability of the continuation of the IGF. Now, let the first one, let me say just a few words and I really appreciate the cooperation extended to the chair by adhering to the time limits. And I have one particular request from a gentleman, Mr. Vladimir rad a know vehicle, representing the Diplo focus. They asked for a display show of a short video which will last for 4 minutes 10 seconds, and if you have no strong objections, I will take it you agree. Huh? For them to the exceed 1 minutes 0 seconds so it's so decided.

[Gavel]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Now, can I call Mr. Bill Graham to take the floor. Mr. Bill Graham from global strategic engagement, the Internet Society.

>>BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Ambassador Sha.

The Internet Society has commented on the future of the Internet Governance Forum at every opportunity. Most recently, in mid-July of this year. And I refer you to those comments which are posted on the IGF Web site, and also on our own.

I want to take this opportunity to elaborate on a few specific points.

The Internet is successful, in part, due to its unique model, as our president said in the opening session on Monday.

The model relies on processes and organizations that are local, bottom-up, and accessible to users around the world.

Those processes all exist together in the Internet ecosystem, a Web of organizations that work together in a vital, responsive, and cooperative manner.

We in the Internet Society believe that the IGF has become an important element in that ecosystem, making its own contribution to Internet governance.

When we consulted our members and chapters all around the world earlier this year, they encouraged us to call upon the United Nations to extend the mandate of the IGF in its current form for another five years. It was clear to them and to us that the value of the IGF is its ability to bring together people who might not otherwise meet. The IGF inspires people to work effectively in support of people-centered development, a key goal of the WSIS.

It feeds work in communities, in countries, in all regions, and at the global level.

The two specific issues I want to address have come up repeatedly in the discussions here: The question of outputs and the question of how the IGF is to be maintained.

The Internet Society believes that we must learn to think in terms of outputs from the IGF, not outputs of the IGF.

Outputs come from the IGF when stakeholders learn, build relationships, and return to their homes and organizations to work together in ways they would not have done without the IGF. That should be true for governments, for business, and civil society at the local, national, regional, and global levels.

I'd contrast that to outputs of the IGF.

We should not lock the IGF into a traditional institutional structure. That

would necessitate creating new bureaucracies, new structures, and new processes, and would certainly make the IGF less adaptable, responsive, and ultimately less effective.

The IGF should remain flexible, able to meet the evolving needs of the Internet stakeholders.

Finally, I want to comment briefly on the vital question of how the IGF can be maintained.

There are significant costs to making the IGF a success. Our IGF country hosts have made huge financial contributions at each successive IGF and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to thank Egypt for the wonderful arrangements that they have made for this year's event.

Some not-for-profit organizations, including the Internet Society, make regular contributions to the Secretariat, as do some businesses and a handful of governments.

Others provide in-kind donations or support attendants at IGF meetings. We recommend that this voluntary and multistakeholder funding model be continued into the next mandate of the IGF.

The Secretariat must have greater stability and assurance in order to do its job, and we call on all others from all stakeholder groups to help sustain the IGF in this very material way.

So in closing, on behalf of the Internet Society, I want to thank you, Ambassador Sha, for the opportunity to participate in this formal consultation. We appreciate the opportunity given to us to collaborate with governments within the U.N. family and with all other stakeholders interested in truly making the Internet for all. Thank you.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Graham. Next, Mr. Waudu Siganga, from WITSA, Vice Chairman for Africa, Chairman, Computer Society of Kenya.

Mr. Siganga, please.

>>WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you, Under-Secretary-General Sha. My name is Waudu Siganga speaking on behalf of WITSA, the World Information Technology and Services Alliance. The WITSA has been an active participant at each of the annual IGFs right from the inaugural meeting in Athens. Thus, we are well-positioned to provide comments on the continuation of the IGF, and the impact the IGF is having.

WITSA members are from 72 countries representing some 90% of the world ICT market. Over 50% of our members are from developing countries. WITSA supports the continuation of the multistakeholder IGF beyond its initial five-year mandate. WITSA also supports maintaining the plenty IGF structures and processes with all stakeholders interacting on an equal footing.

WITSA believes that all stakeholders should continue to utilize the IGF as a mechanism to identify and focus on priority issues that highlight the fundamental building blocks of an Information Society.

WITSA members are committed to working with other stakeholders to deepen and broaden the participation from developing countries.

We also believe that the IGF has already demonstrated that it is flexible enough to allow for change. For instance, the emergence of national and regional IGFs illustrates that the structure and processes are adapting to the input and needs of the multistakeholder community.

As has been aptly demonstrated over the past four years, the value of the IGF lies in its open and informative nature, allowing all views to be expressed, and the full range of experiences and expertise to be shared.

In this way, all can learn, all continue to learn more about how to use, growing, expand, and protect the key communications and information resource that the Internet has become.

The IGF should will be main consistent with its original mandate for facilitating dialogue and sharing best practices and exchanging learning and ideas, and should not engage in the negotiation of formal documents or outcomes.

Moreover, WITSA supports the continuation of an independent IGF Secretariat

with appropriate staff and with funding that can support the IGF events and maintain continuity between its annual meetings.

WITSA applauds the current Secretariat's efforts to serve all stakeholders fairly and equitably through their consistently excellent output, including the provisioning of online content, Webcasts and audio casts, as well as real-time transcriptions from the IGF sessions.

By focusing on these priorities issues, the IGF continues to create a meaningful framework for demonstrable progress toward the long-term sustainability of a truly global Information Society.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments on behalf of WITSA.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you. Next, I give the floor to Ayesha Hassan., senior policy manager, e-business, I.T. and telecoms, ICC. Madam Hassan, please.

>>MS. AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you, Chair.

On behalf of the members of the International Chamber of Commerce and our BASIS initiative, the Business Action to Support the Information Society we welcome this opportunity to contribute to this important consultation.

ICC members include companies and associations from across sectors and geographies and of all sizes. Hundreds of companies and associations support this business input.

Business around the world fully supports the IGF with its current structures and we urge for its continuation.

The IGF is addressing the items in its mandate in Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda and facilitating multistakeholder dialogue that is inclusive and meaningful.

It has also continually evolved and improved. I would like to highlight some of these items and incorporate by reference the comprehensive ICC/BASIS input to the review questionnaire.

Substantive discussions have taken place on all issues, including those that foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability, and development of the Internet, and accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.

Critical Internet resources, security and privacy issues, and the use and misuse of the Internet.

The IGF is, in and of itself, an excellent human and institutional capacity-building opportunity. On a wide range of complex policy issues, best practices, and the policy approaches and choices that impact them.

And every year, new issues are being brought into the process.

One cannot help but come to an IGF and leave having gained insight and knowledge. Every IGF brings together organizations engaged in cross-cutting international public policy issues and participants learn about their work programs and activities, the status of discussions on particular issues, and those on the horizon.

A wide range of stakeholders who connected at the IGF are now actively involved in the work of other organizations. This is an important value, a value-add for all.

It's not easy to measure, but still very real. Many stakeholders have commented that this is a one stop shop for them to get information, make contacts, share experiences, and develop their understanding.

Excellent outputs include the real-time transcripts of the sessions, the chairman's report, substantive inputs, and the synthesis and background papers.

This unique forum offers us all a chance to speak, but also to listen. It allows us to discuss all relevant topics candidly. It maximizes all participants' time by increasing their understanding instead of negotiating texts, which is a major strength.

The IGF is also a catalyst for change. We have become more receptive to each other's perspectives and concerns. As participants have adapted to this open environment, we have seen rhetoric reduced. In turn, we benefit from more informed decision-making by all.

We believe that the IGF processes and structures are effective, and address the tasks at hand. We commend the leadership and hard work of Mr. Nitin Desai, Mr. Kummer, and the IGF Secretariat.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that ICC/BASIS members support the continuation of the IGF with its multistakeholder approach that leads to more informed policy choices and business choices.

The IGF is having impact. It has real outcomes. The IGF is valuable for all stakeholders, and it provides a unique opportunity for us all. Thank you.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Ms. Hassan.

Next, Mr. Richard Beaird from the Deputy Coordinator, Department of State, United States. Department of State.

>>RICHARD BEAIRD: Thank you very much, Ambassador Sha.

The establishment of the Internet Governance Forum was one of the key outputs of the World Summit on the Information Society.

The United States of America takes this opportunity to reiterate its commitment to the results of the WSIS, and in particular to the convening of the IGF.

We appreciate the opportunity to -- afforded by the IGF Secretariat to submit comments and views on the possible continuation of this forum.

We will also submit our support in writing to ECOSOC through Under Secretary Sha.

The IGF has proven to be a valuable venue for information sharing and international dialogue on topics critical to global economic, social, and political development. This flexible structure used at the IGF, which includes open forums, workshops and main sessions, have evolved into dynamic mechanisms that effectively facilitate exchange of information and best practices among and between all stakeholders.

Consequently, the United States supports the continuation of the IGF beyond the initial five-year mandate.

We believe that the current work methods of the IGF are fully consistent with principles as agreed at the WSIS in Tunis, and contained in the Tunis Agenda.

The United States commends the Secretariat, as well as current and past multistakeholder advisory group members, for their tireless efforts. We hope that the cross-cutting themes of developments and capacity-building find renewed emphasis in the IGF process.

Finally, we wish to congratulate our Egyptian hosts for this, the 4th IGF. It has been a great success. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Richard, for your statement. Next I'll give the floor to Vladimir Radunovic. They are going to screen a short film, not more than 4 minutes 10 seconds.

[Video begins]

>> It's a wonderful meeting and we are very grateful for our hope, our Egyptian government, for hosting this great event. And now -- and I think this is a -- Internet is the relevant for everyone, and in particular for the young people, because the young people represent the future of mankind and it is in your hands and we count on you.

>> I think Sharm El Sheikh is a major milestone for the IGF process because it is where -- it is here in Egypt that we will shape the future of IGF and see how we can either go forward, review, or improve on the current mechanisms for Internet Governance Forum.

>> I think it's an amazing collection of organizations -- public, commercial, civil society, government -- coming together to debate the complexity of the future of the Internet.

>> Okay. I think it's -- it's a good opportunity because it's a place where the IGF is going to be decided for a continuation of the IGF, and we are supportive of the continuation, and I think it's been a solid meeting, except for something like the youth corner, so your corner, it's a great initiative, so compliments to IGF Sharm.

>> Well, I think IGF Sharm El Sheikh is one of the greatest things that has happened to Africa in terms of networking. It's the first time that such a major (inaudible) meeting has occurred on the continent, and the leadership and organization played by Egypt in getting us here is one that will impact all of the (inaudible) in Africa, and therefore I think it's an extremely important result that we have, and we value that very much.

>> The Sharm El Sheikh IGF is one of the best that we have had, and every IGF is something special and I think what will be special about the IGF in Sharm El Sheikh will be the way in which young people have been involved, the way in which their issues have been recognized and the way in which their issues have been addressed.

>> My impressions of the IGF here in Sharm El Sheikh are very positive. It's been a very useful set of meetings, very well organized by our Egyptian hosts, people in the ministry, Dr. Kamel and his colleagues are to be congratulated for an excellent meeting and I'm looking forward to hearing Mrs. Mubarak and her discussion of particularly online protection matter.

>> The IGF in Sharm El Sheikh, it's been the best yet.

>> This IGF so far, we had more people than ever before. We had excellent organization. I think everybody is very happy. We enjoyed the Egyptian hospitality and we appreciate very much the organization's skills.

Apart from the high quantity of attendants, we also enjoyed the high quality of discussions and high quality of participants. We had ministers, we had CEOs, we had heads of international organizations, we had some of the leading figures of the Internet, inventor of the World Wide Web, Sir Tim Berners-Lee. One of the coinventors of the Internet, Robert Khan is also here. So we can indeed be very pleased of all the aspects of this year's meeting.

>> Well, IGF Sharm El Sheikh is a special event. I have attended the previous IGFs, and to be frank with you, this IGF is, the way I see it, is the best for several reasons. One, because it is in Sharm El Sheikh. Because of the excellent organization that is done by the Egyptian administration. It is the nice atmosphere, so frankly speaking, this is one of the best IGFs I have ever attended.

>> From what I've experienced, IGF in Sharm El Sheikh is another advancement to the previous IGFs. We have more participants from a broader group of stakeholders, and that is a prerequisite for a very good conversation and exchange of best practices, ideas, knowledge, and we, the global business represented by the ICC, very much appreciate this and Nigeria being here, annual it's a wonderful location.

So from that perspective, I think it's a big success.

>> So this year's IGF in Sharm El Sheikh I believe has been extremely successful. You can just see that in the number of people who are here. It's almost 1800 people. So people from all over the world are coming because they recognize, number one, the importance of the IGF for the ability to talk to people -- all kinds of people, not just government, but there's also private sector, there are academics, there's the youth, there's the civil society, and everybody gets to talk to each other in very informal ways, as well as having opportunities to have, you know, discussions and learn about things that they didn't really know about in the past.

Second, Sharm El Sheikh is just an incredible place to have any meeting. The hospitality is fabulous. The location is great. And for those of us who come from places where it's starting to get cold, it's nice and warm, so --

[Video ends]

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Obviously it's longer than 4 minutes and 10 seconds, right. We need to time to figure out what they stand for. My impression is that they are for the continuation. Right?

Right.

Next, I'll give floor to Mr. Parminder Singh, representing I.T. for Change. Mr. Singh, please.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Mr. Sha.

Respected Ambassador Sha and IGF participants, I speak on the behalf of I.T. for Change, which is an NGO from India. We are of the view that the IGF is an innovative experiment in global governance. We would like the IGF to continue beyond its initial five-year term. However, we also believe more efforts are required to ensure that the IGF fulfills all parts of its WSIS mandate.

The inclusion of nongovernmental actors on par with governmental actors is a key principle of the IGF and we feel that under no circumstances should this be diluted.

We are also of the opinion that the present support structure and institutional location of the IGF should not be disturbed. At present, the IGF structure is able to maintain a fine balance not only among stakeholders, but also among different institutions in the complex Internet governance ecology.

The UNDESA has given fine support to the IGF and helped maintain its independence and neutrality. Moving the location of the IGF into any of the institutions directly concerned with Internet governance will disturb this delicate balance and may harm global public interest.

We firmly believe that a global public policy institution like the IGF should be funded by global public funds -- that is, U.N. funds -- and should not rely on private funding or even on funding from a few countries, since a considerable number of global Internet governance issues entail geopolitical contestations.

We agree with the Under-Secretary-General's statement in the opening statement that the IGF should not make public policy, but that its activities should feed into legitimate global policymaking processes. However, to effectively feed into these processes, the IGF requires significant structural improvements while keeping within its Tunis mandate.

We suggest the following improvements in the IGF structure.

One, there should be a clear identification of key issues to be handled in an outcome-oriented way every year. A broader set of issues, however, can continue to be handled in the workshops.

Two, these key issues should have dedicated working groups that can do intensive preparatory work throughout the year. We can, for instance, have such groups on child protection, network neutrality, and these kind of issues.

And IGF intersessionals can also be held for this purpose.

Three, with adequate preparation, including through research and background papers, these key issues should be taken up in a focused manner at the annual IGF meeting.

Four, taking from the IGF meeting, there should be adequate follow-up work on these issues, which could then come out in the form of some kind of outcomes.

Five, the multistakeholder advisory group has to transform from a program committee to a relatively more empowered entity which can interface with other organizations and advise, as well as make recommendations, as per the Tunis mandate on the basis of the proceedings of the larger IGF.

The working and output model of the working group on Internet governance can be a good example to look at for this purpose, and, therefore, we think it is timely as we leave you, the IGF, to explore the necessary structural changes and evolutions in the IGF to address these unmet mandates. Thank you, Chairman.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Singh. Next, Mr. Andrew Miller. Member of the ubiquity Parliament.

>>ANDREW MILLER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this morning while many of you were in bed, I was having my eyes opened. I was swimming off the reef and saw things in Sharm El Sheikh that I didn't believe existed. It was a fantastic experience.

Topped this week by the privilege I had of participating as a panelist in the youth events here, and I do apologize for the colleagues that were in the room next door that had to suffer all the noise made by the panelist -- the people that were so heavily involved in what was a fantastic project, bringing together Net Aman and Childnet, and Mrs. Mubarak should be congratulated for the work

she's done in helping to support Net Aman and I congratulate the people in Childnet as well.

My plea to my friends in the organizing committee is to say these young people have demonstrated that they have a serious contribution to make, so in the future let's bring them into the mainstream and make -- and really reach out to the next generation and work with them towards finding some of the solutions for the world in which they will going to live.

I'd want to thank my friends in Nominet, the U.K. domain name company, for coordinating a lot of the U.K. contribution to this, but actually for reaching occupant to many other people, and I think that's a good example of how, in this world we live in, it's so important to have people from organizations like that stretching well beyond their own boundaries, helping people in other countries to develop resources that they need to get the best out of the technologies around us.

I firmly believe, as does my delegation, in a continuation, a new mandate for IGF. We want to see it continue.

We want to also thank Nitin Desai and Markus and his team for a fabulous job, and also our hosts here in Egypt. Just ones small criticism, if I may be so bold, Mr. Chairman. One of the problems with the planning is that we all end up trying to get to much in, and I regret to say that I have to leave this room to now go back to the panel that I've got to address in a few moments' time. A minor criticism, but a fabulous event and let's look forward, not just to Lithuania, but let's also look forward to Kenya.

[Applause]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Your comments, including criticism are taken into account, have been noted.

Now, next Mr. Konstantin Kladouras, from ETNO, chairman ETNO, IGV working group, head of the regulatory strategy section.

Please, you have the floor.

>> Konstantin Kladouras: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to address the forum. I speak on behalf of ETNO which is the association of European telecommunication network operators. ETNO represents in 36 countries. Substantial Internet operations.

ETNO is an active participant within the IGF from the beginning of the process.

We have participated in IGF meetings, open consultations, and we have submitted many contributions in writing on IGF organizational issues, including the review on which we would like to highlight the following.

The IGF is one of the key outputs of WSIS, and we can safely say that it is the most innovative U.N. process which started as an experiment but soon became an institution.

In ETNO's view, the most important objective of the IGF is create a true forum for dialogue and exchange of information on Internet governance policy issues, and furthermore to establish a reliable global basis for a cooperative, pluralistic dialogue that embraces all stakeholders.

Much of the success of the IGF stems from its open and inclusive character and its multistakeholder nature. The success also relies on the nondecisive, nonbinding character of the IGF which allows all parties to explore difficult issues without political tensions and to speak freely.

Such an approach is essential in dealing with the challenges the Internet faces and will assist in taking advantage of the opportunity it presents for further social and economic development.

In our view, no other mechanism or individual organization besides the IGF can achieve all these or is more appropriate.

ETNO believes that the IGF has broadly met its mandate although some may say that certainly issues have been not been dealt adequately, but that is not the issue or question today.

Mr. Chair, given the nature of the Internet, but also the continuous need to discuss public-policy issues around Internet governance with the equal participation of all relevant stakeholders, ETNO and its members offer full

support for the continuation of the IGF in its current structure, past its initial five-year mandate.

And we kindly ask you, Mr. Chair, to take note of our view.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you.

Next I give floor to madam Olga Cavalli, advisor for technology, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Argentina.

Madam, please.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am presenting this document in my roam of coordinator of the working group of Internet governance of the Latin American and Caribbean Plan of Action for the Information Society, eLAC, 2010. This document was produced by this multistakeholder working group and is also supported by the IGF of Spain.

The Internet Governance Forum has become a relevant space for debate about public policies and about the future of the Internet. Each meeting is a reference for the evolution of the Internet, and it has also been the inspiration of national and regional processes that are enhancing the local communities' knowledge and building local and regional capacities.

All stakeholders are able to debate on an equal footing and are also able to exchange ideas of how to make Internet move towards the principles of the Tunis Agenda of the Information Society.

The IGF had exceptional role in becoming a space for deliberations and debate about public policy related with Internet governance, but there are some aspects that must be reinforced.

Government participation, civil society, and private sector of developing countries. This has been difficult due to the lack of resources and also a low awareness of this process.

The IGF has proved to be very good and unique mechanism for enhancing the global discussion about public policy of Internet governance with a vision of the Internet which is people-centered, development oriented and inclusive, as stated in the Tunis Agenda of the Information Society.

Although the IGF is coming to the end of its first mandate of five years, the working group of Internet governance of the Latin American regional plan of action of the Information Society, eLAC 2010 would like to express its desire of the continuation of the IGF beyond its mandate.

The continuation of the IGF will allow keeping this only open space for policy debate on Internet governance that involves all interested stakeholders. The IGF could also propose different ways to the stakeholders in order to enhance Internet access, especially in developing countries. Like the IGF, this working group wants to support the enhancement of the existing multistakeholder participation system in order to have a wider participation base for broad consensus and agreement of decisions and debates.

Thanks to the IGF Secretariat for all their hard work they are doing, and to you for giving us this opportunity of presenting our document.

Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, madam Cavalli for your statement.

Now I give the floor to Mr. Lambert Van Nistelrooij from -- a member of the European Parliament.

Mr. Lambert.

>>LAMBERT VAN NISTELROOIJ: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, president, ladies and gentlemen. The European Parliament has supported the IGF from the beginning, actively by participating in all the summits, all the events. And this time we were active via our members in several panels and in several debates.

We are fully aware about the importance -- the important questions about the Internet governance in the future, the questions that come up and the impact.

We embrace the new generation technologies, but also advocate, at the same

time, strong governance principles.

This is not a debate just for the public side, public actors or the private actors. This is the domain that should be open to all actors interested. The civil society from all the parts of the world.

And the IGF method -- open multistakeholder, nonbinding -- is a laboratory for upcoming questions, and this method is unique and should be continued in its actual form.

We should realize that the IGF is still young, and it has grown step by step in its content and outcome.

And it deserves further steps, further growth. And of course within the structure, the framework, we can take on board practical ameliorations.

The European Parliament will participate in the IGF 5 in Vilnius, and we will stimulate a broader participation from other national and regional parliaments, directly elected people close to those important questions.

Mr. Sha and Mr. Kummer, let me end in short, feel supported. Go on; feel strong.

Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Lambert.

Now, next I will give floor to Ms. Liesyl Franz, vice president, information security and global public policy, TechAmerica.

Miss, you have the floor.

>>LIESYL FRANZ: Thank you, chair.

My name is Liesyl Franz and I am with TechAmerica, a U.S.-based ICT industry association.

I am making a statement today on behalf of the U.S.-based associations that are represented here at IGF, TechAmerica, the U.S. Council for International Business, Net Choice, and the Association for Competitive Technology.

Many of our respective member companies are here at the IGF and actively participate in the process and the sessions here, and I am delighted to be here on their collective behalf to express the U.S. industry's viewpoint and our call for continuation of the IGF going forward.

We have participated in all the Internet Governance Forums and we have seen the value of the forum itself and the benefits it brings to the global multistakeholder, multifaceted constituency of the Internet.

We would like to highlight three points for submission to the IGF review.

First, it is precisely the multistakeholder nature of the IGF that gives it its greatest value. There are no other forums where governments, civil society groups, and industry can meet and work together on equal footing on the important issues we have been discussing here in Egypt this week.

The key words there, "are working together" as we saw in the video that we saw just a few minutes ago.

In the full course of the IGF, from preparation to participation, each stakeholder has equal opportunity for input and engagement with their counterparts.

Second, a benefit of the IGF is its ability to be dynamic and timely to address the pressing issues of the day which in Internet time evolve quickly. In this way the IGF is a unique venue that enables information exchange and, in fact, knowledge transfer of technical expertise and policy experiences that participants can take home to their own national, societal and corporate environments.

It allows a bottom-up discussion that is fueled by the stakeholders with the greatest, well, stake in the stable, resilient and innovative Internet.

And importantly, the IGF allows for open and candid discussions because it is unencumbered by negotiations over diplomatic texts which allows people to truly exchange views, experience, and expertise for mutual benefit.

Third, the IGF has a far reaching impact in two important ways. First, it enables remote participation for those that are not able to be here at the IGF in person. That helps embody and enhance the multistakeholder nature of the IGF

and seems appropriate for a conference about the very medium that enables remote participation.

Second, we have seen the emergence of national and regional IGFs. Those kind of events allow for active and ongoing exchanges and help people to internalize and integrate what they gain from the IGF into their own particular circumstances.

It is precisely due to the reach of the IGF that we respectfully suggest the invitation of statements to the IGF Secretariat regarding IGF stock-taking effort in written form from those that do not have the chance to do it during the session today, and over the course of a short, reasonable time frame to allow additional comments from the IGF stakeholders, and at the same time meet the requirements of the U.N. process.

In my remaining second I would also like to give my gratitude to the IGF Secretariat, Markus Kummer and Nitin Desai, for their artful and graceful hosting of this event, and our Egyptian hosts as well.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, madam.

Next I will give floor to Mr. Seck Mactar, representing United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

Mr. Seck, please.

>>SECK MACTAR: Thank you, Chair.

ECA, the Economic Commission for Africa in the U.N., has called upon countries from Africa to apply the Tunis principles in the IGF process.

We have analyzed the participation and the impact of IGF at the Africa continent-wide level. And having done that, we can communicate to you the satisfying results. Specifically, the impact was positive overall.

More than 80% of African states have adopted an ITC policy or have integrated these technologies into their development policies and in their production -- poverty -- excuse me, production strategies.

Other interesting figures are the fact that 75% of African countries have initiated a public-private partnership approach for development of infrastructures.

About 85% have unified their communication systems.

With regard to implementation, specifically government health services, we can see that 70% of the countries are implementing these types of applications, and here I am not even speaking about the explosion of cell phone use, which we are seeing very high participation levels, and the increase, of course, of Internet access.

So we can say that the impact of IGF in Africa has been clearly positive. I have demonstrated this through figures. We also had an African Union meeting recently, and I think that the importance of IGF was clear.

Following up on these activities, we think that IGF could come up with key ways which would allow for more active participation from developing countries, specifically African countries. And this could be done through organizing subregional and regional IGFs; for example, an East African IGF or West African IGF.

So I think this is a key part for the continent, for the African continent. And having these subregional and regional IGFs would allow us to prepare before going to the general IGF.

I think that this would allow us to examine key issues, such as security, Internet security, specifically protecting children online. Also the key question of resources, capacity building, and also access to broadband infrastructures.

So, Chair, I have to conclude by congratulating our colleagues in the Secretariat for the difficult work that they have complete over the last few days, and all of our partners who have supported U.N. ECA and helped developing countries, helped African countries specifically, specifically our partners in ICANN, the European Union, I.F., and other partners.

So thank you, sir.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. SECK.

Next I will give floor to Mr. Johan Ekman, the bureau member, Institutional Relations, Council of Europe, European Youth Forum. You are really young, I noticed.

You have the floor.

>>JOHAN EKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me express on behalf of the European Youth Forum, that is the representative platform of European youth organization, the support for the continuation of the IGF.

I think this is a very good opportunity to bring forward the concerns, ideas of young people across the world.

And let me also use this opportunity to thank the Council of Europe for bringing us aboard this process. I would say that the Council of Europe, as an international organization, is a very good example on how youth organizations and young people can be brought into political processes at an international level.

We welcome very much also the increased focus on youth in this debate and this discussion. I think it's essential to include the opinions of young people when discussing IGF, in the IGF discussions.

And I would have a couple of reflections that I would like to share with you also for the continuation of this forum.

First, while it is important to talk about youth, you can never talk about youth without actually bringing the youth at the highest level into the debate. No policy that is directed towards young people can be credible if not young people are strong stakeholder in the process from the beginning to the end.

The second point I want to make is while safety and privacy issues are, indeed, a concern for many young people, we should not forget that political participation and freedom of expression should also be one of the priorities when discussing ICT in the future.

So with these reflections, these ideas, I wish to see all in the future, next time, at the next IGF in Lithuania.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, distinct representative from the youth forum.

Next I will give floor to Mr. Peter Voss, head of division, international policy for information, communication technologies, federal ministry of economics and technology, Germany.

Mr. Voss.

>>PETER VOSS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at the World Summit on the Information Society, world leaders asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene the Internet Governance Forum.

In an innovative approach, this forum was established as a unique platform for a nonbinding, multistakeholder dialogue on all Internet-related issues at the global level.

It is, indeed, the only forum that allows a gathering of representatives from all geographical regions, across all stakeholder groups, to discuss all aspects of Internet governance on an equal footing.

We feel that the lack of pressure to negotiate binding outcomes contributes to the frank and open exchange of the IGF.

It is the opinion of Germany that the three or nearly four IGF meetings held so far in different parts of the world have demonstrated its values.

Firstly, the number and diversity of the participants of IGF meetings, the impressive amount of workshops and best practice forums have shown that the forum continues to be perceived as useful.

Secondly, the IGF has triggered follow-up discussions at the context of dynamic coalitions, and has inspired debates at regional and national level.

Thirdly, the IGF is complementing other existing structures dealing with

Internet governance issues.

And fourthly and above all, the IGF has provided a space to address controversial issues and discuss possible solutions.

Mr. Chairman, Germany therefore believes that the IGF should be continued beyond its initial time frame of five years and that its basic characteristics should be retained.

However, Germany still sees room for improvement.

Given the feedback that the mandate of the IGF was agreed at the level of heads of state, we think it would be extremely difficult to alter that mandate. But it might be possible to interpret the Tunis outcome in a manner that could open up fresh avenues to explore.

With a view to possible changes, we can, for instance, identify room for improvement in order to further strengthen the visibility of the outcomes of the IGF. Firstly by creating an IGF database of good practices identified during IGF meetings, and, secondly, by promoting the use of effective remote participation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: You thank you, Mr. Voss.

Next I will give floor to Mr. Anupam Agrawal, the chairman of Kolkata chapter of Internet society, India.

Mr. Agrawal, please.

>>ANUPAM AGRAWAL: Thank you, Ambassador Sha. Good evening, good afternoon, good morning to all the people all over the world.

In the panoramic view of the world, life is as simple as thought. And what the Internet has done is connected the dots together and made the world a linear world.

And what IGF does is that it gives us a chance to sit back, relax and see what we have done in the past, plan for the future, and then move ahead with renewed vigor and enthusiasm.

Mr. Ramadorai of PCS did mention in the opening session about Gopal, and I believe that for all the Gopals of the world, it is imperative that IGF should get an extension of another five years.

I attended the last year IGF in Hyderabad as a simple Internet user, and I could attend because it was held locally. And therein I picked up the theme of security.

It gives me immense pleasure to announce that in the last one year we have formed the Kolkata chapter of Internet society and working extensively on data insurance which can be very relevant in the forthcoming year of cloud computing.

However, there are certain suggestions from my chapter.

One, more participation from developing countries, emerging economies, should be encouraged and mechanisms for people from (inaudible) can be put in place. Second, best practices case studies can be compiled from the IGF participants so that others can be benefited.

Thank you all.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you.

Next I will give floor to Monsieur Bertrand De La Chapelle, DÈLÈGuÈ SpÈcial pour la SociÈtÈ de l'Information, MinistÈr des Affaires EtrangÈres et EuropÈennes.

It's typical Chinese, English, French; okay?

Please, you have the floor, sir.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Under-Secretary-General.

... and the answer is yes, five more years. 2015 is the timeline of the WSIS plus then review mandated by Article 111 of the Tunis Agenda, point one.

Second question, improvements, yes again. Because it has matured each year further, we are, France, confident that the IGF will continue to progressively structure its working methods each year.

France has submitted detailed proposals for operational improvements in the online consultations. France is looking forward to making additional

suggestions.

During the new -- the now traditional annual consultations in February in Geneva, the current working methods of the IGF are fully consistent with the mandate of paragraph 72, and the multistakeholder spirit of the WSIS. We must preserve this. And let's use the self-organizing capacity of the IGF to continue to improve its functioning.

Finally, France is also looking forward to a first discussion in the CSTD in May of the U.N. Secretary-General report following this consultation. And furthermore, to IGF 2011, hopefully in Kenya. I tried to be short. I hope this leaves some space for other speakers, business and civil society actors that, unfortunately, will not have much other opportunities to contribute.

Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. de la Chapelle. Next, I will give floor to Mr. Willie Currie, from communications and information policy program manager, Association for Progressive Communications, APC. Mr. Currie, please.

>>WILLIE CURRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to contribute to this important review.

The Association for Progressive Communications, APC, is of the view that the IGF has fulfilled its core mandate in terms of Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda to constitute a space for multistakeholder policy dialogue on Internet governance.

As an international civil society network which has participated in the formation of the IGF from the beginning, APC wishes to express its firm view that the IGF should continue.

We say this because we believe Internet governance is distributed across a broad number of organizations responsible for the Internet. It is a unique form of participatory governance that involves all stakeholders.

The IGF is also unique, a hybrid of U.N. intergovernmental and nongovernmental protocol and practice where individuals and institutions concerned with Internet governance and development gather together for open dialogue and debate.

This unique hybrid is necessary to create a space where all stakeholders feel comfortable, to the extent that they can contribute meaningfully and openly in discussion, debate, and collaborative planning with other stakeholders.

It is important that we maintain this hybrid culture, which sets somewhat in the middle of the intergovernmental and nongovernmental landscape.

However, it is also important that all stakeholders understand the nature of this hybrid culture, the challenges it presents, and the negative impact and consequence of any stakeholder exploiting their access to this form or their positional power to control participation and determine outcomes.

The purpose of a multistakeholder forum is to listen to others and try and reach common understanding instead of insisting on one's own point of view.

Over the years of its existence, the IGF has developed as an adaptive ecosystem in which all stakeholders can interact on a basis of equality of input.

This is an important dimension which depends on the adroit and careful shepherding of the IGF performed by the IGF Secretariat under the effective and diplomatic leadership of Nitin Desai and Markus Kummer. The vital role of the IGF Secretariat in its current form to the success of the IGF should not be underestimated.

We have heard a lot of corridor talk about the status of the Secretariat should be changed in some way and located more firmly in the U.N. system.

We feel that the IGF should continue to operate under the auspices of the U.N., while continually aiming to enhance its multistakeholder nature.

We have also heard a perspective that says that those countries who provide financial support for the IGF have more say over its annual program as a convince of their funding the IGF Secretariat. We have not found this assertion to be true. The IGF Secretariat needs independence from any form of undue influence. If this is a source of concern to some stakeholders, terms of reference for donations could be put in place to protect the IGF Secretariat's

independence.

In view of the limited time for this review, consideration should be given to extend the time for written comment for three weeks, to enable those who have been unable to express their views today to make an input.

We also feel the IGF should be allowed to evolve as a forum that can produce outputs and outcomes beyond those of a space purely of policy dialogue and deliberation. The exact modalities of such outputs should be a matter for the stakeholders of the IGF to determine.

One way of doing this may be to hold intersessional thematic IGFs during the year that discuss key issues related to Internet governance and which can feed the outputs of their deliberations into the annual IGF meeting.

Regional and national IGFs are an example of decentralized IGFs that address national and regional priorities while also informing the main IGF, and what we propose is that consideration be given to doing something similar on a thematic basis.

Overall, participation from developing countries should be improved from all stakeholder groups. One way of doing this is to shift development from a cross-cutting theme to a major theme of the IGF.

In closing, the IGF has an innovation and multistakeholder Internet governance. It works. It's evolving, and should continue. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, please comply with the time limits but I was hesitant to use this gavel. Next I'll give floor to Ms. Ana Cristina Amoroso das Neves from -- as head of the international affairs knowledge society agency, UMIC, the ministry of science, technology and higher education, Portugal. Madam you have the floor.

>>ANA CRISTINA AMOROSO das NEVES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, regarding the three questions that you put tomorrow for us to think about, so I think that I can give you three immediate replies.

Has IGF fulfilled its mandate? No. The task, the Tunis Agenda, is so huge that definitely we need more time and, besides, it takes time to change things and to change the paradigm.

If it can be improved, yes, of course. The IGF Secretariat, together with the IGF host countries, have shown us how much improvement we can get from the experience gained each year.

Continuation of the IGF?

Yes.

And the reason why I'm here today and ask for the floor is to underscore the three very important features of the IGF that give us the evidence for its continuation.

The first one: The global conscience of the Internet and Information Society.

Number two: The strengths and robustness of the IGF movement.

The third one: The reinforced multistakeholder cooperation.

Regarding the global conscience of the Internet and Information Society, IGF has been unique as providing a conscience to the Internet community. This conscience is essential for the development of the economies and for societal improvement all over the globe. It has become a network of the network -- capital N -- the Internet, providing an incredible robustness to this process.

Number two, the strengths and robustness of the IGF movement. One of the most powerful outcomes of IGF until now is the spontaneous (inaudible) and diversified national and regional IGFs all over the world. They are the evidence that the IGF process is a great and powerful idea, because only a powerful idea would deliver such a result.

And the possibility for these national and regional IGFs to become places to write ideas that can be brought up to the global IGF is a very interesting upshot as well.

The history, as shown, is that when movements are spontaneous, it's because they are powerful, and they are meaningful for societies and for their citizens.

And it's exactly these movements that can change the paradigm.

The third one, the reinforced multistakeholder cooperation.

The IGF set up a remarkable variable and wide-ranging dialogue on cooperation geometry between different institutions, public, private, and not-for-profit organizations in countries and provided spaces where the individual, the citizen, the civil society, participating on equal footing along with more powerful entities.

And these three features, they are not compatible with any hierarchical formal structure.

Any existing structure of this kind has ever produced such deliverables, and IGF should evolve as creatively as it has been evolving since the last four years. IGF is a unique platform that must continue for our own and future generations sake. Thank you.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, madam. Next I give floor to Mr. Giacomo Mazzone from the World Broadcasting Union. Mr. Mazzone, please.

>>GIACOMO MAZZONE: Thank you, Mr. President.

I am here representing the World Broadcasting Union that gathers eight unions of broadcasters all around the world. More than 600 broadcast organizations with a total average audience of more than 3 billion people a day.

We participate to the WSIS in 2003 and 2005. We have organized and hosted with other members of the group the EuroDIG this year. We have attended the IGF from the first meeting and we have cooperated tightly with the IGF Secretariat since the beginning.

We are committed to the results of this process, and keen to achieve what was asked to the IGF in the Tunis WSIS agenda. We thank, of course, the Egyptian government for the organization of this excellent IGF edition and particularly I'm grateful to thank our members, the ERTU, that is providing the video services here, but having said so, Mr. Sha Zukang asked us to answer to three questions, so here are our answers.

The first question: Yes, the IGF has been very valuable and we expect it will be even more valuable for the future and we expect a lot from the next edition that will take place in Europe again, in Vilnius.

This edition will have to deliver a report to the Secretary-General that will be very important for all of us because it will say something about the governance of the Internet.

We wish that the Secretariat of the IGF will be strength for making better his job in the next year and for the succession in the future.

The second question: Yes, we consider that the IGF has achieved a lot in a multistakeholder environment, and this is part of the reason of the success, and this environment has allowed new actors like the media that I represent here to participate into the process -- in the process and to discuss with the others. Links of trust and even friendship has been built around these years, and on this basis, we can achieve and build a lot.

The third answer is: Yes, but...

As I've heard from other voices before me here today, the civil society, the Brazilian government, and even German government, we hope that the mandate for the next IGF will be enlarged and new tools made available. We would like very much that the IGF would be able to provide recommendation, guidelines, and best practices. We would like that it will become the place where many of the functions that ICANN and ITU cannot be responsible for could be implemented.

If you remember what Mr. Pepper said in this room just a few hours ago, that videos will represent 60% of the traffic over the Internet in just two years, you can understand why we are so keen and so concerned about the topic of Internet governance and why we are so committed for its -- the results, positive results, of this process. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you. Now I'll give floor to Mr. William Drake, the senior associate, center for international governance, Graduate Institute of

International and Development Studies, Geneva.

>>WILLIAM DRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to support the position that's been taken by many people here that the IGF has been a real success and deserves to be continued for at least another five years, pretty much in its current form.

It has encouraged national and regional IGFs. It has promoted dialogue and mutual understanding. It has clarified issues that a few years ago were very complex and confusing to many people. It has served the international community in all kinds of ways that are really unique and irreplaceable.

It's also, I think, uniquely able to address a broad range of issues, including cross-cutting issues that would not fit under the mandate of any one organization. Its design and operations are very forward looking and innovative, and they've brought positive attention to the United Nations from a wide variety of circles around the world.

I think in particular, also having a small non-bureaucratic Secretariat that is open to all and responsive to all stakeholders has encouraged diverse participation by many people around the world who might not otherwise participate in a more formalized structure.

So I hope that all those kinds of dimensions can be built upon.

At the same time, clearly there's a need to undertake some targeted outreach, to enhance the participation of governmental and nongovernmental actors from the developing countries, and for the resources to do that with.

I think it would be very useful to have a transparently administered program of travel funding for participants from least developed countries in particular.

A second point I'd like to make is about the main sessions. I think that the existing themes have proven to be very useful in the initial phases of the IGF, but it may be time now to consider some innovation and blending in some new types of topics that have not received as much attention as they might have.

In that regard, I would suggest two possibilities in particular that have been discussed here before, and I'm thinking in particular of the session we had yesterday on the WSIS principles. Development, I think, would be very much a useful focus for a main session on an ongoing basis, so that we could really begin to talk about how global Internet governance arrangements do or do not affect development and what is the real meaning of IG for D.

There are a lot of complex issues that really require a lot of thinking through, and I think that this is the place that that could be done. Similarly, it would be useful, I think, to have a session on the procedural aspects of the WSIS principles. That is to say, looking at the transparency and inclusive participation of the different institutions involved in Internet governance and sharing good and best practices, identifying concrete ways in which organizations and networks have been bringing people in and making documents available to the world and so on.

These sorts of things, I think, would really increase the value of the IGF to the international community.

Lastly, I think I would like to say something about the format of the main sessions. It seems to me that it might be useful to generalize the kind of model that we've followed with the critical Internet resources sessions. The -- the model of having speaker after speaker increasingly to me is feeling a little bit worn, and I would be much more interested personally in more structured dialogues where, for example, a topic, a general topic like development was taken, and perhaps three main issues associated with it would be identified and then be the focus of a well-structured and moderated discussion.

The Secretariat could even provide some paragraphs of background to contextualize and make sense, lay out different positions pertaining to each of these topics, or you could involve people in some groups, task groups, to try to prepare these questions.

There are all kinds of things that could be done between sessions, indeed, to try to make the -- make the structure of the main sessions, I think, more responsive and interesting.

At the end of the day, we might be able to get a real sense of the room, of what level of consensus exists on some of these topics, or at least identify more clearly where the areas of disagreement are that merit further consideration.

So that would give us more sense, I think, of a takeaway and many people have asked for more of a sense of a takeaway if not recommendations.

So we're trying to think about ways to make this experience more valuable to everybody, and I think that that might help in some regard. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Drake. I'm not supposed to make any comments on your proposals, but I'm really impressed. Thank you very much. Next, I'd like to give the floor to Mr. Thomas Schneider, the coordinator, International Information Society, International Affairs, Federal Department of the Environment, Transport, Energy, and Communications, DETEC, Federal Office of Communication, OFCOM, Switzerland. Mr. Schneider.

>>THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. In the view of the Swiss government, the IGF should continue to exist based on the way it has been developed during the last four years. It should not be turned into something completely different. We, the participants, and not only the governments must continue to develop the IGF year by year as we have done so far.

In order to make the best use of the three minutes of the Swiss government, I would like to express our support to the statement made by our colleagues from the European Union with regard to why the IGF should continue.

And not too many speakers have given concrete examples on how the IGF could be further improved. I would like to give you a few examples.

The first one: Like others, we would like to see a more tangible outcome from the IGF, a written outcome, but any paper coming out of the IGF should not be negotiated. What we propose to you is something that we successfully tested at EuroDIG, the European IGF, to produce a document containing messages. Every multistakeholder team organizing a session at EuroDIG formulated in their personal capacity as organizers a few bullet points on what they perceived as were the keys issues discussed, including recommendations on which there was common ground but also stating areas where there were differences of opinions.

Then we put all these key issues and recommendations together into one document and issued it in our personal capacity, clearly stated in the document. You can have a look at this document called "Messages from Geneva" on the EuroDIG Web site EuroDIG.org. So as a concrete proposal for the global IGF, we would propose that you consider identifying such instance for instance for the main sessions and ask the organizers to draft such a document.

Point Number 2 is also based on the European experience. We propose that the global IGF could try to have sessions and workshops with no panels at all involving the whole audience in a discussion from the very beginning of the session. This would give -- would avoid that always the same people talk about the issues, would give more opportunities for people to speak and create more interactive discussions and maybe new ideas.

A third proposal is touching the number of workshops. We propose that before making a call for workshops, you define the maximum number of workshops. For instance, 50, for the next IGF. And then that would mean that you would maybe fix a number of maximum, five workshops, related to every main session and maybe 10 that were not related to any main session, and then when you receive 20 proposals for a main session, you usually these people to merge down onto five and that's it. And we think that if this is what people want, then it will be possible.

And the last point is we should continue to enhance participation of youth, parliamentarians, small businesses, and stakeholders from developing countries in general.

These are concrete steps that can be discussed at a next open consultations meeting in February. We will hand in our full position paper by e-mail until

tonight.

I would like to conclude by saying that Switzerland as one of the largest contributors to the IGF trust fund invites all other stakeholders to contribute into that trust fund, for the funding of the IGF Secretariat and the participating of stakeholders from the developing world. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Schneider, for your views. Next, I'll give the floor to Mr. Charles Mok. There, okay. Charles Mok is the chairman of the Internet Society Hong Kong. Mr. Mok.

>>CHARLES MOK: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kummer, I wasn't sure that I'd have the opportunity to speak here until I saw my name on the screen a short while ago, so please forgive me for being a little bit brief.

I represent the Internet Society Hong Kong, a civil society organization, which is also a chapter of ISOC, and we're a civil society organization of Internet users as well as I.T. and Internet professionals.

And -- in the Hong Kong special administrative region of China.

I am personally also a returning ambassador for the ISOC in here, coming to my second IGF.

This year, we are working with the -- organization in Hong Kong called dot Asia organization, which is a nonprofit top level domain name organization based in Hong Kong and we've brought along with us six young people who are university students from Hong Kong, as well as from the China mainland, to join IGF for the first time under the mission Ambassador Program.

We find that the IGF opportunity and its multistakeholder nature to be the most effective and useful forum for developing capacity in all aspects of Internet governance, in allowing equal participation from all sector sectors and levels, including for young people. So I just want to say that Internet Society Hong Kong concurs with the global Internet Society that the IGF process should continue in its current format beyond the original five-year mandate. Thank you.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Mok. Next I would like to give the floor to Mr. -- lady. What a mistake. Ms. Park, Delft University of Technology. Madam, please.

>>Y.J. PARK: Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me an opportunity of contributing to Internet Governance Forum in a capacity of academia.

As many previous speakers addressed, IGF has done a tremendous job of implementing multistakeholder principles under the leadership of ICANN and ISOC community as one of the U.N. WSIS mandates. ICANN-like, private sector-led multistakeholder role without decision-making process, IGF became an international knowledge transfer conference on Internet role. Indeed, IGF is a great place to transfer knowledge and policy from ICANN community to developing world. Most actors from developing world, including governments, in the IGF process became a sole recipient of the knowledge transfer and learn the lessons.

As a cofounder of WSIS Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus in 2003, I would like to remind you another mandate of this forum.

As Mr. Gross, former ambassador of U.S. government, recalled this morning, many of us were heavily engaged with the negotiation of who controls the Internet during the U.N. WSIS process.

Internet Governance Forum was created as a compromise between those who supported the status quo Internet governance institution under one nation's status provision, and those who requested for more balanced roles for governments under international supervision of the Internet.

While IGF has achieved a great success of diluting of such political tension between those who have different views of how to institutionalize Internet governance, ironically Internet governance forum became a forum without governance. The Internet Governance Forum has been a good exercise to identify global public policy issues on the Internet. However, we also have to admit IGF failed to deliver another mandate of the U.N. WSIS: Continuing discussion of

how to design Internet governance institutions.

As one of the main members, it has been always challenging to put institutional aspects of Internet governance discussion on the agenda of the Internet governance forum. In turn, this practice once in a while invited accusations of IGF as a useless forum without another mandate of the U.N. WSIS.

As of today, some stakeholders are content by IGF's networking function in a form of knowledge transfer conference and ask for a continuation. Others think IGF is dysfunctional because IGF does not discuss another critical mandate of the U.N. WSIS like how to design Internet governance institution and ask for discontinuation.

We have another IGF coming soon in Lithuania. If 2010 IGF can deliver U.N. WSIS mandates in a balanced manner, both knowledge transfer and negotiation of how to design Internet governance institution, those who have different expectations on IGF as of today may be able to build a consensus. Otherwise, I would like to propose IGF community should have different forum for different U.N. WSIS mandates. The current IGF continues to function as knowledge transfer of ICANN's values to other stakeholders, while those who want to discuss and negotiate on how to design Internet governance institutions should have another platform for that specific U.N. WSIS mandate. Thank you for paying your attention to my proposal.

[Applause]

>>SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, madam park. Next I'll give the floor to Mr. Zahid Jamil, the senior partner and barrister of law, Jamil -- Zahid Jamil. Please.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you. Your Excellency, Ambassador Sha. I also speak in part on behalf of PASHA, the sole Pakistani trade association of I.T. and I.T.-enabled businesses.

At Sharm El Sheikh, we find travel funding in relation to Pakistan interesting.

The president of our I.T. association is funded by APC. The telecom regulator is funded by ISOC. An academic is funded by government. And civil liberties advocate by a business, which is the ccTLD dispute resolution provider. The discussions, dialogue, and cooperation for implementation of policies catalyzed by the IGF on the ground in Pakistan is truly unique.

The interactions multistakeholders have had here have led to a change in the format and processes of discussions, dialogue, and engagement in Pakistan. This has been very clearly in our recent dialogues on I.T. policy development, which chose to use IGF format and processes.

It is important to note that contribution to this effort by Pasha, ICC/BASIS, and the continued engagement of APC. IGF influenced the advocacy and introduction of internationally compatible cybercrime legislation in consultation with business, civil society, and legislators and even law enforcement agencies.

The engagement of some governments and the CoE has been valuable in this regard. Just yesterday, our federal investigation agency set up a cybercrime committee in the multistakeholder spirit of the IGF.

IGF helps local stakeholders and also the direct engagement of ICC/BASIS and Oracle in the policy process which resulted in data protection recommendatory guidelines addressing privacy concerns, but also being business-friendly and thus enabling trade in I.T. services and outsourcing for Pakistan. Very early on, it led to Nominet and DENIC exchanging best practices for the creation of what is now a successful domain name dispute resolution center, thus enabling Pakistan to demonstrate that implementing dispute resolution in line with best practices can be efficient in Pakistan's challenging environment, even as an online service.

It has given us the model of multistakeholderism that has been injected within our ccTLD. It initiated engagement by Pakistani stakeholders within ICANN not just for dot pk, but also to engage in policy issues related to gTLDs and IDNs.

It has allowed us to sensitize international governments, businesses, donors, and civil liberties groups and initiatives about the need of business, civil

society, media, and development sectors of Pakistan.

Just here in Sharm, the Commonwealth IGF through frank and constructive exchange which is leading to some exciting products being initiated on the ground in Pakistan and other commonwealth countries has done marvelous work.

IGF catalyzed these outcomes and many other efforts.

In short, these would likely not have either happened or would not have been successful, but for the IGF.

Developing countries at policymaking forums can find themselves polarized between extreme views due to politicization since language, outcomes, resolutions, and declarations need to be negotiated.

The IGF provides a forum for policy dialogue and exchange of best practices relatively freer from politicization inclusive of business, civil society and government at an equal footing. As such, we would strongly and even passionately request that the decision-makers work to ensure that this unique and valuable forum is continued. Please do not take this opportunity away from us. Please let this bazaar, as it was characterized this morning, continue.

We also request -- and here's the list -- that we maintain the founding principles and this unique format of IGF being a place for policy dialogue.

Ensure Secretariat independence which has worked hard under the effective leadership and careful diplomacy of Mr. Desai and Mr. Kummer.

Keep IGF multistakeholder, giving an equal space at the table to all stakeholders.

Make national and regional IGFs an imperative, but not at the cost of the opportunities of this global IGF being available on an annual basis.

There are several people, Your Excellency, who are online or newcomers or have, for the first time, realized that it is necessary for them to provide feedback on the IGF since it is -- it may impact its continuance.

In continuation of the opportunity for effective remote participation created by the IGF, I would plead with you that you extend time for submissions with respect to consultation by 14 days.

Such transparent opportunity to contribute will add credibility to the consultations which credibility already has.

On a personal note, I would just like to add, and this is where I conclude, we don't see this as a platform for capture of CIR. It is not a CIR forum. It deals with many other issues -- security, openness, privacy, stability of Internet and access -- which are values shared by us all. Please, as we go forward let us see less of these politics.

It doesn't help us, the users, be they business or individuals or civil society in the developing world, and instead puts the priorities of citizens and businesses on a back burner. Your Excellency, we offer our appreciation and many thanks for this gracious opportunity.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Jamil. Now I give floor to Ms. Sue Baxter, head of the U.K. delegation, head of the E.U. and International Competitiveness Unit, Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills.

Madam.

>>SUE BAXTER: Thank you, Mr. Under-Secretary-General. The question hanging over this whole conference has been should it continue beyond next year, but perhaps a more fitting question should be why think about stopping a process that has proved itself to be useful, popular and gaining in momentum.

Over the last few days here, one cannot help but be enormously struck by the large number of people from so many walks of life and from all over the world to network, to share ideas, and to solve common problems.

The sheer enthusiasm of everyone here is surely testimony to the value of such a forum. And if people didn't find it useful, they simply wouldn't come.

And they have come this year in record numbers.

The reason the IGF is growing in momentum is due to its informality, it's nondecision-making format, and its open and inclusive participatory structure.

No time is wasted in agreeing text, and the debate is on substantive issues.

The evidence speaks for itself.

How many conferences offer an opportunity for teenagers to debate with senior statesmen and women issues which affect the lives of millions?

How many conferences spawn regional and national models based on the same organizing principles?

The answer is not ones which have run their course. And that's because we believe the challenges which are debated at the IGF are the challenges which either already face us or will soon face us in each of our countries.

And as long as those challenges persist, there will be room for an IGF.

So it really should come as no surprise to you that the U.K. fully supports continuing the IGF mandate, and it fully supports continuing with an independent Secretariat, but funded perhaps by a wider range of stakeholders.

Of course there is room for improvement. The IGF could be more inclusive, in particular to developing countries and less developed countries.

The agendas of the conferences could be more streamlined around core themes and more focused on emerging applications and we could have sharper and more accessible summaries of proceedings captured the diversity and range of views expressed, but not, I stress, conclusions or recommendations.

However, we have made a great start, and I am sure that together we can make good progress.

The significance of this conference has resonated throughout the world. It has promoted the principle that the Internet is the future and the Internet is for everyone, and those are principles which the U.K. supports.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, madam.

Let me next give floor to Mr. Gao Xinmin, vice president of the Internet society of China.

Mr. Gao, please.

>>GAO XINMIN: Good afternoon. I am Gao Xinmin, the Vice President of Internet Society of China (ISC). As a civil society, ISC has played an important role in the process of Internet governance in China. Meanwhile, ISC is also an active participant to the IGF that we have consecutively participated in the IGF for 4 sessions. With sufficient participation and exchange from multi-stakeholders, the IGF has been more clearly aware of a framework regarding to the issues related to Internet public policies, which will pave a substantial base to implement the principles of Internet governance set by WSIS.

From the previous IGF, it is obviously realized that Internet has increasing impact on all aspects of social economy. At 2009 IGF, the Egyptian participant told me the Internet had played influential role on recovery from the financial crisis. It is similar to China. China's Internet industry still keeps in growth even though encountering the financial crisis. China not only keeps high growth of Internet users, but also had maintained a two-digit growth of the industrial scale this year. Internet has played an impressive role in promoting the growth of traditional economy, social development and raising the quality of people's lives. Thus, we are very concerned about the progress of Internet governance. IGF plays an active role in promoting the development of Internet, and we have learned much experience from, and are much inspired by the forum.

However, we consider IGF should have made more tangible and practical results, for which we propose to make the following improvements.

Firstly, it is proposed that IGF should concentrate on the main issues which are trans-national, and needed to be solved urgently in the process of Internet development, such as issues of critical Internet resources management, trans-national network security and privacy protection etc. It is advised to raise the priority to solve these issues and to propose to establish experts committee on related fields. It is proposed to raise solutions and suggestions from perspectives of legislation and technology on the base of fully discussion and common understanding among multi-stakeholders. Meanwhile, it is advised to

set a timetable for these issues needed to be urgently resolved. Secondly, in terms of the issues related to national or regional perspective, such as a country's domain name management, management measures of illegal contents, Internet for development etc, it is proposed to encourage each country to formulate reality-based and effective governance measures on the base of common principle. In this process, it is necessary to fully respect the different realities in different countries, such as differences of Internet's penetration and application level, and to understand the diversities of national and cultural background. IGF should continuously play the role as a best practice exchanged platform to create more opportunities for participation from the developing countries. Finally, it is suggested that IGF cooperation with Internet-related international organization as IETF to set up a consultation-based and decision-making promotion mechanism. As for the policy proposals submitted by IGF, it is proposed to be included in related international law or regulation.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Whether the IGF should be improved or not, it's your view. But in my view at least translation can be improved from Chinese to English. Now, next, let me give floor to Madam Lillian Sharpley from NRO, AfriNIC communication manager.

Madam, please.

>>LILLIAN SHARPLEY: Thank you, Under-Secretary-General Sha, for giving the NRO the opportunity to share our thoughts on the continuation of IGF.

Good afternoon ministries, Ambassadors, ladies and gentlemen.

The Number Resource Organization consists of five Regional Internet Registries: AfriNIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, and the RIPE NCC, all of which are represented here today.

Together, the RIRs represent thousands of organizations worldwide according to the multistakeholder model.

The RIRs have individually and collectively, under the NRO, participated with a high level of commitment in the IGF since its inception. We have contributed our operational and technical experience and participated in all aspects and themes of the IGF.

The RIRs were established by individuals and organizations from the community that operate the fundamental infrastructure of the Internet. The perceptions and concerns of developed and developing areas have always been incorporated equally into RIR discussions.

The NRO believes that the IGF, as a nondecision-making forum, has been and continues to be an important and positive environment in which all stakeholders can participate openly and equally.

The NRO -- It has been clearly demonstrated that this model facilitates high-level dialogue and valuable constructive discussions which has been vital to the success of the forum.

If the IGF moves away from these fundamental principles, it will affect the ability of various stakeholders to participate equally and openly.

For this reason, the NRO firmly supports the IGF continuing in its current form.

Other alternatives will not satisfy all of the requirements of the IGF as defined in the Tunis Agenda.

On the thank you the IGF will continue being an open forum, where no decisions are made, the NRO is committed to engaging with and financially contributing to the IGF as we have done for the past four years.

At the same time, we call on other governments and organizations to join us in contributing financially to the IGF to guarantee its continued success.

Finally, and on behalf of the NRO, I would like to thank the Egyptian government, particularly the ministry communications -- the Ministry of Communications and information technology, for hosting this very important event and for their warm hospitality.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Madam Sharpley.

Next I will give floor to Mister -- yes, Mr. Wolfgang -- well, we have some confusion here. Could you please announce your own name and organization.

>>WOLFGANG BENEDICT: Certainly. Thank you very much Mr.

Under-Secretary-General. My name is Wolfgang Benedict. I am replacing my colleague, Ian Peter, who has obligations in a parallel event.

I am a professor of international law from University of Graz, Austria, and head of Human Rights Center there.

I am speaking on behalf of the Internet Governance Caucus, the main civil society group with around 100 member organizations from all over the world.

We have three short messages.

First, the IGF has to continue because the process has been successful and still has a lot to deliver. And I'm quite happy to see that this seems not to be so controversial anymore.

Second, the multistakeholder approach should be deepened and enlarged as it has proven its value for open discussion and jointly seeking solutions for present and emerging problems. In this context, I would like or we would like to underline the importance of the human rights dimension, which was once again confirmed in many sessions here in Sharm El Sheikh, and which should be further mainstreamed in future sessions.

And third, the IGF Secretariat should continue in its present form as the (inaudible) Secretariat and ensuring the approach.

Let me already on this occasion end with warm thanks to the Egyptian hosts and with thanks also for the good work of the IGF Secretariat.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, professor Wolfgang.

Next I will give floor to Mr. Jyrki Kasvi, member of Parliament, vice chair Committee for the Future, Finland.

Mr. Kasvi, please.

>>JYRKI KASVI: Mr. Under-Secretary-General, ladies and gentlemen, with every passing year it becomes more and more evident that the IGF is the most concrete, most successful, and most promising outcome of the WSIS process.

If there are still those who believe otherwise, who feel that the IGF has not shown enough concrete results, I would like to cite a well-known Chinese proverb: A journey of 10,000 miles starts with the first step.

We have now taken the fourth step, and Vilnius will be the fifth.

Let's not stop here. With the speed of the ICTs developed today, we continuously face new opportunities and challenges which need to be addressed together.

There are already a number of topics which have not yet been adequately discussed.

Consumer protection in cloud computing and freedom and responsibility of expression in new social networks are some topics of my personal interest, and new ones continue to emerge.

The IGF in its current format, with its Secretariat in UNDESA, is well placed for such open dialogue.

After every IGF meeting I return home with new thoughts and ideas. For example, having been sensitized to the needs of people with disabilities, I have added a section to my political Web pages in so-called plain Finnish. But moreover, my experiences in IGF have influenced my work in international parliament. For example, concerning freedom of expression of blog writers.

I cannot stress enough how useful the IGF is from national legislatures' perspective, because national legislation is not created in isolation from international context.

I would like to give the IGF another five-year mandate to let it grow and mature and revisit the issue as we make the overall assessment of WSIS in 2015.

For me, the IGF is the best demonstration of the enhanced cooperation since its invention as part of a compromise deal in the late hours of Tunis in 2005.

The Affirmation of Commitments is another reason and promising example. Giving governments a better chance to be involved.

I think it is time we move on from the political deadlock which we have created around the term "enhanced cooperation." Stop demanding the Secretary-General to initiate something where there is no agreement on, and concentrate on action and making progress happen ourselves.

So let's get involved and engage. We all have a role to play in Internet governance.

Thank you for attention. SHAKRAN, Egypt for your warm hospitality here in Sharm El Sheikh.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Kasvi. Now let's give the floor to Ms. Heather Creech, director global connectivity, International Institute for Sustainable Development, from Canada. Madam, please.

>>HEATHER CREECH: Thank you, Ambassador Sha.

IISD values the IGF, as many others have mentioned this afternoon, as an open space for the frank discussion of views.

It is through these dialogues that all stakeholders work together toward an understanding of our shared responsibility in managing and supporting the infrastructure, services, and communities of the net.

However, I would like to echo the comments of Mr. Kahn earlier today and many others. This community needs to engage a broader community of stakeholders, in particular the major civil society and other organizations that are established and active in other domains. The consumer associations, the environmental NGOs like WWF and ICUN, the development groups like Oxfam, save the children. The rights and citizens' groups like Transparency International, accountability and CIVICUS to name only a few.

It is true that the IGF is open and anyone can come, but the IGF needs to reach out and demonstrate the relevance of its issues, its domain, to those who need the Internet and who are trying to utilize it to solve the environment and development challenges of the day.

And as the IGF begins to explore these issues of development, ICTs and the environment, and so on, these other experts and actors should be here.

We are not going to get climate change solutions like smart grids without addressing fiber and cable infrastructure to the last mile and the addressing required for the Internet of things.

We are not going to get to a green economy without the incentives for ICT innovation.

We are not going to get a more informed and engaged global citizenry without addressing the challenges of access to knowledge, privacy, and digital accountability.

But the stakeholders who work in these parallel domains of environment, development, and society, the stakeholders who need us are significantly underrepresented here.

And the IGF does not have a presence in their forums.

The absence of the IGF from the climate change negotiations in Copenhagen, for example, is the type of disconnect that the world can no longer afford.

The IGF is dealing with important issues, with serious issues. It's mandate should be renewed, but that mandate needs to include a directive for broader engagement with other actors beyond the founding community of the forum.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, madam. Next, I will give floor to Mr. Frédéric Riehl, the chair of the United Nations commission on science and technology for development, and at the same time the director international relations, federal Department of the Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications, the DETEC, from Switzerland.

You have the floor, please.

>>FR...D...RIC RIEHL: Thank you very much, sir. I will express myself in French to provide a little diversity today.

Very briefly, I will describe the follow-up process within the CSTD, which is one of the ECOSOC commissions.

A number of you wanted clarification on this process.

The WSIS Tunis declaration in 2005 provides for giving the CSTD with a review of the progress for the implementation of the Tunis Agenda, and its resolution 2006, 46, in paragraphs 4 and 6, the ECOSOCs provide the role for CSTD as a center for coordination of WSIS follow up.

So as of 2007, we have regularly been informing ECOSOCs and the General Assembly on the progress implemented in the Tunis Agenda.

In 2009, the ECOSOC asked us in its resolution 2009-7 in paragraph 46, that during its third session in May 2009, we organize a substantive discussion on the progress accomplished in the implementation of WSIS agenda.

We, in addition to member states, also bring in the private sector, civil society, and other organizations.

In May 2010, is to deal with the issues of the follow-up. And this is to include the report to the Secretary-General on the consultations on the issue of enhanced cooperation, which ECOSOC didn't deal with during its July session. This is in paragraph 19 of the resolution of the same ECOSOC 2009-7.

Also, we are to be talking about of the future of the IGF on the basis of the report which is transmitted according to the paragraph 18, 2007, 46. This I think is important information to see what it is that we will be accomplishing in May 2010. And as chairman of CSTD, I listened very carefully to what's been said here in Sharm El Sheikh, and I think that this will be very useful for us when we meet in May next.

Thank you, sir.

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: Thank you, Mr. Riehl, for your observations.

Next, and at the same time the last, by the Chinese culture last is always the best, well, the last speaker, Ms. Christine Arida from Egypt. Ms, please, you have the floor.

>> Christine Arida: Thank you very much. The IGF process has proved to be a unique forum which has allowed interaction among the various stakeholders in a policy dialogue on issues related to Internet governance.

It has enabled discussions and exchange of information and experience, and thus is providing a great opportunity for capacity building pertaining to Internet governance.

Its flexibility and dynamic nature in terms of topics and formats of discussion is helping promote it as a platform where participants can converse freely, highlight common points of agreement, and identify areas which need further discussion.

It is also helping members of the different stakeholder groups to build common understanding of problems and explore ways forward.

When looking at the experiment of the forum over the past four years, the government of Egypt believes that this process should continue to remain open and inclusive on the premises of the WSIS principles, and should always be directed to the attainment of the WSIS development goal.

On the national and regional levels, we think that the IGF has had a positive impact, and is thus promoting policy dialogues on those levels and linking it to the global dialogue on Internet governance.

The adoption of remote participation tools has had an increasing effect on broadening participation of stakeholders, yet the participation of stakeholders from developing countries is still low and needs to be further enhanced and strengthened at the IGF meetings as well as during the preparatory meetings.

We equally believe there is a need for more localization of the IGF agenda with an increased focus on developmental aspects. And there is an arising need to encourage more national and regional IGFs while exploring the possibility of extending institutional relationships among them and with the global IGF in the

future.

There is a need to revise the working modalities of the open consultations as well as those of the MAG, while exploring the possibility of enhancing the financial and administrative capacity of the Secretariat.

The IGF should continue to play an important role in influencing decisions made within other relevant bodies by reaching out in different ways to other organizations and policy forums related to Internet governance.

In conclusion, we would like to stress our support for the continuation of the IGF beyond its five-year mandate, while maintaining its dynamic nature and the legitimacy provided by the United Nations umbrella.

Finally, I thank you all for your vivid participation and your valuable collaboration to this IGF meeting in Sharm El Sheikh.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>>MR. SHA ZUKANG: So we have reached the end of the list of the speakers. Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, first of all, let me thank you very much for your active participation. And I really enjoyed this session, listening carefully to your open and frank exchanges of views in the spirit of multistakeholder approach, which has now become the signature statement of IGF.

Although we have to conclude this session, I would like to remind you that you will be given the last chance to submit written statement to the IGF Secretariat by the end of the day, today.

For those who are not present here, and for those who did not have the opportunity to speak, you may likewise submit your written statement online.

I'm fully confident that our able scribes have accurately captured all your views expressed today.

You might have noticed, due to technical reasons, there have been a couple of translation hiccups. Those speakers, if you believe that your statement had been, in any case, not fully reflected, please check yourself with the Secretariat.

As I mentioned, of course you know the translation -- I was trained as a translator, but I know how difficult it is to translate Chinese to English, so my sympathies to the translators.

As mentioned, I will report to the Secretary-General of United Nations. He will then make recommendations in his report to the General Assembly next year on desirability of the continuation of the IGF.

Once again, I extend my thanks to all of you who participated in this consultation, both online and off-line.

The formal consultation on desirability of the continuation of the forum is adjourned.

Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Please, ladies and gentlemen, we have immediately afterwards the last substantive session on emerging issues. It will take some time, few minutes, to change the podium and the panelists, I invite them already to install themselves here on the podium.

And please, I think it may be best to remain in the room. I think we will resume in five minutes or so.

Thank you.