

### **Are the main themes of 2005 still relevant today?**

Yes, they are still relevant as a whole. However, the depth of the discussion in some areas or themes has varied over the past five years because of the emergence of new issues that make some areas less prominent or make other themes even more important. This is actually guided by the IGF participants themselves, whether they feel that some areas or themes need to be addressed more thoroughly, or need not be addressed any more. Likewise, participants may identify new themes they deem important to be introduced to the IGF agenda.

### **Are there new themes that are being overlooked in Internet governance discussions?**

One of the key advantages of the IGF is its open, multistakeholder character that brings to the dialogue diverse groups with many new topics and ideas to consider. Over its 5-year term, the IGF has dedicated a main session for emerging issues. In this session, new topics have been discussed and some have become part of the IGF yearly agenda. Social networking, online child safety, and cloud computing are only a few examples of topics that have been brought to the IGF context over time.

### **From Athens to Vilnius. Has the context of the discussions changed, and, if so, how?**

Those who have been active in the IGF can confirm that the context of discussions has changed for the better as more best practices are exchanged, people networks are created and governments and community trust has been fostered. So the IGF has come a long way. It has matured in terms of participation as well as substance. It has become a recognized forum where participants can engage freely and comfortably in discussion of any subject pertaining to Internet governance. The trust that participants have had in the IGF over the past years has been reflected in the quality and diversity of discussions. The theme of critical Internet resources (CIR) is one example of how discussions within the IGF have developed and matured over time. The IGF should continue to provide an open platform, not only to let anyone participate, but also to allow for any relevant topics to be shared and discussed. This will help the IGF to continue to develop and grow.

### **Has Internet governance globally advanced over the five years of the IGF?**

The IGF has created a space where all parties interested in the global Internet governance debate can exchange views and share experiences. There is no doubt that the IGF has been instrumental in building bridges across various organizations and groups, and strengthening ties among the different players in the field. This has helped all participants better comprehend the complexity of issues, and further engage in discussions. The IGF has also inspired people to go back home and work on enhancing policy and technical frameworks pertaining to the Internet. The rise of national and regional IGFs in many places around the world is an indication of the progress made in Internet governance over the past five years.

### **Capacity building: where were we five years ago and where are we now?**

Since the WSIS days, capacity building has been one of the key elements of the Internet governance debate. During those early days, the disparity in the language spoken by different stakeholders with regard to what Internet governance was or was not, was quite noticeable. Today, this gap has been to a large extent, narrowed thanks to the IGF that provided an unprecedented platform where all stakeholders can freely engage without the constraints imposed by having to negotiate an outcome. At the IGF we have been witnessing participation from a variety of governmental, non-governmental, technical and non-technical groups that had not been part of the discussion in the past. We have seen new faces representing parliamentarians of developed and developing countries, small and medium businesses, and civil society groups from developed and developing countries, participating actively at the IGF. Initiatives such as the Internet governance summer schools, education programs run by Diplo foundation even for diplomats, fellowship programs sponsored by some organizations or governments, as well as the newly established national and regional IGFs, along with other initiatives on remote participation to allow all who cannot come to still be part of and discuss issues at hand, have all helped with capacity building in this field. The fact remains though that capacity building in such a dynamic field will always require more work to be done as emerging issues keep being unveiled.