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.

REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES
Sunday, 15 November 2009
INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Can I please ask the panelists of the next session to
join us on the panel, please.
 The next panel will be dealing with regional initiatives, and I do know we
also have some participants who would like to talk about national IGF
initiatives and we are losing time. For some reason, this change of
panelists took longer than I expected.
 I think we're getting there, yes.
 Hello, Issah, please sit down.
 So this second panel will be co-moderator Christine Arida, and I would
like to ask immediately for Christine to introduce the panelists.
 >>CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you, Markus, and good morning to everyone.
 If we can get seated so we can start.
 Before I introduce the panelists, I would like to set the floor very
quickly. This panel is supposed to hear from the different regional
meetings that have happened all through the year. And I think this is a
very important perspective, because we would like our analysts to give us
their perspective on what are the priorities for the different regions, and
how do those priorities link and how are the topics that are discussed in
the various regions also linked to -- what are the commonalities with the
global dialogue and where are the differences.
 So I am not going to take a lot of time because we want to make this panel
as interactive as possible and also hear from the floor, from other
regional meetings and from also maybe national meetings. So I will start
to my left with Mr. Carlos Afonso who is the planning director for the
information network for the third sector from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
 And he will be giving us the perspective of the Latin American region.
 Thank you, Carlos. The floor is yours.
 >>CARLOS AFONSO: Now I have I will speak in stereo.
 Hello? Okay.
 Good morning.
 The second Latin American/Caribbean preparatory meeting of the IGF was
organized by the APC, the Nupef Institute, the information network for the
third sector, and the Latin American/Caribbean Network Information Center,

the LACNIC, and was supported by cgi.br from Brazil, the National Research Network, APC itself, ISOC, and ICANN, cgi.br, among others.

It was an interesting meeting. It lasted three days, from August 11th through 13.

And I will present quickly a summary of findings and outcomes, based on the individual reports from the sessions.

Session one was about access. And the presentations in the panel brought the views of the several participant countries regarding public policies or specific initiatives contributing to universalization of access.

The specific aspects were singled out, like access and capacity building. Educated users can take advantage of the Internet to seek new opportunities, and this is an aspect of the network as a tool for further social and economic development.

One of the perceived challenges is together with the universalization of the infrastructure, including end-user access tools, to universalize the building of capacities to empower as many users as possible, as well as stimulating citizens to learn about the technologies involved and understand this potential for helping to improve the quality of their lives.

Second point in access was adequate infrastructure to provide affordable connectivity. In most countries of the region, Latin America/Caribbean, there are few backbone providers, frequently just one. This is reproduced within many countries where just a few have more than one national backbone provider.

This leads to high international connectivity prices, and we think countries to monopoly or (inaudible) contracting prices which makes the price of broadband, which is usually available only in higher income areas, many times higher for the final user than, for example, Europe. In some cases 65 times higher the price of broadband in countries of Latin America compared to Europe.

In the cases where there is more than one national backbone, deployment of Internet exchange points is necessary. In countries like Brazil, these IXPs are nonprofit services which do not add to the cost of bandwidth, and to the contrary, help reduce costs by optimizing national or in-country regional traffic.

Broadband ought to be universalized, using an optimal combination of fiber and digital radio as well as regulatory and public-policy incentives.

Third point in access, harmonization of regulatory practices. This is mentioned as especially important for the Caribbean, many small countries with divergent regulatory practices which make difficult development of a public-policy for developing infrastructure and attracting private investment.

Another point is appropriate legislation. Of course, this should assist planning investments combining market competition with adequate regulation, public policies, which ensure effective universalization.

It has been verified that the market by itself will not guarantee

universalization, while significant restrictions to private initiative or the replacement of state operators by private monopolies might preclude innovation.

Governments have to be proactive regarding the relevance of universalizing ICTs, for sustainable human development. A need to develop strategic planning in the deployment of these technologies.

International connectivity cost is another point. These impact directly in the price of access for the final user.

And most countries do not have the leverage to negotiate better terms of trading international bandwidth. In the Caribbean, for instance, not all countries have access to submarine cables.

Local content, it's recognized that extending access to all requires incentive to develop local content for all.

National strategies for producing appropriate local content, which add value to the access and connectivity policies, are needed. In this sense, the Internet is also an effective medium for social inclusion in citizens' participation in democratic processes, allowing for significant improvements in transparency, in efficacy, in government. It enables, as well, new forms of business transactions and national competition, thus further stimulating economic development.

Finally, access to communicate and exchange information, it is the basis of realizing the right to communicate, a fundamental right for every citizen.

The second session is on privacy. And the other ones are shorter than this one, just to let you know.

The main issues to emerge in this session on privacy were the need for legal and regulatory harmonization generally within and among countries. The importance of focusing on the user, conceding rights and assuring its protection to anyone who has data -- has its data collected through the use of electronic networks and services.

The need for the creation of structures and audit mechanisms to protect privacy. The need for regional normative harmonization was a concern equal through most of the of the presentations.

The importance of the training of stakeholders on privacy issues was highlighted, especially among lawyers, judges, policymakers, and civil society advocates.

Initiatives to educate the individual user were also mentioned as desirable.

Particular attention is needed on privacy issues concerning social networks, cloud computing, and e-government. The situation of workers and the possibility of online background checks also requires particular attention.

Transparent organic structures are essential to enable the protection of privacy. Users need information about the implications of what they are doing in social networks offered in simple language. While stressing the importance of creation of national policies, laws and institutions to

protect privacy, the panel also pointed that it's essential that users be empowered to make informed choices.

The importance of privacy protection by design was emphasized, recalling that huge privacy difficulties can arise unexpectedly from tiny personal projects, especially taking into account problems of jurisdiction, where data is stored in another country. This also points to the issues involving multi-nationals, global operations.

I will highlight a few points of the other panels because time is very short. Okay?

The critical resources panel focused on the governance of the DNS, domain names, IP addresses and the root structure which enables the global Domain Name System. There was consensus that these resources need to be unique and globally coordinated and the challenges in this regard are, on the one hand, to legitimate this coordination and on the other, to identify the best global practices to manage these resources.

In this regard, six statements were made that are summarized below. The importance of the Anycast system, the positive contribution of the IXP initiatives, the Internet exchange points, the agreement that the regional management of I.P. addresses has been satisfactory, the protracted process leading to the creation of the new gTLDs was a strong concern. The importance of the impact of IDN zone destability of the DNS was regarded an essential, and the deployment of DNSSEC constituted an extremely important step in the direction of stability of the DNS system.

Finally, session four, openness and security, we should stress the balance between legal and enforcement needs on the one hand and freedom of expression on the other hand.

Unfortunately, I can't tell about it any further because the time is very short.

Session five, multilingualism and accessibility. The panel sought to set the theme and in context of the Internet as a tool for human development. It was recommended that universal access funds are still not used in many countries in the region, we have to list one, having accumulated several billion dollars, be effectively and urgently disbursed with a broader vision than at the time they were created.

Finally, dialogue on openness. The dialogue basically focused on six topics considered relevant to the region: free expression and free for all information, access to knowledge and access to information, open infrastructure, open opportunities, open standards and free and open source software, and open governance.

The session on the future of the IGF did not have a report, a summary report, so I cannot elaborate further, but there is the full report available on the Internet. And I will be glad to pass it on to you.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>CHRISTINE ARIDA: Okay, thank you, Carlos. And sorry if time is limited. We really want to hear from everyone around the room.

So I will ask the panelists, please, not to -- to be as short as possible and not to give us the full reports. The reports will be shared on the Web site. So you will be able to download and read it there.

Please highlight and give us the priorities of the regions as well as the commonalities and the differences with the global dialogue.

I am turn to my next panelists, Mr. Thomas Schneider. Thomas Schneider is the Information Society coordinator, International Affairs Department of the Swiss Federal Office of Communication, OFCOM. And I trust Mr. Schneider will give us the EuroDIG perspective.

>> THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much and hello to everybody. I will just limit my intervention on the three points what was common, what was different, and what was of priority for the European IGF or EuroDIG.

The common thing was the objective. The objective was to establish a platform for discussion on Internet governance issues among all relevant European stakeholders. Exchange views, best practices. To raise awareness in Europe about the importance of Internet governance issues. This was a very important point.

It was also an objective to establish a common ground. As you know, Europe is a very diverse region and you have at least five opinions on one issue, normally. So establish what would be the common ground that we all agree was also kind of an objective.

And to feed the European experience in the global discussion.

The priority was that the process would be as open and inclusive as possible. Different with regard to process from the global IGF was that the EuroDIG as we called it, European Dialogue on Internet Governance, was a real bottom-up initiative decided by a group of people sitting at a table in an ICANN meeting in Paris in 2008.

The structure is very light. There is no chair. There is no Multistakeholder Advisory Group. It's just an open network where everybody from every stakeholder, wherever you are, you can join and work with us. It's all on consensus based so every decision is taken on consensus-based process.

We have very limited resources, of course. And the network started with these five people and it's now an organization, and it's now growing and growing. And we have more or less all the relevant institutions and stakeholders present in the EuroDIG structure.

So much to the organization.

And the meeting itself was -- We had the first one in 2008, organized by the Council of Europe in their facilities in Strasbourg. This year's meeting was co-organized by the Swiss Federal Office of Communication and the European Broadcasting Union Geneva, in the EBU headquarters, with the support of the Council of Europe.

What we did different from the IGF is that we were trying to have as little panel and so-called real experts on the podium as possible. So many sessions was just one moderator that was kind of guiding an interactive discussion with the whole room. So there were 200 people discussing on

social network challenges and so on and so forth.

So we tried, knowing that everybody present would be an expert on something, we tried to involve everybody in the discussions. And this was a very positive experience that was very estimated by the people.

What we also did this year was we made a session with parliamentarians, European parliamentarians, parliamentarians from the European Parliament of the European Union, from the parliament of the Council of Europe, from national parliaments, from EU member states and also from non-EU member states, which was very interesting to get the feedback what was the people that had been elected to take care of the needs of the people, what they cared about and so on and so forth.

Another important thing was the involvement of youth. We had quite a number of youth representatives that also took a very active part in the discussion. And they were not too shy to tell us whether something we discussed was absolutely unimportant and outdated according to their views or what they thought was relevant. And that also added to the fact that we had a very interesting and lively debate.

And the third point was that we took some efforts to include the countries from central and eastern, southeastern Europe into the discussion, because those were those who would normally have the least means to participate in Internet governance discussions and mechanisms.

So we invited -- We ran a students program for these regions and invited the ten best students of that region to participate in the discussion. And with students, I do not mean only young people, but they were from governments, from civil society, from the private sector as well.

So there are a few things that we have done differently, which I think could also be an inspiration or something to check and discuss with the IGF on a global level for other regions.

And we have an outcome in the sense that we created the notion of messages. We have a document that you can see on the Web site, eurodig.org. There is a document which is called "Messages from Geneva" which is not a negotiated document but for every session, those that were organizing the sessions, they were responsible of giving their view on what was key of the discussion in their session.

So you have a paper where you see what is discussed, what were the key issues, where was common ground identified. But it's not a negotiated document. It's the views of those who organized it. And everybody is free to say, "I disagree with this view." "I agree with this view."

In terms of content, we based our six workshops and four plenary sessions on the issues like they were set for the global IGF. And we try to maybe focus within the issues on the aspects that were of crucial importance for Europe.

And the themes were end-user access to and choice in services, privacy questions, the question of the reliability of the Internet, cybercrime, cybersecurity, media literacy. We had a session on how we would imagine the Internet to look like in 2020 and what the challenges could be. We had

a session on access to content online, and the question of should you regulate new media or should you not regulate or how should you regulate them. Social networking sites, online social media, the challenges but also the opportunities.
 Then we had a discussion on the post-JPA phase that was 15 days before the publication of the affirmation of commitment, so we had some ideas but we didn't know yet what was going to come.
 And there was -- the last session was a discussion on the future of EuroDIG and the creation of a European IGF, and the main -- the three or four main points where we established some common ground or some common ground was identified was that as well as -- online as well as offline, the basis of our societies are the fundamental freedoms, the human rights and the rule of law, and these should be valid in the Internet as they are in the real world.
 There was a common ground that the Internet has become an infrastructure of public interest, has therefore a public value which people should be aware of, stability and security of the Internet is crucial because we all rely on it more and more in our daily lives. Access, of course, is crucial. Access to services, access to content, to diversity, to choice of services and choice of content, diversity of content.
 Media education is another very important point. And the last point is that this process that we started needs to be inclusive and we have to get even more people on board, more business people, and we want to have the whole European public, all stakeholders that are relevant, in that process.
 And it was then decided that the EuroDIG should be seen as the European IGF, and that we would try to put it on a more sustainable basis, and the Council of Europe offered Secretariat support for future EuroDIG meetings, which was welcomed and so we are now discussing on future meetings.
 We already have Spain, who is thinking about hosting the EuroDIG in 2010, and no matter what happens to the IGF, the EuroDIG will continue. It's already now clear that EuroDIG will continue after 2010. We are discussing with Serbia and maybe other countries on -- Serbia is interested in hosting an EuroDIG meeting in 2011, so we will continue after 2010.
 Thank you very much.
 [Applause]
 >>CHRISTINA ARIDA: Thank you. Thank you, Thomas, and indeed it's very interesting to see this escalation between the national and regional IGFs and the global dialogue because it's a vice versa discussion. I think on the one hand the global IGF is creating a momentum that is carrying the multistakeholder notion into the regional levels but also from within the different regions, there are new policy issues that are arising and coming up, so let me turn quickly to our next panelist, Ms. Alice Munyua. Ms. Alice is a member of the board of directors, the Communications Commission of Kenya. She's also vice chair of the Kenya network for information center, the KENIC ccTLD manager.
 Ms. Alice will be reporting on the East African IGF. The floor is yours.

>>ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much. The eastern African IGF is in its second year. The first one was held in 2008 in Nairobi. Second one held in September, again in Nairobi.

The East African IGF has been convened mainly by Kenya, due to the realization that the East African region had be left behind in terms of contributing and participating in a global Internet governance processes.

So the five or six East African countries were involved, have been involved since the onset -- Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, and Burundi -- and in 2009 we had the pleasure of inviting -- of Sudan and Somalia participating and requesting to participate officially as well.

In terms of stakeholders that have been involved, it's basically all the stakeholders within the WSIS context -- government, private sector, civil society, media, academia -- that have been involved in very actively participating and contributing to the process generally.

And the new entrant this year was also our parliamentarians. We had an IGF parliamentarian session that was hosted by the Kenyan National Assembly and by the speaker of the Kenyan National Assembly and we had parliamentarians from the four other East African countries. That process also developed a resolution, which among others was to work collaboratively to develop policies, for example, broadband access policies and cybersecurity and cybercrime.

Now, in terms of the main East African IGF, the main issues that came up or that were discussed, and there was some certain level of consensus, the first one was on cybercrime and cybersecurity. And the concern mainly was cybercrime was the fact that there is broadband now in the East African region and the new challenges of cybercrime that are going to be experienced from fraud to cyberstalking to spamming, and participants of the East African IGF acknowledged these concerns and requested governments to come up with a policy collaboratively at the international level as well, to develop a cybercrime policy that would look into those issues.

And specifically to develop a national and regional CERTs as well as collaboration with other international organizations that are working on this same process.

The other very important issue that was discussed and consensus around it was on access. Access is still a major issue in our region and in the African region and in our East African region specifically.

Access to broadband, access to local relevant and accessible content, just merely access to the Internet as well.

The main issues were costs. Yes, there is broadband at the eastern coast currently but the costs have not really been felt to have come down at the user level, so the lowering of costs not only access to infrastructure, broadband, but also access to mobile and mobile Internet.

The increase -- there is a lot of concern about local relevant content that is relevant and in languages that are relevant to our region as well.

As well as last-mile solutions for broadband in order to improve and increase access to Internet.

The issue of mobile, as we all know East African -- the African region has taken to mobile very -- you know, in a very big way and we believe that mobile solutions are going to be presenting solutions to access to Internet, and so we felt that there was a need to look at mobile content solutions by all stakeholders.

Critical Internet resources, which is also a theme at the global level, was identified as also a theme at the regional level as well, and our main concern at the regional level was strengthening our ccTLDs. The dot tz, dot ke, dot rw. For some of them, it's an issue of redelegation like dot rw and dot ug, but -- and dot so, but mainly around strengthening ccTLDs in order to contribute to the process -- for example, ICANN's process of, you know, ensuring DNSSEC, ensuring the security and stability of the Internet, as well as within the context of the new generic top-level domains that are going to be introduced by ICANN, just ensuring that our own ccTLDs are able to perform and contribute at that level.

Consumer issues and consumer protection was also quite a big issue in terms of individual Internet users within the context of just protection, consumer protection from cybersecurity, from a cybersecurity perspective.

And also, awareness creation around, you know, what are ICTs, what are the consumer issues that need to be taken into account.

Quality -- issues of quality of service as well as quality of service indicators, development of quality of service indicators for our region.

Policy and regulation still a major issue in our region. Policy because we are still developing policies regarding access to the Internet, and that's where we feel, for example, that the global IGF could be of immense assistance to our region in terms of just a framework around which we can develop some of our policy and regulation from all the discussions and the debate that come out of the global policy process.

So, again, the issue was mainly -- what was presented to the parliamentarians or the policymakers was around coming up with a regional broadband policy to ensure that we lower access costs to broadband.

Coming up with a regional communication policy and a framework for collaboration in terms of Internet governance policy.

As we all know, the key impact of multistakeholder processes like the Internet governance one is mainly felt at the national level, where the center of policy is -- which is normally the center of policy processes. And so we feel, just like the Europeans feel, that the East African IGF and the national IGF -- IGFs at the East African level will continue whether or not the IGF continues, although we very strongly support the continuation of the Internet global -- Internet Governance Forum and Kenya officially made its intention to host the 2011 IGF, if the mandate is extended, but we do agree with the Europeans that despite the IGF continuing, we will -- it's been a very -- the IGF has given us impetus to a very important process which we feel will continue at the national and regional level.

And so with that, the next East African IGF is going to be held in Uganda. It's going to be posted by the Ugandan government and other stakeholders.

Thank you.
 [Applause]
 .
 >>CHRISTINA ARIDA: Thank you, Alice. And I think it will make sense now to hear also from the West African IGF, so let me introduce Mr. Issah Yahaya, who is head of policy planning, monitoring and evaluation/telecoms at the Ministry of Communications in Ghana.
 Mr. Issah, the floor is yours.
 >>ISSAH YAHAYA: Thank you very much and good afternoon. The West African IGF was held on the 14th to 16th October 2009, and it was organized by AfriNIC and the minister of communications on behalf of the government of Ghana.
 The theme was "Promoting the Multistakeholder Model for Further Internet Development in Africa."
 Participants came from the academic community, civil society, government, the private sector, and the technical community.
 The objectives of the forum included identifying of obstacles that impede the growth of the Internet, identifying ways to accomplish related tasks more effectively and efficiently, then staying informed of the industry trades, and an understanding of the resources required and their availability.
 Finally, also, developing relationships with other organizations that are also tasked with common goals.
 The opening challenge as read out by the minister in his address took notice of the fact that good Internet governance is critical for sustainable development. The imperative need for West Africa to embrace the spirit behind the IGF, which is based on multistakeholder approach to address critical issues in terms of access.
 Another challenge was the need to strengthen the Internet industry.
 And also, the need to prioritize issues of IGF for long-term local and regional Internet development plan that would include Internet resources, security, openness, and access.
 Then finally, another challenge was the need for a successful model to integrate organized bodies and their communities in global policymaking process.
 The consensus of the forum, which was captured in a communique, was to pursue the NKRUMAH agenda.
 NKRUMAH, the initials of the vice president of Ghana, a staunch pan-Africanist, had "N" representing network development. That is, the Internet exchange points, et cetera. The "K" representing knowledge. In this regard, capacity-building and sharing. The "R" stands for regional priorities. The "U" representing Ubuntu, meaning people, and Umoja, togetherness. The "M" stands for multistakeholder and good management. Then the "A" representing assembly and ambassadors, whereas "H" represented high-level engagement on processes and policies.
 There were other outcomes.

West African countries should strive to create an environment that favors a multistakeholder model dealing with critical issues, challenges, in Internet development.

Affordable access should continue to be the priority for countries and regulators in order to improve Internet usage as a tool, and enabler of socioeconomic development.

Affordable access starts from optimizing traffic flow paths and inter-networking by encouraging local interconnection through the setup of exchange points and production of local content.

Access and security are key concerns for the region. That must be further discussed at IGF and stakeholders can share experiences.

That global IGF has been a successful initiative as it has helped to create an open environment. Hence, the support for the renewal of the IGF mandate after the first five years.

And then also, to organize the West African Internet Governance Committee reflective of the stakeholder model to carry out the initiative of the West African IGF.

So in the communique, the West African stakeholders urged that active participation in the IGF to be held in Sharm El Sheikh, it also urged to increase the participation in ICANN especially with governments with GAC, so as to participate in the new oversight and evaluation mechanism.

And thirdly, to broaden popular awareness of the IGF issues in general, and West African priorities in particular, as well as building Internet resource management with continental partners, such as FOSSFA, OSIWA, ECOWAS, governments, regulators, academia, the technical community and civil society.

Finally, to further engage Internet governance experts and local, such as AfriNIC, AfNOG, AfREN, AfriSPA, in the regions global policymaking process. The communique was dated 16th October 2009. Thank you very much.
 [Applause]
 >>CHRISTINA ARIDA: Thank you, Mr. Yahaya and I think, yeah, the African momentum is something indeed to be proud of. Let me -- because I'm the moderator, I'm I can say I'm proud to be African here and it's been I think a very busy years for the Africans. We've had so many meetings in all the different regions and we also had two of them here in Cairo, one focused on Internet governance and one of them just two days ago which I think the AU will give us more on.

But now let me turn to my other the hat, the Arab region, and let me call on Dr. Ibaa Ouieshak, who is chair of the Arab working group on Internet governance and Arabic domain names to give us the perspective from the Arab region.

Dr. Ibaa, the floor is yours.
 >>IBAA OUIESHAK: Thank you, Christine. I will give a very brief introduction about the Arab team before I start to talk about the ideas which were expressed regarding IGF and the priorities.

The most important thing to notice is that the Arab team has not been

formed specifically for the purpose of the IGF. This team has been working on issues which are relevant to IGF before even the launching of the IGF process. Initially this team was working on domain names and multilingualism issues, and it was already in the heart of the IGF of that issue which became later one of -- of those on IGF list, so in one way or another, we can say that the Arab region, from day one, is in full accordance with IGF items on IGMs (phonetic) access of interests. Some of them have more priorities than others. This is natural from -- from hearing what are -- what is being expressed here through our colleagues, representatives of different regions, we can notice that priorities are a little bit different. From our side, the focus was on multilingualism during the last few years and then it moved also towards other access. Should I say that yesterday there was a meeting for the team and to which were invited several members of the Arab -- the Arab region, international organizations also, and some of our colleagues, experts from other international organizations such as ITU ESCWA, which contributed substantively to the meeting.

 The issues which were discussed, if -- well, the priority was given again to multilingualism, mainly due to the extraordinary evolution we are launching these days in the IDN and the domain names field. ICANN has very recently -- and actually it's today, I think today or tomorrow, maybe, the launching of the applications to the IDN ccTLD process. Everyone was very enthusiastic about this evolution, but we also stressed the point that this is only the beginning. Because now that let me say the hurdle -- the main -- one of the main hurdles was removed, now we are -- we can have IDNs in the root name of the Internet. It's up to us to continue working on this, and filling the standardization gap which still remains, filling the gaps which are on the application levels, in order to bring to the end user a fully usable and secure and stable system.

 That was the first -- that's the first action.

 And then we moved to infrastructure. Migration to IP Version 6 was discussed and we noticed that we -- there was -- there needs to be a regional plan for migration, given the expected depletion of the IP version -- Version 4 address space within the next three, maybe eventually four, years, but this is something which will come, and we might -- we should have an answer to this and we should move quickly.

 So a regional plan is being debated, and it is prepared now. Hopefully it will be finalized and then went into action and completed before the depletion of the space.

 Meanwhile, there was a reminder that we need to insist on the bodies who are working on mainly the RIRs who work on distributing addresses, that they need to take into consideration the situation of countries who are developing in the field of Internet and who have been -- did not have the chance to get located much address space as their -- as our friends from the developed countries. So this shall be taken -- should be taken into consideration during the next few years in order to restore a sort of

balance.

And that in the -- and that appropriate measures should be taken to not reproduce the same situation even if potentially we talk about un-depletable IP address space in IP Version 6 but this could even happen in the future.

So we should avoid this.

Then we moved to cybersecurity. There was -- given that in the region, there is a move towards adopting Internet into more and more business-critical applications such as e-government, e-banking and these sensitive applications, there needs to have -- there is a very strong need to have a consistent policy at the national level, and even at the regional level, if possible, to coordinate regional action -- national actions at the regional level into building a policy.

We are starting to inspire from already existing initiative by -- introduced by the ITU and -- regarding security standards and the cybersecurity action which is being led there.

There is also a need to develop national CERTs. We are -- there is a momentum in the Arab world regarding creating CERTs. Now several CERTs are being created. There is a need to even create more, and push them to coordinate nature amongst each other.

There was also a contribution from our colleagues in ESCWA, who is a U.N. -- the U.N. agency in -- responsible for western Asia. They did a very good study about all Internet governance issues, and this will be introduced within this forum. I will give very few hints about what was -- what were the priorities which were discussed on our side. Mainly we were talking about access, and here I join our colleagues in Latin America about that access remains a very critical issue these days, mainly due to the cost of access and mainly due to interconnection fees.

The pricing model, which is applied now, makes that -- the -- when we connect to the Internet, it is the one who connects who pays everything. It's not something which is balanced, and it's the -- so it's not based like telephony, for example, on exchanging trafficking on a sort of settlement of traffic which is being sent in both directions. No. One side pays it all, even if there is something like parasite traffic coming from the other side like spam or like attacks. We pay for this, and the others send us spam. That has been discussed, and there is a big need to change this. From my own experience, this has a considerable ratio of the price that the end user pays for the Internet is due to -- to the international connectivity fees.

And this needs -- I mean, in our countries. And this needs to change. And no national policy can help. Whatever a country alone could do this could succeed. There is need for regional coordination and international coordination in this.

And the last point, which was also mentioned, is the right of access to all information available on the Internet to everyone, with no discrimination against people coming from a certain region or a certain

country.
 Now, I think that that states all the priorities which were discussed. As
you can see, the priorities of the Arab region are somehow in line with
things which were -- with access which are discussed at the IGF. Some of
them have higher priority than others. For us, multilingualism remains a
very high priority because it constitutes a barrier for the users in our
regions, due to access and to use the Internet efficiently. Thank you.
 >>CHRISTINA ARIDA: Thank you.
 [Applause]
 >>CHRISTINA ARIDA: Thank you, Ibaa. And let me turn to -- right away to
Markus, so that we can hear from the floor. Please, Markus.
 >>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Christine, yes. Just a very few words as a
reaction to this presentation. I think they all underlined one of the
findings of WSIS: International coordination does not work if there is no
coordination at the regional and the national level.
 And I was also struck by the various regional meetings. They may have
started to begin with as a kind of preparatory meeting for the global IGF,
but increasingly, they see themselves and that they are a value in
themselves, and the way Alice and Thomas said, there's a need to continue
irrespective of what happens at the global level.
 I think this is an interesting development, but I do understand there are
also speakers who would like to talk about national initiatives from the
floor. Who would like the floor to present? Yes, there, I can see --
please go to the microphone and introduce yourself.
 >> I did go to the microphone. It just wasn't there.
 So my name is (saying name) and I co-coordinate the Spanish IGF. Our
national forum was first launched in December 2008, and we are a very
active platform and have succeeded in making it truly multistakeholder.
 Madrid will be hosting, like Thomas said, EuroDIG 2010 with full
commitment from the Spanish IGF advisory group.
 The forum will be taking place at the end of May at the same time that
Spain holds the European Union presidency. Advisory group members act in
the personal capacity but they are expected to provide links to their
respective groups of interest.
 Our advisory group members include members of the government, the private
sector such as Telefonica, Google Spain, et cetera, and the civil society,
including technical community, academic community, ISOC, Internet users, et
cetera.
 They all fully support the EuroDIG platform, and they commit to Madrid
hosting next year's event.
 So you are all invited to join us in Madrid, 2010.
 Thank you.
 >>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there other speakers from the floor?
We are not so much interested in reports. We welcome reports and we post
them on our Web site, but we would like to hear what are priorities in
different countries, what are the commonalities they have with different

countries, what are the differences.
 There are two people. Sorry, where was that?
 Yes, there is -- Please. And please introduce yourself.
 >>ESAM ABULKHIRAT: Okay. Thank you, Chair. My name is Esam Abulkhirat.
I am representing the African Union Commission in this forum. I want to
brief you on what's going on from the African Union site.
 We had a workshop on the Internet governance and Internet issues in
general on the 13th of November here in Egypt. The workshop was jointly
organized with the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology in
Egypt.
 Before I brief you on the outcome of that workshop, I just would like to
inform you that the heads of states and governments of the African Union
are meeting twice a year, and they decided to dedicate the next common
meeting in January 2010 for ICT in Africa, challenges and prospects for
development.
 This is the general theme of African Union summit in January 2010.
 In this regard, the African Union has decided to have several subthemes;
namely, the enabling environment for growth, ICT infrastructure
development, Africa and the economics of the Internet, capacity building,
research, and development.
 And last two weeks in Johannesburg, the ministers of Africa met in
extraordinary session and recommended some points that I think it's very
relevant to our forum here and worth mentioning. I will just brief you on
two or three points, which I think that's most important. The African
Union Commission and the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa, UNECA, would
jointly develop a convention on cyber legislations based on the continent
needs, which adheres to the legal and regularity requirements on electric
transactions, cybersecurity, and personal data protection.
 And it was recommended that the member states of the African Union will
adopt this convention by 2012.
 They also recommended consideration of the critical resources of the
member states, like the Country Code Top Level Domains, and to be managed
at local level and domestically have the needed skills to have more and
more experience in managing the critical resources.
 The other point is put in place all institutional arrangements and
mechanisms for Africa to be at peer with other continents that will reduce
the cost of communication and connection to the Internet.
 Build a strong and efficient public-policy partnership to achieve economic
and sustainable growth in Africa, and ensure a feasible and implementable
action plans.
 And finally, to establish dot Africa as a continental top-level domain for
use by organizations and individuals, with guidance from African Internet
agencies.
 This, in terms of the outcomes of the ministerial conference in Jo-burg.
 The workshop has also recommended or came with the very good conclusions
to the IGF and Internet governance in general.

The workshop was divided into four or five sessions. The first one was about managing critical Internet resources. And the participants from the workshop recommended to consider top-level domain, the ccTLDs, as a nation critical resource, which is important in the development of knowledge economy and ensure that the management is done by national stakeholders and conducted professionally.

Promote localization of Internet development by promoting the use of the different languages in Africa, and development of local content.

Promote awareness and end-user education through various forms of media and TV stations. Encourage stakeholders to collaborate through PPPs, public/private partnership. For security, openness, and privacy, their common infrastructure should be installed to a certain level of standard that considers security, openness, and privacy of all African people, women and youth.

Develop African model law or a legal reference framework on cybersecurity that consider the specificity and values of the African countries in line with the international initiatives in this regard.

Deal with cybercrime, cybersecurity, privacy and openness as a mutual responsibility of all stakeholders.

Need for raising awareness and for training to make people handle Internet security problems, with educate and enough information -- with adequate and enough information.

About access and diversity, promote access --

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry, sir. Can I ask you to wind up and be sure there are other speakers that would like to report and we have very little time left.

>>ESAM ABULKHIRAT: Okay, sorry.

I will conclude by going directly to the final session which was about expected outcome and Africa's position of IGF.

We have four points which, very briefly. Improve the Internet Governance Forum functioning and ensure that it is more pragmatic while maintaining the multistakeholder approach.

Second, encourage regional IGFs in Africa to address the African agenda while increasing the participation and contribution of Africa in the IGF.

Three, increase awareness of Internet governance issues and continue to develop capacity and build regional as well as continental consensus.

The final one, consider the institutionalization of the Internet Governance Forum to act on the issues that have been discussed and raised previously.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, very much for your understanding and my apologies for cutting you short.

My understanding is there was somebody asking for the floor. Can I see Marilyn Cade? Please, you have the floor. Oh, in front. Yes.

Yes, sir, please.

And while you are waiting for the microphone I also ask you to be as concise as possible.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am be very, very fast and very short.
 I wanted to stress on something that was raised earlier by Alice from East
Africa. And just to state that our IGF in East Africa, the inspiration is
international but the impact is local. And through this process, we have
been able to isolate and highlight issues that are purely regional. And
what we have done is to ensure that we have established linkage with
stakeholders at the local level and the national level. And we have been
hand-holding those decisions at the local level to be able to take over and
address those issues.
 We have also been able to isolate issues of international nature and
create a framework to ensure that we are able to liaise those issues at
this level.
 At the same time, we are very happy that we have been able to move the
debate from technical level to the parliament, because we believe
parliament has a very, very critical role to play to ensure that they pass
legislation that is going to support, enhance the usage and safeguard the
Internet.
 Finally, what we found is that the East African IGF is now a process, is
self-sustaining in times of specific space it's addressing, and will
continue as a driver of Internet governance in the region.
 We are particularly proud that our parliament is now part of that process.
 Thank you.
 >>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this.
 Do I see -- There is another.
 >>LAMBERT VAN NISTELROOIJ: I am Lambert Van Nistelrooij, a member of the
European Parliament. I want to add something to the last speaker.
 It's very important that we show in our regions our commitment to the
developments for the Internet, and we speaking for European side, we just
finalized now a comprehensive legal framework within the European Union
that strengthens the position of the citizens, of the users that works on
the net neutrality, et cetera. And in this sense, it's important to have
this, let me say broad basis in our cooperation and to find solutions that
are tailor-made in parts of the world.
 And I think for the future of the IGF, this is a very important thing.
 Later on in this conference, there will be a lot more information about
this legal framework that is just now finalized.
 Let me make another remark. It's more from the content side. Europe.
Europe is now in a transitional period. We are going to have a much more
aged society. We are now -- We are for instance, now four workers on one
person in pension. In 20 years this will be two workers in one on pension.
This has an enormous consequence for health care, for the economy, for
social life. And there we stand with ICT as an important bridge to build
on services. And now we invest a lot in these kind of programs to fire
research, fire applied innovation, et cetera, to give new answers.
 And on this field, by delivering the outcome and exchanging to each other,
this might be very important to give this also on the table in these kind

of conferences and exchange this.

And in this sense the millennium goals are so important to use of Internet all over the world. And in this sense, one side, good governance. The other side is concrete delivering. And combining these two things that might be, I think, an important support to continue the IGF.

Thank you very much.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this.

Indeed, the parliamentarians have been increasingly active in the IGF context and have emerged as a new stakeholder groups and we welcome this very much. Of course, members of parliament are very, very important, and they are the ones, after all, who make the laws.

Is there another? Now, yes, please. Now we have Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you.

I am just speaking as one of the co-organizers of the IGF U.S.A. We will file a report, but I am just say very briefly that the focus we took -- and it was a very multistakeholder organizing group from the very beginning. We held a one-day session, and the focus we took was to try to look at the themes of the IGF and then look at developing a national perspective from a global view.

So we're very much aware that in order to understand and examine this, we have to deepen the awareness and understanding within the United States very broadly about what Internet governance is.

We concluded our session with a version of the session that will take place here on examining the advisability about the continuation of the forum. And we did have a youth panel, and I will say I think all of us who participated are really looking forward to the focus on youth here because we certainly had some learning experiences. We incorporated youth in all of the sessions.

We will have a meeting again in -- in this case, it will probably be in late July, so that we are prepared for participating fully in the IGF 2010. And we will file a report, Markus, with more details.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for this.

There's another request for the floor.

Please, madam.

Just for the management of time, we have to close fairly shortly. Are there other participants who have anything urgently to say?

Doesn't seem to be the case, so, madam, you are the last intervention, please.

>>CATHERINE TRAUTMANN: Thank you. I am Catherine Trautmann from the European Parliament. And I just speak some minutes after Lambert Van Nistelrooij, and I wanted to say that the next year will be very important for the European Union and for the work we have to do. And effectively also to prepare the next event in Lithuania.

At first, our agenda will have a spectrum conference. And for the first time, the European Parliament will be co-decider for the roadmap on the evolution of the broadband for Internet.

And so this is, I think, a step forward.

Next year will be also a period of investment in fiber, and also about the deployment of satellite.

So I think that infrastructure will be very strong and broad, but we want also to see the effect of the evolution of the market and the confidence, the trust of the companies in the possibility of the new regulation.

And I want just to express something which is very important, because I know that this IGF is very attached to this.

At the end of the TAKO (phonetic) package, we decided to have the recognition that Internet is the main, you know, way to exercise the fundamental freedoms and rights. And now it gives the right to a person or to a group of persons to be recognized as, you know, innocent in the first time. And that the cut of Internet is not possible before procedure in which there is the capacity to be heard and to defend himself.

So I think that this is a way forward also for the users, for the end users, with the progress of the rights for consumers, but also the right to be recognized as a citizen on the Internet.

So I think that if Internet is global technology, there is also the meeting point with territory and the people in territories.

So I think that for Vilnius and Lithuania exercise, we will prepare it, all the European institutions with all the partners, and EuroDIG specifically, and also, of course, all the team of the IGF to have something which can give this human content, even if we have also all the technological points. But we are very in favor to continue the exercise because we think IGF was a specific possibility for us to inspire the work we did as legislature, and also to inspire our agenda on the public policies. That's why I wanted to say at the beginning of this addition that we are strongly in favor of the continuity of IGF because, of course, IGF is a sort of dissemination of culture, dissemination of propositions, and dissemination of expertise and common advice.

So thank you, and we are very glad to be here.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for your contribution and your support.

I understand there is one more contribution, but this really has to be the very last one. Somebody in the back of the room asked for the -- Yes, please.

But please be short and concise. Thank you.

>>DEIDRE WILLIAMS: I shall. Thank you very much.

My name is Deidre Williams, and I come from Sir Arthur Lewis Community College in St. Lucia in the West Indies. The Caribbean also had an IGF at the end of August. This was our fifth IGF.

The interesting move was from a purely technical interest towards an interest in the part that human beings have to play in what is happening online, which is a great deal, I think, of Internet governance.

In terms of what we need in the Caribbean, the Caribbean Telecommunication Union is part of Caricom. Their interest up to now has been largely

technical.

The governments in the Caribbean appear to me to be not very interested, at least not in the English Caribbean. We need as much feedback and publicity as we can get to galvanize our governments to take part.

Thank you.

>>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this. I think the last speaker highlighted the special characteristic of the IGF, which is the mix between technological issues and societal issues.

On a very practical note, I don't think our very clever scribes managed to catch the names of all the speakers, so it would be helpful if you could go to them if you didn't see your name recognized properly, to hand in a business card or write down the name on a piece of paper, how it should appear in the transcripts, which will provide the record of the meeting.

With that, I would like to thank you very much, and would also ask you to join me in giving a hand to our panelists.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>MARKUS KUMMER: And please, the afternoon session, the opening ceremony, starts at 2:00, so very short lunch break, so I ask you to be in the room in time.

Thank you very much.