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.

Internet Governance in Light of the WSIS Principles
17 November 2009
Internet Governance Forum
Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt

>>AHMED EL-SHERBINI: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.
Welcome to the afternoon session of the third day of the IGF in Sharm El Sheikh.
The session is entitled, as we all know, Internet governance in the light of the WSIS principles.
Once again, as we all know, the IGF was created as a product of the WSIS, of the WSIS, and the Tunis session, and the IGF was mandated by the Tunis Agenda to promote and assess on an ongoing basis the embodiment of the WSIS principles in the Internet governance process.
So in this session, we are exercising this right. We, as the IGF community, constituency, the participants, would like to see the implementation of this mandate. We would like to assess the past four years, whether the WSIS principles were taken into consideration in the governance of the Internet.
And to do that, we have three hours. This session is an open forum. It's more of a dialogue than presentations.
And to do that we have three able and distinguished moderators. So allow me to introduce our three distinguished moderators. To my left is Ambassador Janis Karklins. He is the Ambassador of Latvia to France and the permanent presenter of Latvia to UNESCO. And to my right is Anriette Esterhuysen. She is the executive director, the Association for progressive communication, the APC.
And to the extreme right is Mr. Bill Graham. He is heading the global strategic engagement unit with the Internet society.
So without further ado, I will give the microphone to Ambassador Karklins to address you and give you the structure of the session and to start right away.
Ambassador.
>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, chair.
With your permission, I will go down to the floor and will do my presentation from there.
So good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to be one of the moderators of this session. And I will start by thanking our distinguished chair for introductory remarks.
I will start with a couple of administrative announcements. In a way, how we are planning to run this session.
So first of all, we do not have a preassigned speakers list. So therefore, we are counting on very active participation of all you in this room.
I don't know what the dynamics will be. We may have a very heated debate; we may have very slow and lazy debate. But it is more up to all of us to see.
We are suggesting that those participants who would like to make substantive interventions take up not more than five minutes.
For those participants who would like to intervene in reaction of something which has been said, for the first time would not take more than three minutes, and any subsequent intervention would not make more than two minutes.
It is to provide opportunity to all those who would like to speak to have this opportunity.
Equally, I would like to suggest that the style and tone of comments should follow rules of politeness, dignity, and should avoid being offending. It is just a reminder. I believe that we will be very friendly, and the debate will be extremely positive.
Those participants who would like to speak, I would like to ask raise their

hands, and then the assistant will approach you, will ask to you write your name on the sheet of paper, and then please write your name and possibly affiliation, which organization you are representing. And we will call on you in the first come, first served order.

 And along the way, we will invite organizers of those workshops which have taken place during this session and which are relevant to our debate here in the room to report on the main thrust of their discussions.

 This session, three hours, will take place in three parts. So the first part, we'll concentrate on principles which have been adopted in Geneva and Tunis, and particularly on one principle, principle 29.

 The second part will be devoted to debate on how Internet governance influenced evolution of inclusive, nondiscriminatory, development oriented Information Society.

 And the latter part, the third part of the debate, will be conclusions. Bill Graham, who is sitting on the stage, he will be taking notes throughout the whole debate, and he will do kind of concluding summary of the debate.

 And after that, we will open the floor again for some interventions, comments, based on what you would hear in the summary.

 So I think it is sufficiently clear. The rules of the game are known.

 And let me start to give maybe context of the first debate on WSIS principles guiding Internet governance.

 So if you remember, it is five years since these principles exist. And these -- The session is intended to provide sort of subguidance to all of us, and particularly to governments, who will be assessing the continuation of IGF and assessing implementation of WSIS principles in the U.N. system.

 I would like to start our substantive debate by reminding the working definition of Internet governance, which was developed by the Working Group on Internet Governance in the framework of preparations for the second part of world summit.

 And the working definition which was suggested by the WGIG was the following: Internet governance is the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society in their respective roles of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that shape the evolution and use of Internet.

 I think that the reminder of the working definition of Internet governance in this context is very important, that we know what we are talking about.

 This working definition reinforces concept of inclusiveness of governments, the private sector, and civil society in the mechanisms of Internet governance. This working definition also acknowledges that with the respect of specific issues of Internet governance, each group will have different interests, roles and participations, which in some cases will overlap.

 Tunis Agenda reflects the collective wisdom of the international community on Internet governance issues as they were in 2005, November 2005.

 I would like to suggest today, we reflect on the WSIS principles as contained in both Geneva Declaration of Principles and Tunis agenda for Information Society. But specifically concentrating our debate on paragraphs 29 and 31.

 I would like now to ask Secretariat to display on the screen paragraph 29. And I will read it out to refresh our memory.

 We reaffirm that principles enunciated in Geneva phase of WSIS in December 2003, that the Internet has evolved into a global facility available to the public and its governance should constitute a core issue of the Information Society agenda.

 The international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations.

 It should ensure an equitable distribution of resources, facilitate access for all, and ensure stable and secure functioning of the Internet, taking into account multilingualism.

 These are high principles which we thought were applicable to the Internet governance at the time.

 And today, in the context of this debate, I would like maybe to start by asking

a couple of questions.
 First of all, how these principles are seen by different stakeholder groups today. What has been changed or, rather, what impact these principles have made to operations and decision-making of different institutions, organizations, and stakeholders.
 Are these principles still relevant today? Should they be amended? Should they be enlarged?
 What are examples of application of those WSIS principles in daily life or daily work of different organizations?
 And I would like to invite now governments, intergovernmental organizations, civil society, nongovernmental organizations, technical community, representatives of academia, to intervene and tell us how do you feel about it, how you would answer those questions.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Janis, I first have to make an apology and a clarification.
 A helpful member of the room informed me that, in fact, the paragraphs that up saw were from the Geneva Declaration of Principles. So the Secretariat is going to correct that. The intention was that we project paragraphs 29 and 31 of the Tunis Agenda.
 So for any of those of you who are referring to the text, we will correct the correct text.
 But just in response to Janis, Janis's question and invitation, I have had some names. We would like more people. Remember, you put up your hand. One of our helpers will come to you, write your name and your organization. And if you were a convener of a workshop, please also put the name of your workshop on the piece of paper.
 But Janis, we have some names there. So we could start Christian O'Flaherty from the Internet society in Argentina.
 But please introduce yourself as well if I have not done it sufficiently.
 >>CHRISTIAN O'FLAHERTY: All right. Thank you. Is it working? Yes.
 My name is Christian O'Flaherty from the Internet society. I am going to make a brief description of the workshop of Internet core values which was held this morning.
 It was a very diverse and were represented with many points of view. It's going to be just a summary of some of these topics covered.
 First, for most people, the Internet is the applications. Applications drive the Internet, and in that respect we talk about digital divide, accessibility, usability, et cetera.
 Even though technical awareness is independent of the Internet, it sits on top of the Internet. Hence coordination at different layers, it's needed. As an example, we must keep, for example, one root DNS for consistency.
 Then the second topic was open standards with transparent and open processes. Free standards and open access to this information are required.
 Then the principle of freedom of choice. Choice for the user for any platform, any software, any system. It was the same with other things in the past, like telephony, for example, and there are concerns about returning to a point with lack of compatibility.
 And then universality, use populated by the whole society and not owned by an expert community. Internet is not about technologies. It's about behavior of people. We must preserve the cooperative approach in order to deliver healthy community. A truly universal Internet where the real value is the networking of users and the human value of those users.
 We can consider the interim as the core value but the real is the human bodies like freedom, friendship, fun, community, et cetera.
 Information space and low barriers were also mentioned and the Internet model with the bottom-up processes, collaborative efforts, self-organizing procedures was presented in contrast with the usual government style.
 For many, it's a leveling process, and it's difficult for other organizations to implement the Internet way of doing things.
 It's a challenge for a traditional structure to integrate Internet model because we cannot control it. We have to let it happen.

And then the ethics of openness. Initially, the Internet was conceived as a
means of communication for computers. It was designed to make different brands
of computers interoperate. Although the current Internet core values are not
just technical, there is still a need for technical agreement.
 Nowadays, the same process of open standard development prevails, engineering
talking to each other in a flat yard. And it was agreed that or it was
mentioned that some of these core values are under threat.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Thank you, Christian, for this report. And I
have many speakers now already.
 So the first is Michael Remmert. from the Council of Europe. And the next will
be Peter Dengate Thrush from ICANN.
 >>MICHAEL REMMERT: Thank you. Yes, Michael Remmert of the Council of Europe.
I would like to speak not only on behalf of the Council of Europe but also on
behalf of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and APC who are the
proponents of a trilateral initiative to launch a code of good practice on
information, participation, and transparency in Internet governance.
 And in the context of this discussion, I would like to explore what this code,
if it is endorsed by Internet governance entities and implemented, could
contribute to the implementation of the WSIS principles.
 First of all, this code on which the three organizations have been working
since the IGF in Rio de Janeiro in 2007, is a multistakeholder initiative which
reflects the principles of WSIS. And each of the three organizers bring their
particular experience and strength into this. The Council of Europe, through
its work on human rights and democracy in the off-line as well as in the online
world, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe through its pioneering
instrument for inclusive work in the environmental field and APC would bring in
an international users perspective.
 So this code proposes that all information which is relevant to Internet
governance and decision-making should be open and publicly available; that
Internet governance entities should broadly publicize opportunities for
participation in the work and policy-making of their organizations. And that
the development and administration of Internet policy and standards should
generally be open, transparent, and inclusive.
 All these goals reflect the principles that have been agreed on by the WSIS,
and we believe that this code would translate these principles into
operationally principles that would set benchmarks for both those organizations
that have been born out of the development of the Internet, but also those who
have had different public-policy traditions and working methods, but
increasingly are involved in setting standards and policies for the Internet.
 So this code could provide benchmarks against which the implementation of the
WSIS commitments and principles could be measured, and thereby contribute to the
WSIS Geneva principle 72i to constantly assess the implementation of the
principles that have been agreed by WSIS.
 For all those who are interested to learn more about this initiative and who
would like to comment and discuss the initiative, I would invite you to a
workshop tomorrow morning at 8:00. It's one of those that begin an hour earlier
than planned. We hope that many of you will attend. And we look forward to
discussing this initiative in order to take it forward to endorsement and
adoption, we hope by next year's IGF in Lithuania.
 Thank you very much.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Michael.
 Next speaker on the list is Peter Dengate Thrush, the chairman of the board of
ICANN. And after that, Mr. Ypsilanti from OECD.
 >>MR. PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Janis. Mr. Chairman. Ladies and
gentlemen, I am the chairman of the board of ICANN, and let me just introduce
ICANN.
 ICANN is the multi-lateral, multi-national, international body set up by the
Internet community in 1998 to meet the mandate of the U.S. government's white
paper.
 Let me just stop there for a minute because it's often said that ICANN was
actually set up by the United States government. It was not. It was set up by

the Internet community in response to the white paper.

The reason it was set up is to carry the mandate in the white paper of three of the elements of critical Internet resources. In the discussion of critical Internet resources yesterday, we tended to focus on those. Of course there are many others.

The three that ICANN is responsible for the coordination of: names, numbers and protocols.

Looking quickly at the principle 29 that we had on the screen, it relates to the international management of those. We are careful to avoid the word "governance" in relation to what we do. It's the coordination or international management of those three elements of the critical infrastructure.

And the first is that we need to be multilateral. Well, we have been from the outset. ICANN is composed of a wide range of organizations, individuals, NGOs, corporations and of course with the full involvement of governments.

They come from all over the world.

We are transparent, written into the bylaws, and I will take you shortly to the work that we do to maintain that transparency.

We have to be democratic. Again, these things are something that we strive to maintain. We have what we regard as democratic processes, where we listen to all voices and then have voting systems that take that into account.

The requirement of the full involvement of governments. We have a Governmental Advisory Committee which has been growing stronger and stronger since the inception of ICANN and makes substantial contributions to the development of public-policy. Most notably recently, of course, in relation to the launch of IDNs in relation to the country codes.

In addition to the governments, of course, we have to take account of the private sector. We have large involvement of the private sector. We have contracts with 935 organizations that act as registrars, for example, in the private sector in the management and retailing of Internet domain names in the generic namespace.

We also have huge involvement from civil society, largely through a mechanism that we call rather quaintly the at-large mechanism. That's where civil society plays a substantial role, and there are other places as well.

So international organizations also play a part. We have as members of the technical liaison group, for example, the ITU, the W3C, and one of the European technical standards bodies. And they participate in other mechanisms as well.

So these things have been hard wired, in many ways, into the DNA of ICANN since its inception.

What's important to express, though, is the commitment at ICANN that meeting these standards is a journey. It's not something that one ever arrives at. And we constantly strive to improve.

I would just like to pick up some notes on the transparency goal and Janis's question of how have things changed since the Tunis Agenda was developed in 2005.

We divide our accountability up into a number of ways, beginning with accountability in the public sphere. And so we have a number of bylaw requirements for transparency.

Under that, we have created an information disclosure policy. We have dispute resolution frameworks. And then we have all the usual, if you like, corporate accountability in terms of auditing and financial statement disclosure.

Let me just pick out a couple of our commitments in the bylaws. We are required under the bylaws to make decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness. We are required to act with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while it's part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.

And we are required under the bylaws to remain accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness. Just some samples of many of the principles in the bylaws.

The other thing we do and have developed from the beginning is a documentary disclosure policy so that information contained in our documents is set out and

who can access them and how they may use them have all been made very clearly available.

We have classes of documents of course that are not available, and they deal mostly with personal matters, private matters, people's incomes, et cetera.

There is also a process for applying for those documents, and, if you are turned down, of complaining that you want access and having that decision reviewed.

We also have three dispute resolution mechanisms about that, including an approach to an ombudsman, applying to the board for reconsideration, and then applying to an independent review panel for consideration as to whether or not we have complied with our bylaws.

I mentioned the financial accountability. We do the usual things that you would expect of a corporation. We have independent external audits, we publish accounts, we have a Board Finance Committee that supervises those processes, and there's full reporting by way of the annual report and the financial accounts.

Finally, let me come to the audit we conducted of our tranparency in 2007. We got the One World Trust to conduct an audit. We published the terms of that, we published their response, and then we published our response in the ongoing commitment that we make to transparency.

So as I say, it's something that's deeply embedded in the DNA of ICANN, and we are constantly struggling to improve it.

Thank you, Janis.

>>DMITRI YPSILANTI: Thank you. My name is Dmitri Ypsilanti. I am with the OECD. In particular I work for the Committee on Information, Computer, and Communications Policy at the OECD which is that part of the OECD that looks at Internet issues, communications policy issues, security and privacy.

I would like, in particular, to talk about multistakeholder participation.

For several decades, the OECD has worked with business and trade unions, and we have two bodies at the OECD, one called the Business Industry Advisory Committee, and the other called the Trade Union Advisory Committee. And they participate fully in the work of virtually all committees of the OECD.

I think what's important about the WSIS principles is that it brought to the forefront for policymakers the fact that there are other stakeholders out there; in particular, civil society and the Internet community. And as a result, in 2007, when our committee started to work on a major ministerial conference, we invited both civil society and Internet technical community to work with us in addition to business and trade union in the work leading up and in the background documents leading up to that ministerial meeting.

That minister's meeting, which was titled the future of the Internet economy, took place in June 2008 in Seoul, Korea. At that meeting itself, before ministers met, we had encouraged both civil society and the Internet technical community to hold their own meetings in order to make input into the final declaration that Ministers were expected to adopt. And this happened.

In the declaration, we call it the Seoul declaration, which was signed by 30 OECD ministers plus nine ministers from non-OECD countries, Ministers did call on the OECD to ensure that they took a multistakeholder approach in their work, and in particular, in following up the Seoul declaration.

As a result, after that ministerial meeting, we discussed with civil society and with the Internet technical community the means and modes of their participation and eventually they did become full participants of our committee.

There were, however, certain principles that we did ask them to adhere to. And as you are all aware, there are quite a number of civil society bodies. You just have to look at this meeting and how many different bodies there are, and the same for the Internet technical community.

And so we did ask them to self-organize. And we asked them that when they come and work with us, that they consult amongst themselves, civil society with the members of the civil society bodies, and Internet technical community with the Internet technical bodies, and speak, to the extent possible, with one voice, so we didn't have to deal with multiple comments which there was a danger that they would be contradictory.

So finally, we have two other bodies in addition to what I mentioned earlier,

BIAC and TUAC, business and trade unions. We have ITAC, the Internal Technical
Advisory Committee to the OECD, and we have the Civil Society Information
Society Advisory Committee to the OECD. They've been participating fully in our
work since the beginning of this year, and I think we certainly, from the OECD
Secretariat, have benefitted. I think our member countries have benefitted.
And I certainly hope that both these bodies have also benefitted.
 Thank you.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Good. It is working. And thank you, Dimitri.
 And before I go on to the next speaker, it would be very interesting to get the
reaction from some of the stakeholder groups who have now been participating in
some of the institutions we've heard about, so if there are people that have
been interacting with ICANN, interacting with the OECD and others, that want to
share your experience, please add your names to the speaker list.
 And next we're going to have Shadi Abou-Zahra from the World Wide Web
consortium. Shadi, where are you? Good.
 >>SHADI ABOU-ZAHRA: Yeah. Good afternoon. My name is Shadi Abou-Zahra. I
work for the World Wide Web consortium, W3C, and I just want to share a bit of
the experience of W3C in working with different stakeholders and the
participation, in particular, of people with different backgrounds.
 So W3C develops standards for the Web, Web standards that actually operate the
Web, such as HTML and others. It's a consensus-based and open forum in which
core staff and working group participants work together and collaborate, and the
public, to develop those standards.
 We are a truly international organization, operating from different host sites,
from different places, and we've learned that this multistakeholder approach,
bringing businesses, governments, private people, research, and more together at
the table really produces standards that work better for all.
 Moreover, interculturally, working with different people from different
backgrounds and different cultures -- I myself, I come from Egypt, I work in
France, I live in Austria, my boss is in the U.S. -- and we have all sorts of
things like that throughout the group.
 We produce royalty-free standards that really contribute to affordable
solutions, so that people throughout the society can use those technologies so
that people are not locked into specific vendors or specific products, but have
the option to use different types of modalities to interact with the Web.
 In terms of participation, I want to mention that the interaction and the
inclusion, the involvement of people from different cultures and different
backgrounds is absolutely important. For me, myself, as a person with a
disability, the involvement of people with disabilities and older people in the
standardization process has been very useful to help us produce better standards
with better usability for all.
 Last, but not least, we see that a lot of our technical standards being used in
policy settings, in policies that relate to people with disabilities that do not
include people with disabilities, so we try to improve our processes and our
involvement, and we think that the IGF has contributed to awareness-raising and
to more inclusion of people with disabilities, but unfortunately I think there's
a lot more to do, especially of involving users with disabilities in policy
settings. Thank you.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Shadi.
 Next, we have Bertrand de la Chapelle from the government of France.
 >>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Hello. Good afternoon.
 First of all, I think it's an excellent idea to have a session on this
specifically, because fundamentally the question we're addressing here is
related to a very small set of words that I would characterize as the "in their
respective roles."
 Both in the definition of Internet governance and in several other parts of the
documents adopted in Tunis, this notion that there are specific roles or diverse
roles for the governments, the private sector, civil society, and international
organizations, is the core of the multistakeholder question.
 What the IGF is doing, and what the WSIS is asking us to establish, is
modalities of interaction that are actually not available anywhere else at the

moment. It is our common task. Especially in the IGF, but not only there. -- to discuss and also to test a certain number of modalities of interaction.
 And in this respect, I've had the opportunity, in other main sessions, to explain that the respective roles of the different categories of actors can vary and should vary according to the issue, the venue, and the stage of the discussion.
 This is an opportunity to elaborate a little bit on this notion.
 According to the issue, nobody will doubt that there are very technical, very political, very commercial issues, can some that combine all those dimensions.
 And it is clear that some will have a heavy portion of governments involved, some will have a heavier portion of commercial actors involved, some more technical or civil society actors.
 But the balance can be different. However, the multistakeholder principle guarantees that on all issues, at least some proportion of interaction is required.
 The second element is that the venue counts. You have intergovernmental organizations, you have standards organizations, you have business communities. Each of them is dealing with certain issues, and the balance of responsibilities will vary as well.
 And finally, the balance of responsibilities depend also on the stage of the discussion. When you are at the decision-shaping stage or even at the issue-framing stage, the process must be as open as possible. When you evolve into the drafting stage, it can become more limited to specific stakeholders that have a major stake.
 And when you get into the adoption and validation stage, sometimes you have a smaller range of actors, sometimes it can be endorsed only by governments or by governments and specific commercial -- business actors or a broader range of actors.
 The point is -- and I want to finish with this -- Internet governance is an ecosystem of organizations, and what we are experimenting here in the IGF is actually a multistakeholder interaction protocol. How we do interact with one another.
 The IGF is not an organization. It's not an event. And it's basically a format.
 So the benefit of the WSIS principles is that it forces us to define what are the respective roles and the modes of interaction. Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Bertrand. Before giving the floor to Kurt Erik Lundquist from Netnod, Bertrand I wanted to ask you one question.
 You were theoretical about Internet governance and WSIS principles but let me ask you: What has changed in France -- what has changed in France, in the past four years, in terms of how you approach Internet governance issues nationally. Is there just a government involvement or do you have a kind of process which involves also other stakeholders? If you could enlighten us very briefly on that.
 >>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Hello? Yeah. The first thing I want to say is we had a forum on Internet rights that exists in France since 2000, which is actually a multistakeholder space for dealing with issues of access and regulation at the national level.
 The second thing is since the existence of the IGF, consultations have taken place to prepare for the IGF. Just the mere thing of inviting the different actors who participate in the IGF to discuss what is going to be the topic of the next agenda is important.
 The next thing is, we have been instrumental in helping the emergence of the EuroDIG, which is the regional IGF, in partnership with other actors from civil society and the Council of Europe, and one very specific topic that my minister, the French minister, presented in the opening session on Sunday which is the right to delete information about one's self or the right to have one's information deleted after a certain period of time.
 There is a direct connection that is happening. We had a multistakeholder workshop about a week ago on that topic to prepare for here. Then she came and proposed this. We will have a follow-up nationally, and this is how this

feedback loop is functioning. And in general terms, I must say -- and there's a colleague here from the ministry of industry -- this is also forcing us, be it ICANN or the IGF, to have more interaction among the different ministries and also the other actors to prepare for those international spaces.
 So it's very beneficial in that respect.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Bertrand. So next, Kurt Erik Lundquist from Netnod.
 >>KURT ERIK LUNDQUIST: Thank you. I'm not speaking, actually, on behalf of my company but rather as a very longtime participant in the IETF and Internet Engineering Task Force. That said, I do not represent them in any way. I have chaired many working groups and worked there for a long time there, and I wanted to use the IETF as an example on multistakeholder and open and transparent process but actually it was in process before the Tunis Agenda and the IGF process has served us for a long time.
 As we probably all know, the Internet is actually built on the standards developed by the IETF, and these -- inside the IETF, everyone who participates represents ourselves, and as individuals you can bring your ideas and innovations, whether they have been developed in a private, corporate, or governmental environment, into the standards process, and then have them vetted and maybe hopefully standardized and later implemented.
 All of this vetting will be done on purely technical merits.
 The IETF process is highly inclusive, and anyone can actually join and participate on equal terms. You don't have to represent anyone. You don't have to be a member of any organization in this.
 And you can -- everyone can also not only bring in work, but you can also comment and address work in progress. All these documents are freely and openly available on the Internet. And all of the discussions in the IETF are conducted on mailing lists that are free to anyone to join.
 The IETF does hold meetings three times a year, where the ISOC provides fellowship programs for participation, but no decisions are allowed to be made at the face-to-face meetings. They actually have all to be done on mailing lists for the fact that everyone should be able to equally participate and interact in the discussions.
 And last what might be very interesting and explain some of the success of the Internet is that these standards are freely available on the Internet for anyone to make use of them without any of the -- any restrictions on getting access to them. And as I said, that also includes the work in progress documents. This freeness and openness of the standards have enabled people to innovate and build new products, services, and start entrepreneurship on the Internet, as was shown on the examples of the opening session, for example and I think these standards and the truly openness to both the process and the documents have made the Internet the success story it is today.
 Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Kurt. I would like to ask you one question related to IETF, the work of IETF.
 How it has changed in the last four years. Do you -- can you say that since IETF initially was the gathering of technical gurus with ponytails and jeans and doing stuff that nobody understands, the government representatives, is there any increase of participation of government representatives? In particular, governments from developing countries. And if the answer is positive, do you feel that their contribution is useful. And if the answer is negative, why do you think they do not participate in IETF work?
 >>KURT ERIK LUNDQUIST: The -- as I said, you participate in the IETF as individuals, so it's hard to do statistics on who people actually represent in that way.
 I do believe, however, that the governments and also developing countries have started showing a lot more interest for what's happening in the IETF and they are -- they are participating. We are seeing governments who even send agencies to do work inside the IETF. There is -- and have submitted work items and have worked on the standardization. So is that a result of the Tunis Agenda or not, it's very hard to say, but it's clear that I think as the Internet has become

more important, that they are working inside the IETF.
 I would like to say, though, that the IETF has actually adopted the Tunis principles before the Tunis principles even existed, so I think it's hard to say that they helped, but they certainly built on what was already there.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Kurt. So now I would like to invite Abdul Waheed Khan, Assistant Director-General of UNESCO, and after that's correct I will call on Byron Holland from dot CA ccTLD. Dr. Khan.
 >>ABDUL WAHEED KHAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
 Following the second phase of the World Summit on Information Society in Tunis, at UNESCO we had very extensive debate whether or not we should participate in the Internet Governance Forum. And the debate was, "Well, it is -- it's a governance issue and what has UNESCO to do with it?"
 But then we argued that our proposal for building inclusive knowledge societies included four principles: Respect for linguistic and cultural diversity, freedom of expression, universal access to information and knowledge, and quality education for all.
 Now, if we really want to advance the notion of knowledge societies and uphold the principles, the four principles, that we articulated, then how can we not remain engaged with IGF?
 So we began to participate as observers, and I think over a period of time we have made a case for openness of the Internet governance to ensure, first of all, freedom of expression. Any attempt to block free flow of ideas, clearly UNESCO stands firmly against it.
 And we uphold the freedom of expression, irrespective of frontier, and the Internet is the most advanced technology. It's the fastest growing cyberspace.
 So we -- we have participated in all the IGF forums, and as a result of our participation, we have, number one, through our general conference and through our programs at the grass-roots level, we have encouraged member states to develop strong policies which promote and facilitate language diversity on the Internet, we've also promoted creation and dissemination of content in local languages. And encouraged multilingual access to digital resources in cyberspace.
 We've also promoted harnessing ICTs for the preservation of endangered languages. We've worked in cooperation with other international organizations to establish policies, regulations, technical recommendations and best practices relating to multilingualism and multilingual resources and applications, including innovations in language computerization.
 In fact, this -- this afternoon, I'm signing an agreement with ICANN to promote what UNESCO -- the multilingual part of UNESCO's work. So those are things that I think UNESCO has done, and we believe we must remain fully engaged with the Internet governance process. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this position.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Dr. Khan. I believe that especially now, with the introduction of IDNs, in the cc space and hopefully in the space in the G space, UNESCO assistance to all those who need assistance in working in multilingual or promoting multilingual Internet will be very much needed and you have a lot of years of hard work in front of you. So thank you.
 So I will call now on Byron Holland from dot CA ccTLD that is the manager of Canadian country code, and the next speaker on my list is -- it's the organizer of workshop of multistakeholderism at the IGF.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: And it's Guru Gurumurthy.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Guru Gurumurthy. It was not mentioned in the -- I'm sorry, sir. Your name was not mentioned here.
 Byron, please.
 >>BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. As mentioned, my name is Byron Holland and I'm the CEO of dot CA.
 We're very operational in nature, but I believe many of the principles, the WSIS principles, are really woven right into the fabric of all of our operations.
 Not to overstate it, and to -- to borrow liberally from Peter, I think it's literally imprinted in the DNA of our operation. And I think that, in part, is because we're -- we conduct ourselves within the ecosystem of the Internet in

general, and also in the IGF ecosystem.

But fundamentally, it's because it is our business, and the business of my colleagues in the cc world.

Really, what we do to a great degree is translate principles into policy, and then policy into process on the ground.

In a sense, fundamentally what we do is convert the erudite and esoteric into the common vernacular on the street. It's certainly not without its challenges.

Engagement for us of our domestic stakeholders can often be a real challenge. We commonly get the refrain that, "Well, I turn it on and it works so, you know, who cares? Who cares about discussing the governance of it?"

Everybody in this forum does care, but on the street, the end user, often that's not the case. So it's a significant challenge to keep people and to get people engaged.

Getting the average user to engage in discourse and dialogue on the governance of the Internet is a real challenge, but we continue to do it. I have a few issues that -- or a few specifics that I think will give some concrete examples to it of where we have WSIS principles that work.

Recently, we did some work with the IISD, the International Institute of Sustainable Development, and we partnered with them from the sustainable world as well as our colleagues in government, and did an outreach and survey into issues that did matter to end users and various stakeholders regarding Internet governance.

In the specific research, it actually ended up being very successful, and it gave us a real sense of what some of the concerns might be.

And that hopefully is going to form the basis of an ongoing domestic dialogue, a dialogue that we can then bring to this forum at future dates to provide more educated input.

And from that perspective, we communicated with registrants, registrars, law enforcement, the sustainable development community, private sector, other civil society members. So it really was a very wide-ranging consultation and engagement to get feedback from the full spectrum of the Canadian domestic Internet landscape.

WHOIS is another concrete example. As some may know, we -- we have introduced recently, in the past year, fairly strong privacy protections in the WHOIS.

In our domestic landscape, we must do that. So for all individuals, we have privacy coverage within the WHOIS.

That was the result of actually a multiyear consultation and engagement, again, of many different stakeholders within the Internet landscape in Canada. Certainly law enforcement, as you can imagine, privacy advocates, registrants, registrars, various end users, et cetera.

And the policy we developed really came out of that engagement, and that's the policy that we have on the ground in effect right now, in terms of process, too.

We may -- or many people here will, I'm sure, remember Conficker, the worm that really made its name known last spring in the March time frame.

We were one of the early cc's to get very involved in that process, to take a very proactive stance, but, again, we worked with many stakeholders. It was a very multistakeholder endeavor. With our colleagues in the cc world, private sector actors, software/hardware companies, law enforcement, various elements of government. Both to create a policy that was very collaborative, and then also to distribute the message, to inform, to educate, to get that message Ute into the public arena.

For us, primarily domestically, but certainly other colleagues much more internationally.

So for us operating, believe it or not, the WSIS principles are something that we deal with and have in effect every single day. So I think they're very relevant.

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Byron. Let me ask you one, maybe incorrect, question. I called it that we should be polite. I will be polite but the question will be incorrect.

Supposing we -- there wouldn't be WSIS. Would you have been following the same principles in your daily operations?

>>BYRON HOLLAND: I think that if we wanted to remain successful, we would have to. And we were following some element of them, definitely, prior to the WSIS principles in the early 2000s when our WHOIS engagement started. We were bringing in multiple stakeholders to consult with, even prior to the WSIS.
 But certainly WSIS has expanded upon it, and to some degree clarified some of the principles.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. I think WSIS set a trend in some sense.
 So let us turn now to civil society representative Guru Guru. Please. You have the floor.
 >>GURU: Yeah. It's only one Guru, as yet. Thank you.
 Guru from IT for Change, Bangalore India. We had a very interesting workshop today morning titled "Multistakeholderism at the IGF, Assessing Impact on Participation."
 Bertrand just spoke a few minutes back about how multistakeholderism is such a vital part of WSIS, as well as the IGF, and indeed it's very unique contribution from WSIS and IGF into the space of global governance, and it's very important that this morning time, now that we are in the fourth IGF, and we're actually looking at IGF itself, reviewing IGF and seeing how to take it forward, it's probably a good time to also look at this principle of multistakeholderism and see what actually has happened in terms of its implementation.
 In two true multistakeholder spirit, our participants of course came from various sectors and there were slightly differing points of view which will be of interest to here. We began with a small study of actual participation at IGF at Rio and at Hyderabad being presented by the first panelists, and this is very interesting. It's from data available publicly, but just in terms of the people who actually participated, what sectors they came from, what were their nationalities. That was an important analysis.
 A second one was in terms of actual participation, the words being spoken, because transcripts are publicly available, so what is the word count. This is just to give a rough idea of the actual participation. It does not necessarily mean that volley equates to impact but just to give us an idea nevertheless.
 So looking at both the IGF at Hyderabad and the IGF at Rio, then the nationalities were actually broken up based on the UNDP human development index classification. So there are four groups, HD -- human development -- Index 1 through 4, where 1 is the most developed and the 4th is what I'll call the least developed countries.
 So the analysis was not very surprising. The numbers say that participants, both in terms of individuals as well as organizations that were present, came overwhelmingly from the developed world, which is HD1 and HD2, and if you were to exclude the host country because we always find that in each of these IGFs, host country participation tends to be very high, but it's skewed because typically in Rio you would have a large number of Brazilians but they would not be there in Hyderabad or Sharm El Sheikh. If you exclude that, more than 70% of the organizations who participated in IGF 2 and IGF 3 came from the 20% of countries in this world which are largely in HD1 and HD2. Even within the developing world, the participation of the least developed countries was very minimal. In fact, one noticed that in the IGF at Brazil, there was not even a single speaker from the least developed country world in any of the main sessions.
 So in terms of -- that's in terms of the number of the organizations. If you want to look at the number of individuals, the finding is was it is even more skewed, because from the developed world organizations, many more individuals come per organization than from the developing world. So this was just an initial study to give us a feel and the panelists said that they would do more on the lessons learned in terms of who are chairing the various workshops, who are chairing and participating in the dynamic coalitions, because all these are a part of the IGF. That is something that will come in.
 I'll just go to the other speakers and come back to this at the end.
 There was at one -- an ambassador from the -- the Greek ambassador also participated and spoke about another aspect of this multistakeholder participation at IGFs. There are many themes because different stakeholders are

perhaps interested in different kinds of things, and sometimes it becomes quite fragmented, which we are also seeing perhaps at Egypt, that there are so many different processes that how are they tied in together? How do workshops come and relate to the main sessions? And how together they represent what is the thinking at the IGF is something that we really need to concern ourselves with, so that there is a more formal, firm linkage. In the traditional processes of global governance, there is a linkage but even in subsequent policymaking, it's much more clear than it is now. At the same time, he also felt that because there are different sector people participating, it may not be that there is agreement at the venue itself, but there is subliminal impact in people's mind and when they go back, maybe impact and changes are happening over a long period of time and that's of great value.

 The participants from the business sector actually said something very interesting in which -- in subsequent, in hindsight, one feels is very true, which is that when it comes to the private sector, it is even more skewed in the developing world because businesses, small businesses from the develop countries have even less ability to participate than maybe the civil society from the developing countries, so that participation that is even more skewed. But she also felt that in terms of the multistakeholder participation that is at IGF, there is enormous value in it and she also felt that interestingly, the traditional structures of the U.N. which were not maybe previously having MSP as a very intrinsic part of their working, she's seeing changes there, so it's not even IGF as having the principle of multistakeholderism is impacting but within IGF. It's seeming to have impact in other institutional spaces as well, which is of value.

 We had a person from -- another person from civil society who spoke about a similar thing, that there are now -- within country IGFs as well. I mean there are, at the global level perhaps MSPs well established. Even within countries, people are coming up and saying that the same principles which maybe are democracies in the making are not so much there. Even in those countries, there is an impact in terms of getting many people together and talking and listening to them.

 After having discussed some of the issues that we are facing in terms of implementing this principle in spirit, people also talked about what can be done about it, and one important principle people felt was capacity-building, which is if participation from the developing world and from least developed countries is very poor, we need to have those voices out here. Without those voices, the debate is that much poorer, and capacity-building is important. There is also discussion on the nature of capacity-building. Of technical capacity-building gets brought up a lot but capacity-building needs to extend to the political aspects as well. How do -- because we are talking about governance so how do least developed countries, people from there are able to articulate -- understand and articulate their own interests and make sure that those are taken care of here.

 A second issue was funding, that we need to probably have funding support for people from other countries, from the developing countries as well. And again in terms of funding, the need for public funding, (inaudible) funding was seen as something that was seen as important. I'll just conclude with the last point, which is basically that the first panelist when he presented, he said that if you're talking of democracy, it's very important to talk about substantive participation and not just formal participation. We may have very -- been successful in terms of formal participation. We still have a long way to go when it comes to substantive participation, as we look at our next (inaudible) IGF, we need to be very focused on this principle because otherwise our original thinking of reducing exclusion, we will reduce the exclusion in one way but we will increase it in another way, and that's not the spirit of WSIS and I think that's something that we need to keep in mind. Thank you.

 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Guru. You well understood my threatening approach to you, so with a paper which says you should stop soon. It was a polite reminder. No, thank you. It was just another confirmation of the value of this -- of this enterprise which we call Internet Governance Forum.

Sami El Basheer, development of development sector in ITU, is our next speaker, and I still have, apart from him, another five in this session.

So I would like to say that I'm closing now the list of speakers right after this, what I received, this card, so -- and once these now seven speakers end their interventions, we would move to the next topic on our agenda.

Mr. Al Basheer, you have the floor.

>>SAMI EL BASHEER: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. I'd like just to introduce the ITU again. I would like to tell you how delighted I am to see this dialogue and just go back in history and remember in '98 when the ITU adopted the famous resolution which started all this process through the U.N. and, as you know, you know the history that we organized both phases of the summit.

I think it's very clear from this discussion, and everybody agrees with me, nobody challenges the multilateral mechanism of the governance of the Internet, and that all stakeholders have a role.

I think this is -- this is agreed by every single entity, and in this room and outside this room. I think the statement of the WSIS was very clear that we all have different roles to play, and we are playing these roles.

I would like also to emphasize that the ITU is promoting telecommunication ICT infrastructure worldwide, and conducting the unconnected even with some specific projects in some developing countries, to promote the use of -- of Internet as very important means of communication and forming the Information Society.

We, for example, Mr. Ambassador, have three -- have 11 workshops during this IGF. And so we are doing our role. We are active, and we want to be even more active. And I hope next time we'll see some of the ITU officials as panelists on the next IGF, I hope, because it's an irony we started all this process. Now we are competing for a spot to speak.

But that is democracy, and I like this kind of arrangement.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take too much of your time. We are very active in cybersecurity around the world. We are working with our members. All our work is membership driven. And our members who are the governments and 750 sector members. The idea of involving the civil society, it's still on the agenda of the ITU, and I think everybody knows it will be discussed next plenipotentiary in Mexico.

But having said that, I want to assure you that through many of our initiatives, Especially on the D arm of the ITU, we work with many civil society entities and NGOs to promote the use of Internet.

Mr. Chairman, you warn me before that I have little time, so I want to stop here and wish you all the luck.

We just want to say that the Secretary-General and myself said on different occasion, we have an excellent relation with the ICANN, and like my colleague from UNESCO and others, we are working also in the future to have a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN in order to put behind us any misunderstanding may occur during this process.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you Mr. El Basheer, for your intervention and very clear statement of friendship with ICANN. It's really appreciated. And I think that we should continue in that spirit for years to come.

But if you would allow me, you recall the question I asked the representative to IETF about participation of government representatives in the work of IETF. I know you are not from standards sector, but you should have a sense.

In your view, is there any particular reason why governments do not participate in -- or government representatives do not participate in IETF? And at what level you are drawing on IETF experience and knowledge in working in different working groups in standardization sector? Because certainly, you are addressing sometimes questions which are, if not the same, very similar.

>>SAMI EL BASHEER: Well, this is, Mr. Chairman, a very good question. I think many governments, and as I think we just heard from the civil society representative about the numbers, statistics on the study they made, that very limited number of developing countries are participating.

I think it's clear from the WSIS outcome that the international community did

not reach a consensus in how they run their Internet. And that's why they came up with this arrangement of the IGF. That's why we are still discussing this. This is one reason.

 Another reason we have to remember that like when the ITU, as you said in the standardization sector and other sectors, you have a private sector driven proposals and so on and so forth. But the governments are there. They are there, and are sitting in management of the spectrum and in other issues of the ITU.

 I think it's as simple as that. It doesn't need too much effort to realize that the governments still don't feel, in my opinion, generally speaking, that the IGF is the right place to govern the Internet, but it is a multistakeholder forum to discuss what we are doing. And as I said again, each of the parties do their parts, and we come here and we share information, and we see how we can take it forward for the future. And I think this is what we are doing.

 Thank you very much.

 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Thank you.

 Next speaker on my list is John Curran from American Registry for Internet Numbers, ARIN. And after that, I will call on Fouad Bajwa from Pakistan ICT policy monitor. And it seems to me I have to start limiting interventions from five minutes maybe to four and a half.

 >>JOHN CURRAN: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. I am John Curran. I am the president and CEO of the American Registry for Internet Numbers, what you know as ARIN.

 ARIN is one of the five Regional Internet Registries that collectively manage the Internet resource pool for all organizations worldwide.

 I am here to report on the experiences of the five RIRs in making use of the principles contained in paragraph 29 of the Tunis Agenda.

 Much like a prior speaker, I'm happy to say many of those principles have always been part of the Regional Internet Registries. This includes transparency, multilateralism, and democratic principles.

 But I will say that the presence of those principles in the Tunis Agenda has made it easier for collaboration between the Regional Internet Registries and many other bodies, both civil society, government, and international organizations.

 We have undertaken a program of outreach, in some cases joint workshops, in some cases particular collaboration with people going to speak with each other's panels.

 And as a result of the principles that are contained in the Tunis Agenda, I would say doing this collaboration has been much easier.

 We look forward to continuation of those principles and would welcome being able to continue to do the collaboration that we're doing now with organizations like APTEL, CTU, the OECD that has been further enabled by having them in the agenda.

 That's all I have to report. In the interest of time, I turn the floor back. Thank you.

 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Thank you, John.

 So next on my list is Mr. Fouad Bajwa from Pakistan, ICT policy monitor. And after that I will call on Olga Cavalli from Argentina.

 So you have your four minutes.

 >>FOUAD BAJWA: I'd like to sort of bring the debate back to the principle 29. And I'd like to remind us that the Tunis Agenda is formed on the principles of the WSIS declaration. And the paragraph number 29 is based on the foundation of our joint vision, combined vision for the Information Society. And this role is yet not fully realized.

 The words including "should bring the government's requirement to the IGF," and we know it's an open space. That can't happen.

 Ensure it brings a monitoring role to it, which can be a partnership opportunity with other organizations and other groups in the multilateral system to look after that. And the IGF is going to continue to be the result of open consultations, will be an open dialogue forum, and will be constituted not through organizational divisions but be -- and should not be considered

concrete, since the organization structures will continue to be adjusted and to be changed until they are fed into the needs of the multistakeholder members.
 Yes, the IGF facilitates a gathering for open dialogue and opportunities for creating partnerships, and understanding around issues concerning the principle 29.
 It can draw attention to issues and put them on the agenda for international dialogue.
 The IGF topics are not fixed, and we should remember we have the opportunity to change those according to our needs, according to the needs of the multistakeholders, and according to trends of the evolving Information Society.
 If we look at the Geneva Declaration of Principles, the world has a common vision of the Information Society. We started from the millennium development goals, and we have a very important component in the WSIS declaration and the MDGs, which is human rights.
 And in order to explore, in order to touch upon the issues of human rights and associated, like, when we come down the structure into the heart of a structure and the multilateral organizations concerning that, we have a development agenda which is evolving slowly. And slowly we feel it will come into recognition.
 So when I look in the near future with the continuation of the IGF, enshallah, is that the human rights and development agenda topics will come into main sessions. And as I would like to say, that please don't forget we are there. We, the people of the developing world, are there. And most of us, almost all of us, are not in the OECD countries. And we are -- we may not be participating as much as in the international multilateral system. Why? For example, my experience from ICANN, I saw less staff members from my part of the world. I saw less board members from the whole of the developing world.
 And everybody is playing the role. They have been sharing their roles. But there is a need once again that I must ask. Please, please, please, there is a requirement for more participation from the developing world, and there should be partnerships outside the IGF which can help ensure this.
 And secondly, the IGF will continue to evolve on the needs and requirements of the evolving Information Society. The topics will be evolved, will be changed. And we must continue to bring in these subjects. And when we touch upon them, they become cross-cutting. And I see human rights issues -- for example, with the European Union's Internet rights statement on the telecom reformations -- as a very good example of where we are headed in the information society.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Fouad. I believe your appeal was heard, more participation from the developing countries.
 Now I am turning to Olga Cavalli from government of Argentina, and after that from Internet society, Constance Bommelaer will speak.
 Please, Olga, go ahead.
 >>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Thank you very much.
 Thank you, Janis.
 I want to make a comment and a statement in my role of coordinator of the Internet governance working group of the original plan of action of the Information Society of the Latin America and Caribbean ALAC 2010.
 This group is a very interesting multistakeholder approach that we learned after WSIS. It has -- it is multistakeholder and it has the participation of several governments of the region, also from civil society representatives and private companies.
 The group was created in the plan of action as a special request made by the government of Argentina, where I am an advisor, and the purpose of the group is to exchange ideas and best practices about Internet governance in the region, and also to increase the participation of the region in the whole Internet governance process.
 Now the group is in the process of making a survey about the Internet governance-related organizations and upload this information to a map, with a visual interface, that will be built in a special Web site. We will make this also with our local chapter of Internet society in Argentina, where I am a member.
 Also, we want to upload in this Web site the relevant information about

Internet in the region, to have it as a reference for all of us.
 In the national level, I must say it has been a significant consolidation of the multistakeholder approach, and I want to mention to you two examples. The most important ones are the development of the national digital agenda, which was made in a very much multistakeholder approach, and also an evaluation of the convention of cybercrime made by the government of Argentina.
 About suggested updates or changes, I would say more focus on development should be good. Not only having it as a cross-cutting theme, but more focus on development.
 Thank you very much.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Olga.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Janis, can I ask a question? The same question Janis earlier asked the Canadian ccTLD.
 Olga, do you think this would have happened in the Latin American intergovernmental process if not for the WSIS principles? Short answer.
 And also, has it improved the outcomes? Or has it made a substantial change to the outcomes of the process?
 >>OLGA CAVALLI: I think it wouldn't have happened if we had no -- not the multistakeholder approach we had in 2005 in WSIS. It is not easy for governments to handle the multistakeholder approach, but it's a process. You can start from something and build upon there.
 What was the second one?
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Has the participation of different stakeholder groups improved or changed the outcomes of the process?
 >>OLGA CAVALLI: This is only a personal opinion. I think yes, a lot. But it's not an opinion of my government, but it's mine.
 Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you, Olga.
 We have now another four speakers on the list and another 15 minutes maximum to go, not more than that, in order to allow one hour for the second part of the discussion. So now I am inviting Constance from Internet society, and if you would tell your name because for me, it's unpronounceable. Sorry.
 >>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: It's Constance Bommelaer.
 I just wanted to echo briefly what Dmitri Ypsilanti from the OECD said earlier about the ITAC, the Internet Technical Advisory Committee to the OECD. This opportunity that was offered to us by the OECD and also to civil society to join the work of the OECD I think is really unforeseen.
 It was obviously the result of the agreement set in the 2008 sealed declaration that acknowledges the WSIS principles and encouraged member states to work collaboratively with new stakeholders, all stakeholders.
 So in less than a year, these new constituencies, the process has been very rapid, thanks to a very welcoming OECD staff. And in less than a year, these new constituencies, including the Internet technical community, were able to join all working parties of the ICCP committee and already in a position to contribute to crucial policies such as information security and privacy policies, and we know that this year is going to be crucial because of the revision of the privacy guidelines of the OECD, critical infrastructure policies that cover, for instance, IPv6, or even Internet innovation and economic issues.
 Regarding the Internet technical advisory committee, finally I would just like to mention that it is an open group. It's open to any Internet technical or research organization. Its working methodology is based on a charter that we expects the rules of participation that was set by the OECD itself. And if you would like to know anything more about the ITAC, the Internet technical advisory committee to the OECD, please visit the Web site. It's internetac.org.
 Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Constance.
 Now I would turn to Mr. Aldarrab from Saudi Arabia. And after that Art Reilly, and after that we will conclude the session with Heather Dryden from government of Canada.
 >>MR. ALDARRAB: Thank you very much, Ambassador Karklins. In fact, I asked for the floor for two points. One is related to the point which was mentioned

by my dear friend from France when he referred to the definition of the Internet, and he referred particularly to the magic words he said, and that is "in their respective roles."

He mentioned that this -- respective roles are not clear, and I would like to refer to item 33 or Article 33 in the WSIS. There, it is mentioned clearly that the report has also enhanced -- that is, the report of the WGIG, has also enhanced our understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of governments, intergovernmental and international organizations, and other forums as well as the private sector and civil society, from both developing and developed countries.

So that is a good source. In fact, it is recognized by the WSIS. And there we could find a list of roles.

This is number one.

The second thing, if I dare to attempt to answer your question related to the participation of developing countries and IETF coming from a government, in fact there are a number of issues that prevents or let me say make the governments less, from developing countries, less involved. Two points in particular.

One is financial issues. Many developing countries, they do face difficulties in the financial issues. Therefore, it is not so easy for them to participate in the IETF.

The other thing is the technology, know-how. And if you remember in the WSIS, one important element came along with the Internet issue, and that is the financial mechanisms.

So there are many elements. All together, if you put them all together, many solutions could be found. One of them is the financial solutions. The other one is the transfer of technologies and the know-how.

So those elements, I think, also need to be looked at.

Unfortunately, I have heard that the digital solidarity fund which was a result of the WSIS unfortunately was dismantled, did not succeed, and probably they are thinking about another mechanism. But that is a very important element that needs to be looked at also.

Thank you.

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Thank you for this intervention. I believe the IETF people listened carefully and see what they can do.

Okay. So Art Reilly from ICC/BASIS. And do you wear also the Cisco hat at this time?

>>ART REILLY: Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. It's a pleasure to be here.

Yes, as you indicate, I am here on behalf of ICC/BASIS, and BASIS -- well, ICC is the International Chamber of Commerce and BASIS is the Business Action in Support of the Information Society. And I work for Cisco in the interest of making sure it's transparent as to my role here.

Certainly the business community supports the WSIS principles of multistakeholderism, transparency, democracy in terms of the Internet governance processes. But I think we can take a step back from those and remember that the underlying principle of all of this is that the Information Society is one that is, in fact, should be, people-centric and development oriented.

And I think that's an issue that, in the discussions here, we need to continue to focus on.

Multistakeholder is excellent, and we certainly support it. But that means that we are dealing with individuals, individual people and their needs, and that we not lose sight of that.

I think the IGF is very, very successful in addressing that, utilizing the flexible format to allow us to have both sessions like this where we can talk about this issue, as well as workshops where, in detail, we have panelists that can talk about the issues and their experiences, and also people from the audience raised questions about specific situations that they have.

And I have been very impressed this week to hear a representative from Ghana talk about their needs for affordable, low-cost Internet connectivity and for us to have a detailed discussion of what are the elements that could, in fact, do that.

This is something, I think, we all look for in the WSIS process or how we could actually individually work together, to actually increase the number of people on the Internet by one or a thousand or a billion.

So I think that's an important element.

And the business community is very proud of the role that we play with the other stakeholders in actually achieving over the last four years, since the WSIS, the fact that there are now more than 2 billion more people connected via mobile in the world than there were at the time of WSIS. That there are now more than 700 million people connected to the Internet today.

Each one of those businesses are very proud to be part of the process of connecting them individually, person by person. And making that available to them to give them access to the content around the world.

Another aspect of business's role is innovation, to provide new services and applications and content. Business obviously is a big contributor to the content on the Internet. So we are very proud of that role as well.

Capacity building is a fundamental part of preparing for the Internet of the future.

So one of the activities of the Internet Governance Forum that we think is critical is its capacity building capabilities. We are proud to bring our experiences to this forum and share those with others, and hopefully they can, in fact, impart to us issues and their experience. As I mentioned before, we can take back those issues and begin to work with them internally and then improve things going forward.

I might just step back and indicate that I have heard the Ambassador's question with regard to what happened and what's different over the last several years.

I've talked a little bit about in terms of what businesses have done individually to help people, but at a collective level, we have organized in terms of the BASIS, the Business Action in Support of the Information Society, to coordinate and to outreach to businesses around the world, in developing countries as well as developed countries, to include them in preparation of issue papers and participate in these discussions.

We have represented business community here at the IGF, but also in the Global Alliance for ICT in Development, in the WSIS action lines, and an important addition in these last several years in is the U.N. Commission on Science, Technology and Development, to participate in that and bring our expertise to that as well as gain from the insight of others.

We have also participated in the regional IGFs and consultations associated with those, and as I mentioned, outreach to our individual affiliates in about 100 countries around the world to, in fact, encourage them to understand these issues and to do advocacy with regard to their respective governments on creating the enabling environment that the WSIS and that underlies the Internet governance processes that we talk about.

So I, once again, thank you very much for the opportunity to talk about the WSIS principles, the business role and our continuing desire to participate in this forum which is multistakeholder which we think is very important, which is non-decisional, which gives us the opportunity to talk about these issues and freely and without negotiated text and we look forward to continued participation. Thank you very much.

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, art. And thank you for all the involvement of BASIS in the activities which has been consistent since many years already.

Heather Dryden, Government of Canada. She's the last speaker in this part of the session.

>>HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much. First I'd like to begin by saying that Canada really values this interaction. We've heard from the technical community, the private sector, civil society, and governments, I'm happy to say.

I would like to recall that the WSIS was really about raising awareness of ICTs at high levels, and the underlying principle there, obviously, is development and capacity-building, and I'm pleased to note that a number of previous speakers put a considerable amount of emphasis on that.

And related to that, reminded us of the importance of increasing developing country participation in important forums such as the Internet Governance Forum.

I am happy to report that in accordance with this, the Canadian government has been able to provide funding to the International Telecommunication Union, who has kindly agreed to administer those funds, in the amount of Can$450,000, and that is in order that developing countries can participate here.

So this is the value that we place on this kind of format.

It seems to me that the nature of the Internet really demands flexibility and adaptability, and with the clear multistakeholderism emphasized in the WSIS documents, the discussion forums and the Internet organizations related to these issues, they need to remain flexible and adapt. There's really no one stakeholder group or organization that can afford not to.

And I think this is consistent with the comments that have been made about the future of the Internet, and needing to embrace future and new challenges.

Specific to governments, it was a delight to hear from our colleague from Netnod talking about the involvement of governments in the IETF. I note that ARIN, John Curran, didn't mention this but a working group has been created there recently for governments to participate and it's simply in recognition that there are issues of interest and relevance to governments. That's not going to change. Not all issues are going to be of central relevance to governments, but this is one of the ways that governments have been able to become better involved in ARIN, for example.

And of course the Governmental Advisory Committee at ICANN is yet another instance of governmental involvement.

And what I would like to emphasize related to this is those governments that participate, they are adapting. They are trying to meet new ways of doing things. That's certainly how Canada views that matter.

And so I think there needs to be recognition of that and just taking this into account as we meet future challenges related to the DNS.

So thank you.

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Thank you, Heather, for this intervention.

Let us now move to the next part of our discussion related to Paragraph 31 of Tunis Agenda. If the Secretariat now could put the text on the screen that we could read it together.

Paragraph 31 says: "We recognize that Internet governance, carried out accordingly to the Geneva Principles, is an essential element for people-centered, inclusive development-oriented and nondiscriminatory Information Society. Furthermore, we commit ourselves to the stability and security of the Internet as a global facility and to ensuring the requisite legitimacy of its governance based on the full participation of all stakeholders, both from developed and developing countries within their respective roles and responsibilities."

And in order to trigger debate, maybe we should -- we should think about a couple of questions we would like to seek answers during the next 50 minutes or so. And I would propose the following questions: Whether the current Internet governance arrangements, or for what extent the Internet governance arrangements have contributed to the development of the Information Society. What is the meaning of the term "Internet governance for development"?

What do I understand with that?

What are examples of impact to the development -- to the development of the evolving intergovernment arrangement?

And here, I would like to quote one remote participant, who sent his comments some time ago. This is kind of a comment and question, which relates to the topic.

"When we speak of stakeholder participation and Internet governance, do we create anything by calling interest group differently? We have had a lot of -- we have heard a lot about inequalities of Internet access globally. Are all stakeholders equal or are some more equal than others ?" So -- and now I will give the mic to Anriette to continue moderation.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Janis.

Well, the -- thanks for the comment and the question, and from the remote participant, which I hope the speakers will keep in mind.

And our first speaker is Bill Drake, from the Graduate Institute of

International and Development Studies in Geneva, but Bill also convened a
workshop earlier today on the Development Agenda in the -- are you ready, Bill
-- in the Internet Governance Forum. Some quick comments.
 >>WILLIAM DRAKE: Thank you, Anriette.
 I -- we had a workshop today called "Implementing the WSIS Principles, a
Development Agenda for Internet Governance."
 The workshop was cosponsored by eight different organizations, including two
governments and one international organization, the Council of Europe.
 We had eight speakers. Unfortunately, I did not manage to achieve gender
equity. Seven of my speakers were women, so you failed to have the proper
balance, I guess, there.
 Five of the speakers were from government. And what we discussed was the
following.
 There's been a lot of concern among many participants, I think, that there's
been inadequate discussion in the IGF over the years around precisely the kinds
of questions Janis was just opposing, what does Internet governance mean, how do
we think through the impact of Internet governance arrangements on development,
on people-centered development. And the problem has been really a lack of
systematic, focused dialogue on these kinds of issues, as well as a lack of real
analysis by academics like myself and others. It simply hasn't been the leading
edge of the discussion in the IGF or other settings.
 And I think the consequence, of course, has been a -- sort of a missed
opportunity to build support for a multistakeholder process focusing on
developing country concerns, and to promote developing country engagement in the
IGF.
 One option for trying to address those issues is the notion of a Development
Agenda. By a Development Agenda, I mean a holistic program of analysis and
action intended to mainstream development considerations into decision-making
across the range of important global Internet governance mechanisms.
 In the first instance, a Development Agenda would be an analytic enterprise,
involving monitoring trends, aggregating information, and conducting analysis to
assess progress against some agreed baseline in terms of how effectively these
mechanisms are actually promoting or addressing developmental concerns.
 At the same time, one could also imagine such an agenda moving on beyond
analysis to identifying and generalizing good or best practices, and perhaps
making some consensual adjustments to enhance the development awareness of
Internet governance procedures and policies.
 Development Agendas are already being pursued in related international arenas,
such as intellectual property and international trade, under WIPO and the WTO,
but we've had no parallel process in Internet governance.
 Of course Internet governance is very different from the two arenas I just
mentioned because it's highly distributed, involving many different types of
institutions, and processes, both governmental, nongovernmental, and
multistakeholder, and that means that you could not pursue exactly the same kind
of Development Agenda that you would have in a centralized body like WIPO and
WTO.
 IGF does not have members, it doesn't have a rule-making role, people don't
make hard commitments and allocate budgets and so on here. But we could be
using the IGF as a vehicle to sort through the issues, to identify those that do
bear on development, to gather and share information, and so identify and
encourage best practices.
 So in a lot of ways, I see this as sort of a parallel concept to the sort of
approach that the APC, the Council of Europe, and UNECE have pursued with regard
to the procedural aspects of Internet governance, promoting transparency and
inclusive participation. Development is a horizontal, cross-cutting norm that
should inform all Internet governance activities and we could be assessing how
well that process works.
 Accordingly, I've organized a couple of workshops on this in the past, both at
Rio and Hyderabad, to flesh out the concept of a Development Agenda, and in this
meeting what we did was to make the link, then, to the WSIS principles on
Internet governance, which in my view can be read as mandating that indeed

Internet governance is supposed to be promoting development and that the IGF has a mandate to be promoting and assessing that kind of activity on an ongoing basis.

The meeting talked about a number of different issues. We had a fairly vibrant discussion. But essentially, we considered, in particular, four possible elements of a Development Agenda. Obviously, capacity-building being one, which could be more systematized and more information shared about what types of options are available, who's doing what and so on, sharing best practices, et cetera. A second set of questions around institutional and procedural issues pertaining to Internet governance mechanisms. Possible barriers to effective participation that may exist in intergovernmental, private sector, and multistakeholder processes, and ways we might address those barriers more effectively.

Thirdly, the substantive policy issues pertaining to the governance of infrastructures that we might want to consider, whether it's naming and numbering or security or technical standardization and so on, trying to identify which of the issues seem to be most directly relevant to developmental trajectories.

Fourth, a parallel look at the governance mechanisms pertaining to networked information, communication, and commerce. That's to say the use of the Internet for transactions, whether it's information security, intellectual property, electronic commerce, whatever.

So we had a whole exercise, over the course of these three workshops, where we tried to identify what are some of the key issues that a Development Agenda might try to take on board, and then we also talked today finally about ways to perhaps take this concept forward. Both in the IGF and other global institutions -- or IGF's not an institution, but other processes, and in terms of research and capacity-building efforts.

And the main conclusions, I would suggest, of the workshop were as follows.

First, with regard to the IGF, there was strong support among the 60 or so participants in the room, and this resonates with the results of the previous two workshops as well in Rio and Hyderabad, for the notion that development should be a main theme session in the IGF. We've been talking about the traditional five for a while now, and it might be time to consider having development in there. What -- precisely, the question that Janis asked: What is IG for D, how do we begin to promote and assess it.

In a related point, it could be possible to develop a more coordinated cluster of workshops, best practices forums, and open forums, where perhaps institutions would talk about what they do to promote development objectives, how they work with developing countries, et cetera.

National and regional IGFs are increasingly important, and certainly we would want to see if there are ways to try to bring development considerations into those in a more systematic way and then percolate the results of those back up into the international IGF that we hold once a year.

And there was also discussion of the idea of perhaps having a dynamic coalition to sustain the dialogue around this, and a lot of people have shown interest in this in the past, so we will continue to consider how feasible that might be.

I might add, in closing, also, that there is ear kinds of elements that could be pursued in this context, other types of initiatives.

Within ICANN, those of us who participate in the noncommercial stakeholder group have been discussing the possibility of forming a development interest group that would focus on development aspects of the names and numbers issues that are before the GNSO. There are other parts of ICANN that might want to take these issues on board as well.

And in terms of research and capacity-building, I will probably try to organize some initiatives in terms of producing a book and some courses and so on. We already do some of this in the international summer schools on Internet governance.

So -- oh, by the way, I might note that a recording of our workshop is online if anybody is interested. It's at www.american.edu/sis/ic. Thank you very much.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: And thank you, Bill. And I was in this workshop this morning, and there was a very interesting question, I think, from George Sadowsky, who said that he understood that the IGF was about development, and that it was, in fact, a priority theme. And he questioned, you know, what -- why did we come to this point now where we are looking at development agenda and where there's also a strong feeling from many people that the development agenda and development issues should feature as main sessions or as a main session.
 And I invite somebody from a developing country, perhaps, to say how it feels to them, to what extent is development a priority in the IGF, and how does it feel to be a developing country participant in the IGF, and what do you feel would be the reasons for us needing to place this special emphasis on it?
 Has Olga left? Is there anyone else who would like to react to this? There's a hand over there. Just introduce yourself. And keep it brief.
 >>FOTINDONG CORNELIUS: Yes. Thank you very much. I am Fotindong Cornelius from Cameroon. I work for the Minister of Posts and Telecommunications. I think that the idea of laying emphasis on the aspect of the government in IGF is very important for developing countries, because at our level, we are still trying to get the basic access to the Internet, but contrary to developed countries where the access is readily available.
 So we would have expected more emphasis on development -- workshops on development to take priority and to appear in the main session. Thank you.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks for that. I think we also talked about the importance of continuity, because access has, in fact, featured in the IGF, and -- but unless one participates in every single IGF, it's very difficult to -- to get a sense of progress.
 Our next speaker is Lisa Horner from Global Partners. She's also the coordinator of the dynamic coalition on Internet rights and principles. So some comments from you, Lisa.
 One of the points in Paragraph 31 refers to a nondiscriminatory Information Society, and perhaps if you can comment on the WSIS principle in that light.
 >>LISA HORNER: Thank you. I'm actually just an active participant in the dynamic coalition rather than the coordinator at the moment, but we will be having elections for the steering committee and I'd encourage people to actively participate and consider being a member of the coalition.
 I'd like to speak a little bit about the extent to which Internet governance institutions and processes are contributing to the development of this people-centered, inclusive, development-oriented, and nondiscriminatory Information Society.
 As the only internationally accepted framework of standards and principles relating to what it actually means to be people-centered and what "development" means in practice, human rights provide an appropriate benchmark to measure progress that is being made and also an appropriate basis upon which to develop the norms that underpin and, again, the WSIS declaration itself reinforces the importance of upholding human rights in the civil society. Both civil and political rights and economic, social, and cultural rights.
 So I organized a workshop that was held on the first day of the IGF, and that was "Human Rights and Principles in Internet Governance, Practical Steps Forwards." And the work showcased the various initiatives that are being taken by different stakeholders from the bottom up, to foster the evolution of an Internet that supports and promotes human rights --
 >>INTERPRETER: Could the speaker please slow down slightly.
 >>LISA HORNER: -- such as the Global Network Initiative, my own organization's Freedom of Expression Project, the Council of Europe Guidelines of ISPs, APC partner organization networks that are working at the national level, and other projects that provide practical guidance on how to actually incorporate human rights standards into Internet governance policy and practice.
 Stakeholders in the workshop commented that the human rights framework is an essential tool for understanding how to build a people-centered information society and Internet, and the translation of human rights standards into practical principles and guidelines to address specific issues and dilemmas is a promising way forwards.

I will say participate actively in the dynamic coalitions on Internet rights principles and freedom of expression, and these have made important steps forwards over the past few years.

But I would like to say that there does remain a lot to be done to foster this people-centered information society, development-oriented society. The dispersed range of Internet governance institutions, actors, and processes, and the multifaceted nature and multilayered nature of Internet governance makes it difficult to ensure that human rights do underpin --

>>INTERPRETER: Could the speaker please slow down.

>>LISA HORNER: Internet governance is often seen as a technical domain and the social implications of policies aren't always taken into consideration enough.

So therefore, I'd like to say that we need more initiatives to be undertaken by all of the stakeholders at different levels from the bottom up to uphold and realize human rights through Internet governance drawing on the best practice examples, for example, that were explored in our workshop.

So we need better coordination between the Internet governance institutions on some of these issues. For example, with those concerned with its social dimensions, working more closely with those concerned with its technical dimensions.

We also need more meaningful multistakeholder collaboration, including spaces for civil society groups and Internet users from across the world to have meaningful and useful say in how our Internet is governed and how it operates on day-to-day basis.

In the dynamic coalitions, we'd love to hear particularly from business stakeholders and from Internet governance institutions about how we, in civil society, and user communities, can help you to expand the ethical dimensions of the Information Society.

Only when we include Internet users of today and tomorrow better in the policymaking and dialogue processes that affect them can we possibly hope to build an Internet that meets human needs and facilitates human development, dignity, and the realization of human lights. Thank you.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Lisa. I have Y.J. Park and also Professor Peter Bruck, but before that, does anyone else want to react on this issue of rights and the rights agenda in the IGF, and in Internet governance more broadly? No one else? And Y.J.

Just behind you.

Y.J. Park is from Delft University of Technology.

>>Y.J. PARK: Yeah. Thank you. Y.J. Park from Delft University of Technology.

Yes, I have been very impressed by how wonderful the multistakeholder principle is from ISOC, ICANN, OECD, W3C, IETF, RIR, and others, and is it really a wonderful principle for all?

I felt like I was in a religious meeting that shares each other's experience of how the multistakeholder god came to each other's spirit and how great it was to observe all the changes the multistakeholder principle god -- god wrote about. So I was quite afraid of saying my own experience that was not quite similar to people are sharing here.

I wish the same god also came to me and saved me like god did to you. However, the god did not come to me. At least yet.

I'd like to share my own experience of multistakeholder principle in the context of a development, not as religion but as one of the WSIS outcomes.

This morning, I could have a chance to talk one of the private sector members from USA. He said to me he just was coming from APEC CEO Summit in Singapore, and was very much surprised by the fact that there are very few Asian governments in this forum.

Why?

Governments in Asia, together with governments in many developing countries, do not take this equal footing multistakeholder principle seriously. As even the Canada delegation expressed, governments still make a lot of efforts to adapt to this new rule. At least some governments are trying to be in this process. However, the majority of governments in the world are not engaged with this critical Internet governance debate.

Should we go without those governments? Is it a right thing to continue marching all together with those who converted to the rule first in this room under the flag of leadership of multistakeholder parallel or should we spend more time for those governments to take on board.

 If so, why should we do?

 National governments are critical in terms of standing up national policy and implementing both national and global policies. Without national governments' participation, multistakeholder principle is not meaningful enough. I'm glad IGF community is very sensitive to human rights and many other rights issues promoting development. I hope IGF community should also increase the rights of national governments' participation as well as civil society from developing worlds' participation, as my civil society colleague addressed.

 Lastly, as Guru addressed, we also have to support political capacity-building, as well as economic capacity-building, for those who will not ready for the new rule of the multistakeholder principle. Thank you.

 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Y.J., and I'm pleased that you raised some of the more challenging questions because it did feel to me, earlier, that we heard a lot from institutions and the efforts that they have made to apply the WSIS principles. I'm not sure we heard enough from the people on the other end, the people who would like to participate in these institutions, and who try to participate in these institutions.

 Does anybody want to react to Y.J. Park's comments? You're all too tired.

 Professor Bruck?

 >>PETER BRUCK: Thank you. Thank you very much, Anriette.

 I still am digesting what Y.J. said, and I think it was very correct of you to ask people to comment on it.

 I think that she raised a number of points which also need some clarifications.

 But I want to address another issue regarding the context in which we talk about principle 31, and also the relationship between Internet governance and the access question.

 As you and many other people in this room know, the World Summit Award operates as an activity in over 160 U.N. member states, and thus, I travel in various different kind of regions in the world, assisting in various national markets, local and regional. The multistakeholder approach towards looking at best practice for Internet contents and innovative applications and using a mechanism of an open and fair and transparently judged competition in order to develop the content industries and the good use and the fair use of the Internet in terms of applications.

 I was recently, just a couple of months ago, in western Africa, in a couple of countries, and I talked to the producers there and the people who are producing actually Internet contents, have Internet agencies and so on. And I was really struck by the enthusiasm and the energy and the creativity, especially also, of the young entrepreneurs, some of them 26, 27 years old, and who will offering very valuable services to the community developing local media and so on.

 And then I talked to them also about the economics of the situation, and if you want to have a proper ISP access, broadband capacity, in those countries, you have to pay $12,000 a month. And I -- when I came back to Central Europe, I looked at the bill which we have in some of our units, and we pay for the same connectivity 315-Euro a month. So when we look at the question of Internet governance in relationship to development, my questions is: Would it not make a lot of sense to take the cost issue and the dramatic inequality in terms of cost much more into account?

 And I say this in light of the fact that when we looked at -- or when you look at the Tunis Agenda, there's -- prior to the Internet governance, there's a whole section on the financial mechanisms and the issue of how to finance the Internet and so on has been in Tunis quite an important issue and we had also the issues regarding setting up a digital solidarity fund and other initiatives, but it is always talked about in regard to setting up new infrastructures.

 What I'm talking about is I -- when you talk about governance and development and you are not taking into account the glaring inequalities in terms of the economics of the situation, we are remaining completely idealistic workshop

goers, workshop celebrators, or being kissed by the gods of multistakeholderism, as it was said before.

 So my question is: How can we integrate this in a more sensible manner so that we are actually addressing also the material issues which are making Internet actually only accessible and then multistakeholder and feasible for the social and cultural development and economic development in various regions of the world. Thank you very much.

 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you. Any reactions to that comment or that input?

 Are there any other speakers? Anyone else who wants to raise any point with regard to the WSIS principles?

 There's a hand over there.

 Are there any other hands? Now is the time.

 >> Thank you very much, moderator.

 I am coming back to -- I want it make a comment not on what the previous speaker said but on what the lady, Y.J., said just before him.

 I want to ask this question. How multi is a multistakeholder principle? As Y.J. just said, some governments -- government officials might be trailing behind the multistakeholders. And these are the decisions that are supposed to enforce any accommodations.

 Would it not be interesting if IGF could appeal to the government institutions through their participation to enforce the implementation of some recommendations made by IGF?

 It is governments that can tomorrow decide to make the implementations of the IGF binding to all issues. For us now, the recommendations of IGF may not necessarily be binding. A country may just look at it and keep them aside.

 But if governments' decisions is to be implicated in this discussion seriously, they may move ahead, and even transform these decisions to decisions that should be respected and implemented by all in international community.

 Thank you.

 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think that's a very challenging question. And we have discussed the issue of the role of the IGF. But what do you feel about something like the WSIS decisions which were, in fact, binding in that they were agreed to by government? Where we have just to take one example. The application of the multistakeholder participation in the development of the Internet and the Information Society. And we still have so many governments that are not yet introducing fully multistakeholder participation.

 So I think that there are all kinds of issues around the IGF making binding decisions, but we should also consider that there are so many bypassing decisions that are not being implemented.

 So it's not as easy as it might sound.

 And can we just have -- Is that Vladimir from DiploFoundation at the back?

 >>VLADIMIR: Thank you, Anriette. I am Vladimir from DiploFoundation.

 Also reflecting to the previous talks on the roles of the governments as well, we should remember one important thing, which is capacity building within the governments.

 Since even now, or no matter if the IGF has binding or nonbinding decision-making process, many decisions are made on a national level. So it's very important that the governments, national governments, are somehow included in the process.

 One of the experiences that Diplo has with capacity building is exactly that. If you introduce a multistakeholder approach within the capacity building as well, and you put the stakeholders together, and especially if you pay attention to involving younger governmental officials within the process -- and I am not talking -- when I am talking about capacity building it's very important to stress that it's not training as such, but it's training plus involving people, immersion, involving people in the process. And you can see all the new fellows that are around from developing countries, putting them together to discuss.

 In that sense, building up the national -- the IGFs on the national level is, as well, one of the best results that we had of the follow-ups of the IGF. Not the least, the capacity building should also result with follow-up initiatives.

And one of the concrete results that we can figure out from the capacity building that we had throughout the IGF process, which was based on multistakeholder approach, is, for instance, that now, at this moment, we have ten hubs, I think, remote hubs somewhere around the world participating remotely. And I'm following their discussion on Skype exactly now. Somewhere around the world they are Skyping while they are joining the sessions here. This process of remote participation was a direct result of capacity building.
 Another thing is the youth corner, which you can see over there in IGF Village, which was also the result of capacity building, where you can, for instance, test your digital native level, comparing with the youth.
 So I just wanted to stress the importance of capacity building and linking different stakeholders at that stage already, and then bringing them into the process so that we can maybe expect that on national levels, also, we would steadily have growing multistakeholder approach, including the governments that may not be feeling that importance at this moment.
 Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Vladimir, for your intervention.
 I just want to come back to the question of connection costs and access costs and cost for broadband.
 Indeed, that was a huge issue during world summit, and there were a number of reasons mentioned what contributed to the high cost in access to Internet in developing world. Some of them were -- now I'm quoting from my memory -- the lack of enabling environment, the situation of monopoly; from other side, lack of private investments or public investments in infrastructure, the low density of users. There was a lack of local content which raised the price and increased international traffic.
 So I would like to ask maybe ITU director of development, Sami El Basheer, if you can dwell a little bit what in your view, is the situation now and what's the difference at the time we discussed it four years ago and now? What has been changed and in which direction?
 >>SAMI EL BASHEER: Well, this is obvious, in developed world the broadband cost went down, because we have a more sophisticated network. We have fiberoptic, and also the mobile broadband has gone down.
 So the cost, the access cost has gone down.
 In the developing country, we have the problem that most of the of the Internet connections depend on the fixed network, where it's usually not capable of doing that. And so the cost on mobile broadband is high.
 As we have more mobile broadband in the developing countries, like what happened in the case of the voice, of course it will go down.
 This is the situation we are in. That's why the ITU and all other stakeholders are working hard to promote accessibility and connectivity around the developing countries regions where a lot of work and investment still is needed.
 Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. I know that you have many programs in that, and we can see from statistics that there is certainly a number -- increased number of Internet users. And the increase of users is exactly in developing world, despite of the high cost.
 So we may think that with the increased density of use, the costs may go down simply because of the volume of users. So let's hope and work on this.
 So I see on this subject is professor brook and Raul Echeberria wants to intervene.
 Professor Brook.
 >>PROFESSOR BROOK: Thank you very much.
 The ITU published this spring the ITU statistics, and that report is very comprehensive and breaks down to the country level very much also the cost issue.
 And I think the indicators which are provided there are excellent in terms of monitoring the situation.
 My intervention before is very much along your line of thinking, Janis, that we need to take into account the cost and economic issues when we talk about Internet governance and development, because otherwise we are just flying in a

situation where we are actually deacontextualizing what we are talking about.
 Obviously, in especially developed countries, the provision of mobile Internet
has brought about a real revolution also in terms of what is there, what
contents, what kind of applications can be used. They are knowledge-intensive
applications, they are content-rich applications, they are complex applications,
and they are really user-centric in a way which really adds value.
 This is what I want to see, also, and I'm sure many in this room would like to
see also, being fostered and facilitated in the developing countries. Because
the principles which we have are very clear, but if we are not realistic about
the challenges which we have, that is a real problem. And the monopoly
situation, as you have discussed, is just one of the market structure factors
which really impede, actually, people having access to Internet, mobile or
fixed.
 Thank you.
 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Professor Brook.
 Raul.
 >>RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you.
 I am Raul Echeberria, the CEO of LACNIC, the Latin American and Caribbean
registry, and also the chairman of the Internet society.
 I have spoken many times in this week, but always in English. But we have
translation services, and this is a minimal, multicultural environment, so I
will switch to Spanish right now.
 I have to confess I speak more comfortable speaking in my own language, as many
of the people here. This is the behavior that we have to motivate.
 So we worked very much on the cost of access, specifically for developing
countries. So of course we have to take into account different factors, not
only international links, because we did see, obviously, many changes in the
Internet over the last few years. But there are other factors that we have to
take into consideration.
 Obviously, connectivity prices, and access to services and to content are
important factors.
 We all have issues, content issues, distribution -- content distribution
networks, excuse me, so this is a very complex issue. And we have to make sure
that decision-makers understand to what extent they can intervene in the
situation to change it in Latin America. And I have already mentioned this
earlier. There are 100 percent of service providers that are active in this
sphere, and this is quite rare to see this. And our organization has played a
key role in Latin America.
 We have an IXP in Ecuador, and there were different initiatives launched with
Google, with other companies for content distribution.
 So there are many companies that are going to Latin America now to change the
state of affairs. Access to fiberoptic connections is also important here.
This allows us to reduce costs.
 Access to high-speed Internet through underground cables, through fiberoptics
are also important.
 So there are many factors that have to be taken into consideration,
specifically with regard to the issue of cost. In our region, we are working on
all of these different factors, and we have also seen activity in Africa.
Because we see things in a similar way.
 So Internet has evolved over the last few years. Models are becoming more
complex, more complicated. And we can change the state of affairs by acting on
different issues. We have to make sure that everything is clear to take correct
decisions and to make sure that the general public can adopt itself to this --
adapt itself, rather, to this.
 We have to look at local content. We have to underline IXPs and their
importance. We have to see how underground cables can be used.
 We also have to make incentives to make sure that providers have incentives to
put these networks into place. And all of this will contribute to cost
decrease.
 Thank you.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: In fact, I just want to read a comment from a remote

participant and then we have a question from a remote participant.

The participant is Miguel Alcaine, Ambassador -- deputy Ambassador from El Salvador to the U.N. in Geneva, and someone is who has been working in this process and a member of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group of the IGF.

And Miguel says, "I want to support the idea of transforming the development orientation of the IGF into something specific and practical. Abandon for a while the overarching nature and concentrate ourselves in discussing specifics about IG and development, like the global story."

And then we have a question, also from a developing country participant, from the remote hub in Ghana. It's Charles Amega Salom (phonetic), and his question is one that actually has been asked before but I will ask subsequent speakers to respond to it again.

How can we get developing countries governments involved, more involved, in Internet governance processes? And what are the reasons why these governments and these countries fail to participate in these discussions?

So perhaps our next speaker on our list is John K. Njoroge, the ISOC Ambassador to Kenya. And I know, John, you want to make a comment, but perhaps you can also make a comment briefly about why developing country participation is not strong enough.

Have you got the mic yet? Wave your hand. There you are.

>>JOHN NJOROGE: Thank you.

Thank you. My name is John Njoroge. I am from Kenya, and I am an ISOC Ambassador to the IGF.

I will start by agreeing with what Vladimir has talked about, engaging young people with the local -- with national governments.

I mean, I have been attending the debates at the youth corner with the DiploFoundation, and discussing with various youth from different countries. That's a start how we can have national governments engaged.

And just to enhance the thought on development, with developing countries. According to the WSIS principles, my challenge is really that developing nations should be continuously accorded more and more support in relation to what we are discussing in these IGF issues.

Well, this is my first time in the IGF, and I am a young person, and I want to see a lot more support accorded to the developing nations by the developed ones, simply because, really, young people, in particular, myself, I feel this can help the developing nations jump into new and better heights towards achieving the millennium development goals, and of course the individual national and socioeconomic and political goals.

The IGF issues being discussed here really they need to provide a new and a fair platform for engagement between nations of the world.

I feel, really, that developing nations should be assisted to see how best they can use ICTs to change their lives and the lives of their citizens. The world is a social place, and ICTs enhance this existence.

So providing regulations and legislations achieved in the shortest time possible for developing nations will also come in handy to help in that.

Developed nations, for that matter, through this IGF process should continue to empower and encourage developing nations in this agenda.

I think there's a quote in the Bible that talks about being my brother's keeper. I think the developed nations should continuously be the brother's keeper of the developing nations in this agenda.

Thank you.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, John.

And we only -- We are closing the speaker list now, and we have two more speakers.

We have Mactar Seck from the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa, and then Parminder Jeet Singh from I.T. for Change.

Mactar, where are you?

>>MACTAR SECK: Thank you. I will speak in French. It's more comfortable for me.

I wanted to explain the African experience that we have garnered on certain specific points, and they have to do with infrastructure and access.

We can say at this point that since the beginning of IGF on the continent, according to our own experience, we have seen many strides made in the area of access.

And the proof of that is that in many African states, governments' awareness has been raised and computer equipment has been made tax exempt. This is very important.

And also, computer equipment is sometimes distributed free of charge. Laptops, for example.

And also, higher educational institutions, in some countries, have 100 percent Internet connectivity.

So there is an effort that is being made at the level of educational institutions when it comes to access by all governments.

And this awareness raising also took place at the social level. Equipment is being provided to make sure that citizens have access to social services. About ten African countries have provided such infrastructure. And I think this also is under awareness raising.

Also, countries realize the importance of infrastructure. We know that infrastructure is something that they themselves can create, and they organize themselves together with the private sector in order to create the necessary infrastructure, and this was done of course together with the development partners. And I am referring to satellites, underwater cables, et cetera.

In five years' time, I think the whole of Africa will be connected. This is under way.

But this has to be viewed against the background of certain regions, countries.

There is a digital divide, and I think that IGF has to underscore this point. Bridging the digital divide. Even within individual countries. Between, for example, urban and rural areas.

Another point I wanted to touch upon is the freedom of expression. This is a point which is relevant in some countries. Internet is used sometimes in order to impede or stop the freedom of expression. And this is a very important point, and we need to give some thought to that.

So these are the points that I wanted to draw your attention to. And as regards others, I think in workshops we will be talking about strategy, cybersecurity, which is very important. The protection of children in Africa is also a problem. And these issues I think we will be discussing in workshops.

Thank you.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Mactar. And, Parminder, before we go to you, I overlooked or mislaid a piece of paper. We have Jeremy Godfrey from the government of Hong Kong. Jeremy, yes, there you are.

You are also addressing the question of developing country participation.

>>JEREMY GODFREY: Yes, I wanted to talk about how to widen participation. Not just necessarily from developing countries governments. But if I can confess that I have been a member of the GAC for 18 months, but I have been a complete absentee member from the GAC. And if I can maybe share why it's been difficult for me to participate.

I wanted to pick up on what Y.J. said about people getting religion about multistakeholder.

Of course, there are people that have the religion, invest an awful lot of their time and effort and enthusiasm in participating. But one of the consequences of that is for people who haven't got religion, it looks like a very expensive thing to do in terms of time in order to participate effectively.

So the barrier is actually very high.

And certainly that's how I felt as an individual member of the GAC. I wonder whether or not that may also apply to representatives from developing countries governments and possibly even to people from civil society and from the private sector who might also have a contribution to make, but who haven't got the religion and find that the cost of participating is too high.

So it's been certainly very good to meet with Janis and other people here at IGF and discuss these issues. And I think if we can find ways of getting people to participate which don't require such a heavy development of time, that might require some more active facilitation of some of the conversations. And we need

to find a way of doing that that doesn't undermine the bottom-up
multistakeholder approach.
 I think that will be useful.
 So people have talked about capacity building. People have talked also -- I
think the lady from the Canadian government talked about helping people with the
costs of participation in terms of the monetary costs. But I think we also need
to look at some of the processes we use to enable people to contribute.
 Thanks.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.
 And I think, also, not to forget that regional and national IGFs can make
engagement of these multistakeholder processes much more affordable, much more
accessible. And in some ways, also more directed at addressing very specific
challenges and problems, experienced in that region or in that country.
 So for someone who has not found their religion, that could be a very good way
to start.
 Parminder, you have the last word.
 >>PARMINDER JEET SINGH:
 Thank you. Or "words," perhaps.
 I'm Parminder from I.T. for Change. I had the exchange between Ambassador
Karklins and the ITU representative, and they listed a series of issues which
were envisaged in WSIS about access, the problems of access, and that reminded
me that the biggest global issue which was raised in WSIS was about
interconnection charges, and we seem to have not done anything on that over
these years, so I would like to know whether there's a feeling that the problem
has gone away or we could not pull together the political will to address the
issue, and I understand there was something mentioned in the WSIS documents
about ITU doing some study or some work on interconnection charges.
 And my feeling is that we could not summon the political will to take on a
particular government's regime which informs all Internet governance systems
which is market fundamentalist, and anything that challenges that is kind of not
give my quarters, and it is in this relation -- in this relation that I see WSIS
principles which gave some kind of political guidelines which had to stand
alongside the market principles to guide Internet governance regimes and on that
account, we have already kind of abandoned interconnection charges issue, but
network neutrality is another issue which is facing us and we refuse to look at
it in terms of any kind of political -- social/political principles and there
are enough of them in the Geneva Declaration of Principles to help us guide us
along.
 Open and free sharing of knowledge is one of the core principles mentioned in
the Declaration of Principles, and that gives us a way to, you know, take
network neutrality along and not only on the WSIS principles. There was a lot
of examination done about how organizations which are involved with Internet
governance assess themselves on the basis of participation in multistakeholder
but not on the basis of substantive principles, and one example which comes to
my mind is whether, because Access to Knowledge has been mentioned as such a
basic principle, does ICANN think about having an Access to Knowledge
constituency at the same kind of level as they have an IP constituency, which
would start changing the manner in which those organizations do work.
 Well, thank you, Anriette.
 >>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Parminder. You should have raised all
those questions earlier because now it's too late to pick up on them.
 We'll be closing now, and Bill Graham will give us a summary. Just I think a
reflection from me, I think -- and perhaps also commenting on Jeremy's remark, I
think what we've heard was from some institutions -- I think particularly the
government of Argentina -- talking about how you had to do it in order to really
understand the benefit of it. And also that, in fact, if it wasn't for the
WSIS, that road might not have been -- that there -- the governments of Latin
America might not have started on that road. And I think we sometimes
underestimate that this is really a change process, and we haven't been in it
for all that long, and I think we should keep that in mind.
 And I think we also are not necessarily addressing the challenges effectively.

We might not be challenging one another effectively. But I think my reaction to the input was that clearly there's been serious efforts made to apply the WSIS principles and to reflect on whether it's been valuable.

 I think the extent to which we're achieving it is still very new. There's sense of beginning to grasp whether we're getting there, but there's still a lot of disconnects. The disconnect between developing countries and the global processes, and perhaps some of the disconnects between certain stakeholder groups and certain institutions.

 I just want to make one reflection. I think Raˈl pointed that out, but others as well. When we talk about capacity-building, it's also about institutional capacity-building. It's not just about building capacity of governments and individuals to participate in global processes. We've seen what local and regional institutions like LACNIC can achieve, so we need to keep that in mind as well. That the process of transformation cannot just take place in the global arena. It also needs to take place in national and regional spaces.

 >>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Anriette. Bill Graham asked me to dance and sing about three minutes before he would make his summary to -- just to compile everything which was -- which we heard, and took note on, on the paper in the summary.

 But you took all the time and I will not be dancing and singing.

 All I will say is thank you very much, from my part, for a very constructive engagement.

 I was slightly afraid that this would be very inflammatory discussion, but it turned out being very constructive and I believe this is the proof of maturity of this forum. Maturity of debate. That we are looking more for solutions, we're sharing our experiences, rather than finger-pointing and saying that we are better than others and others are not doing what we wanted them to do.

 So I think that, again, this is the sign of maturity and be thank you very much indeed.

 For me, it was very informative and I believe for you too.

 And now I'm turning to Bill Graham for summary and then, of course, to the chair for concluding remarks.

 >>BILL GRAHAM: Thanks very much, Janis. That wasn't a very long song, I must admit.

 I'd agree with you that I think this was a useful session, and certainly it's one of the things that we were required to do by the WSIS, and I feel there was a lot of useful information that came out here, and some very good suggestions about what to -- what we should look at in the future.

 I'll break the summary down into two sections, as we did with the content itself, and I'd say the first session, I wouldn't quite characterize it as some kind of religious revival meeting, but I would say that it indicated that even before the WSIS, there was a commitment to what eventually became the WSIS principles.

 So I think what that tells us is that the WSIS principles didn't arise suddenly out of a few months' meetings in Geneva but, in fact, there was already a developing trend in the world towards more transparent, more democratic, multistakeholder processes.

 And I don't think that that is unimportant. It's something we need to remember, that the IGF is part of an ongoing evolution, as the WSIS before it was part of an ongoing evolution, and I don't think that evolution is finished.

 It was very good to hear specific examples of work that is being done that clearly responds directly to the WSIS principles. I'd point at the discussion by Council of Europe on the developing of a code of principles for participation. I've had the opportunity to read through that, and be involved peripherally in the work, and it's -- it's a good piece of work, I would say.

 The presentation by the OECD and, on the other hand, by one of the organizations involved in the OECD, now that it has brought in the technical community and civil society, I thought, were an interesting example and a very concrete useful example of best practices.

 Certainly there was useful discussion of areas where work still needs to be done. Multilingualism is one of those.

Some institutions identified problems that various stakeholders still have with full participation. I would say that the presentation from the OECD pointed to -- sorry, from the ITU pointed to work that's being done, and yet says that they, as a multilateral institution, don't feel yet that they're fully accepted in the framework of the IGF. And I think that's something we need to note and mark down as requiring work next year, if the ITU doesn't feel they're being fully included in main panels and so on.

There's clearly a lack in our process.

Here, too, I think we started in the first session talking about the need for -- to find ways to be more inclusive to participants from the developing world. There is no doubt that the developing world is making progress in many cases to increased multistakeholder participation, more open processes and so on. The government of Argentina gave us some examples. We heard some useful comments on the need for more participation from Pakistan as well.

And finally, I would point to the comments from France and Saudi Arabia on the importance of the WSIS statement about respective roles. Bertrand from France pointed out that participation is not a simple thing, it's not a flat thing. There are different levels of participation by different stakeholders that is required at different stages in the process, moving from discussion through to a decision, and that was backed up by our friend from Saudi Arabia who pointed to the need to keep those respective roles in mind and also pointed to the need for technology transfer.

But in general, I'd say we heard certainly from business that they have increased their outreach and credit that to some extent to the WSIS. We heard from civil society and technical organizations that they are increasingly engaged with other stakeholders in a multilateral and transparent fashion. And so we heard more examples, I would say, from those sides than we did from governments, although it was quite clear that some governments are making an effort to adapt. I would point at Argentina and Canada very strongly there, and that those processes are underway but need to be improved.

As far as the discussion of people-centered and inclusive development in the second section, Bill Drake pointed out that three years of workshops have gone on before there was a main session on this topic, and I was impressed myself by how far those workshops have gone to clarifying the thinking around the concept of Internet governance for development and the specific things that should be focused on going forward.

We heard, first expressed in that report from Bill but it came up later several times in the discussion, that although this is a session on the WSIS principles and Internet governance, it needs to be a start, and specifically people-centered development needs to be drawn out as a main theme, rather than being an overarching theme as it has been for the first four years.

So I think that's -- that's an important remark.

We heard about some discussions of what would be benchmarks of a people-centered development. Human rights was put forward. Again, lots of talk about government participation and how governments can be encouraged to be more engaged. Particularly the governments from the developing world.

We heard suggestions of increasing capacity-building for government officials in national governments, particularly young people. We heard that even though that -- that is still in its infancy, that kind of capacity-building in governments, some governments are picking up and we heard from an African speaker a series of examples of what is going on in his country.

One thing that we certainly all realize is that participation in these open mechanisms and concentration on development is not a simple thing. It's complicated. It's time-consuming. And there were questions about whether it could be simplified to make that more accessible and easier for government officials, particularly, to participate.

And a final point in that session.

I would draw together a number of speakers who spoke about the need to talk about -- think more thoroughly about economic realities and not simply concentrate on idealistic views of participation, but, in fact, look at some of the economic factors that work against the ability to participate. And we heard

some useful comments from a number of parts of the world on that, including Latin America, particularly.

 There was, again, discussion of the digital solidarity fund and whether there might be other support mechanisms that might be used to support the ongoing development of these WSIS principles in Internet governance very broadly, and in the Internet governance forum specifically. Thank you.

 >>AHMED EL-SHERBINI: Ladies and gentlemen, let me, on behalf of you, thank our three very able moderators for actually giving us a very lively, interactive session, and adhering to the time. So I thank the three of them on behalf of you. And I thank all the participants that enriched the session with their interventions, and as Janis said, the dialogue was very mature and I salute all of you for that.

 And if there are two main points that I would like to highlight and wrap up before we end the session, they are the following:

 One, there is definitely a serious effort being exerted to adhere to the WSIS principles in the governance of the Internet or in the Internet governance ecosystem. There is definitely serious efforts and sincere efforts being exerted, but there is still a lot of work that needs to be done to get everybody on board and to adhere to the all WSIS principles.

 The second point that I would like to highlight from your interventions, that there is a stronger need for more serious engagement of the developing countries in the IGF activities, and from here I call on the developing countries governments to get more involved in the IGF activities, to make use of this forum, to get their voice heard, to get their opinions on the issues related to Internet debated, and also I call on the IGF Secretariat to devise means and ways to motivate the governments of developing countries to get more involved in the IGF.

 With this, we end the session, and I thank all the participants and all the moderators again. Thank you.

 [Applause]

 >>AHMED EL-SHERBINI: One housekeeping announcement before we leave. That please before you leave the Congress Hall, stop by at the reception desk. You should get an invitation for -- like this one (indicating) for tomorrow's session. Without this invitation, you will not be able to enter the Congress Hall tomorrow morning.

 So this pass will -- by itself will not be enough to get in tomorrow morning, so please, there is an invitation for every participant in his name at the reception desk, so please before you leave, make sure that you get one of those invitations. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. With this, I announce the session -- ah. Please.

 >>MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should have asked for this earlier. Also a housekeeping announcement.

 I said it this morning, but please be reminded, mobile telephones will not be allowed into this room, so it may be safer to leave it in your hotel room.

 The same goes for cameras except for accredited media people. Laptops, however, are allowed in, so you're safe to bring in your laptop, but leave your camera and your cell phone in your hotel room. Thank you.

 Well, you can give it up at the entrance, if you wish, but I can imagine that it might be difficult to find it again. Thank you.

 >>AHMED EL-SHERBINI: Thank you all again, and see you tomorrow. Thank you.