



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative

BASIS

Business Action to Support
the Information Society

ICC BASIS interventions at IGF Open Consultations Geneva, 23 February 2011

The following ICC BASIS interventions and those of fellow business representatives are extracted from the real-time captioning taken during the 23 February 2011 open consultations of the IGF. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

MORNING SESSION

Intervention 1

Delivered by Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T

ICC/BASIS: Thank you. I wanted to pick up on some of the points that Michael Katundu made about Kenya is thinking in terms of the IGF and say one I think one way to approach emphasizing development would be to focus on approaches and messages to policymakers as what can be done to really both directly advance the deployment and infrastructure, building of the Internet as well as the uses of Internet for development and maybe think about focusing on it from almost an external audience. How do we develop some real clear decisions for policymakers? That could be a something that could be a more tangible set of solutions that could be really targeted to policymakers as the audience. Thank you.

Intervention 2

Delivered by Ayesha Hassan, ICC/BASIS

Thank you, Madam Moderator. I would like to join others in congratulating you and Kenya and for your efforts to get the preparations started. ICC/BASIS and the global business community look forward to contributing along the way through the weeks and months ahead to make this another successful IGF.

I wanted to address -- first of all, my name is Ayesha Hassan speaking on behalf of ICC/BASIS. In listening to the various issues that have been put forward as overarching themes or umbrella topics that need to be addressed, I wanted to put forward a suggested idea for how to encompass all of those topics which we also support as being very important at this year's IGF.

Maybe the idea of an overarching theme of "Internet-driver of change" with subtitles, "development, freedom, access," could potentially help to encompass all the different themes that are emerging as priorities in the discussions. For instance, "Internet driver of change," subtitle, "development, freedom, access," would cover the development issues, the human rights, freedom of expression democratization, access to knowledge, infrastructure, et cetera, the cross-border issues. So it really could be a nice way to -- a starting point for discussion for how to encompass all the various -- the range of social and economic priorities that have come out in this discussion. Thanks.



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative

BASIS

Business Action to Support
the Information Society

Intervention 3

Delivered by Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T

Thank you, Jeff Brueggeman with AT&T. I want to make a few comments about the discussion of principles.

First, I think a lot depends on the process that we are talking about. If the IGF is a forum for sharing ideas and information and perspectives, then obviously principles is an important part of that. And as Wolfgang and Bertrand and others have noted, as well as Brazil, there are a lot of different discussions of principles that are already occurring around the globe in various contexts. And I think those are appropriate to bring to the IGF.

However, if we believe that the IGF is not a negotiating body, then I share the concern that negotiating principles is a step toward something that we do not want to be pursuing, because that is going to lead in a fundamental change to what we are engaging in at the IGF.

Also, I find principles to be much more relevant in a specific context. And I do think we have had some very thought provoking discussion this morning about principles as it relates to cross-border information and the global nature of the Internet. There is certainly a relevance to talking about those issues.

I find that to be more -- perhaps more relevant than a very high-level general discussion of principles, and I think -- So to me, having principles be the type of thing that comes up in the context of specific topics and issues within the IGF is something that I think already has occurred and can continue to happen and should be encouraged that way.

Sometimes that is in the context of human rights, sometimes that is in the context of privacy, and sometimes it is emerging new issues that we are just starting to wrestle with such as the flow of information through countries and other things.

So I think these are important, but I would encourage us to do that in the specific context of those issues.

And I would like to pass the microphone to Ayesha.

Intervention 4

Delivered by Ayesha Hassan, ICC/BASIS

Thank you, Jeff. Ayesha Hassan for ICC/BASIS as well. I just want to go over some of the ideas put forward for cross-cutting themes at this year's IGF. From our perspective, we were very pleased that the bottom-up process of preparations put an IG for development session on the agenda for last year.

This year we feel that the IG for development issues should not be part of a main session but should really be focused through every single session.

We are hearing there is a development angle of every single topic that has been brought up. So in our view, maybe there would be a positive way of ensuring that the development issues get addressed and brought to the table and discussed with vigour by making sure that in every single main session and every subtopic, you have the question posed, as has been a wonderful suggestion brought out by the group here, what are the development issues? What are the policy challenges? What are the policy options? Are there relevant initiatives, forums, and organizations addressing these issues? What are best practices that exist on the topic? And if there is a desire to have a follow-up discussion on raising awareness about Internet governance and its relation to the development agenda more broadly, that could really be a



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative
BASIS
Business Action to Support
the Information Society

very good substantive workshop to pick up on some of the issues that those who would like to may feel should be picked up from last year's main session.

Thank you.

Intervention 5

Delivered by Patrik Fältström, Cisco

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Regarding -- I actually have something that talks a little bit more specifically about security, openness and privacy, where I think there can be some enhancements done.

The security, openness and privacy issues have been explored at both the main session and at various workshops, and I think we should move forward with some improvements, in specifically four different areas.

The first one has to do with Internet openness and network evolution. And we already heard some wording about Internet exchange points at these meetings just as one example. And to be able to communicate more, we of course need more investments, and we also need more broadband all over the world.

So -- And the next bullet which is connected to this had to do with human rights issues connected to openness and neutrality issues. And that is something that I also support. We need to talk more about that.

The third issue is that I think being one of the co-chairs of the main session on cloud at the last IGF meeting, I think what I heard quite strongly at that session was that one thing that we have not been talking about -- enough about has to do with various cross-border issues. And that is something that definitely has to do with security and openness issues, and that is something that we can move forward and take the discussion to the next level.

And the last thing that also to some degree was discussed in the cloud session has to do with the privacy issues. And one thing I think we can specifically talk about is how to preserve privacy issues in a cross-border environment and still serve, for example, enforcement purposes. And there we can build upon work that both OECD, Council of Europe and others have already been doing.

So openness and network evolution, human rights issues regarding -- connected to openness and neutrality, cross-border issues and how to preserve privacy.

Thank you.

Intervention 6

Delivered by Marilyn Cade, TechAmerica

Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Like a speaker earlier, I welcome the opportunity to say that. I am going to make three comments. My name is Marilyn Cade, and I am speaking on behalf of TechAmerica.

One comment that I would like to make is while I have been pleased to observe the benefit of the use of feeder workshops, we do believe that there must be the opportunity for independent workshops as well.

I would also know that we must factor into our thinking, if we propose to use feeder workshops, that there is substantial additional coordination and planning that is needed. And this is very important to understand because those who take on the function of organizing a



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative
BASIS
Business Action to Support
the Information Society

workshop have the need to meet the needs of their participants but also to have a further layer of interaction and coordination.

My second comment -- and I would say more about this perhaps this afternoon -- is I would like to talk more about the participation of the regional and national IGFs. I am the chief catalyst of the IGF USA. I will say more about that this afternoon. But I think it would be helpful to think about the interactions coming to and going back from the global IGF into the national and regional IGFs.

Finally, a long-standing comment from TechAmerica that I will repeat, it is our view that there will be a lot of new people at the IGF in Kenya and that there will be a much deeper opportunity for participation for new participants. So as we plan the IGF workshops, I think we must keep in mind it is not the number of workshops that matters. In fact, it is: are we meeting the needs of the breadth of our participants.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Intervention 7

Delivered by Marilyn Cade, TechAmerica

My name is Marilyn Cade, and I am going to speak in this case as an individual participant and someone who has organized workshops at -- and events, supported speakers on major panels and also acts as the chief catalyst of the IGF U.S.A. It would be extremely helpful if we could know as early as possible what the physical resources are that are available in terms of the sizes of rooms and the flexibilities of the rooms. And I will just give you an example.

In the workshops that I did at the IGF U.S.A., in the workshops we did at the IGF U.S.A., we were using auditorium-style seating. This really limits the ability to have flexible design and setup of the room. And if you want to work in an interactive way, there are certain limitations to that.

It often helps -- that gives you, perhaps, a larger number of seats but it limits the flexibility. And if we are trying to advance real participation and interaction between the participants, then we need to keep that in mind.

So as soon as we can know the number of rooms and the flexibility of the rooms to be designed according to the needs of different kinds of approaches, I think we would find that very helpful.

You may find that actually one of the reasons you end up with so many panellists is the only way to get people facing the rest of the audience is to put them all in a row at the front of the room.

And I think, also, the ability to support sophisticated remote participation, and if we can figure that out early -- that is, is it possible to do video out, even if not multiple video in, to particular workshop settings. We will be, at the IGF U.S.A., we will have a remote hub that will operate doing the Kenya IGF from one of the universities in Washington, D.C. Our group is committed to that. But it will be important for us to understand whether we can really effectively participate at the workshop level in terms of the facilities that are available.

As soon as possible -- and I know there are many stars to be aligned. As soon as possible, knowing the dates is very important to us in terms of understanding the booking of senior executives, ministers, senior officials, but also the plain-old person and expert we are trying to



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative

BASIS

Business Action to Support
the Information Society

get into the workshops who very often, also, have very busy schedules.

In order for many of them to raise the funding to come and participate or to justify, if they are a business person, to justify coming to the IGF, they very often need a speaking opportunity in a workshop. And I ask that we keep that in mind.

If it is possible to start the IGF on a Tuesday, leaving Monday available for pre-events, I will say that I would find that very helpful. I am in dialogue with a number of other organizations, both NGOs and business associations, about trying to organize a very deep-dive event on the day before which would justify bringing senior executives to the -- to Kenya. And if I have to run that meeting on Sunday, I think the odds of my getting those folks to come and do a related topic but a very deep-dive topic would be diminished.

Finally, I will just say again, and I will repeat something that I said this morning, let us try to design the number of workshops and the approach of the workshops around the audience we want to attract, and about the participation we want to enable.

And I would make one final comment. I would like many of the suggestions that Anriette made because one of my concerns is that the MAG has been forced to wear too many hats. They are trying to be the program committee, and they often also are presenting workshops or they are presenting in workshops. And I think if there is the possibility of utilizing the expertise of MAG members to support particularly new workshop organizers, that this -- and thus to move some of the MAG at least into more program planning and program workshop support, this might be very helpful if we want to attract new workshop organizers.

Intervention 8

Delivered by Peter Hellmonds, Nokia Siemens Networks

Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, I would like to thank Bill Drake and Anriette from APC. They have made a couple of very good suggestions. And I think to summarize what I heard -- the summary of criticism from Bill is the lack of professionalism that he has seen in some of the previous workshops.

So if following your question on what would be suggested selection criteria, I would suggest a couple of them, starting with it should be professional. There should be balanced representatives, participation from different stakeholder groups.

Part of being professional would be that this is a well-prepared workshop. And, of course, it should have relevance to the topics of the current IGF.

I would like to see these criteria evidenced by certain things. And a couple of those were suggested already, such as the quality of the previous years' workshop report, if it is sort of a repetition or a workshop proposed by someone who has done previous workshops.

The number of different stakeholders who are participating in the workshop can make sure there is proper balance and representation.

In terms of professionalism, I also would like to see that all speakers are confirmed well in advance and there should be a certain deadline for confirming speakers.

I would like to see that the workshop organizers also organize support personnel; and that could be, as Anriette suggested, members from the MAG or also previous members of the MAG. I am one of those. And I think also evidence in some way of how the workshop organizers support remote participation.

In terms of evaluating this criteria and the evidence provided, I would suggest that because it



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative
BASIS
Business Action to Support
the Information Society

is quite difficult to answer the question of legitimacy of who is the right sort of group of people to make that determination, that we need to think about installing a transparent, open evaluation process, a process based on pre-established criteria and perhaps even some kind of a scoring system.

In that respect, I remember that I myself in my company have something that is called the Quality Award. And I have been a member of the committee making sorts of determinations of which of the submitted proposals makes it into the Quality Award.

And what we have done there is we have used a scoring sheet where we award points to a number of different selection criteria questions. And then, basically, you can make a determination based on having a certain proposal and having achieved a minimum score.

That takes away the need for some sort of obscure black-box approach, and I believe in the past the difficulty in turning down any workshop proposal was precisely the problem.

And, Bertrand, thank you for pointing this out to me, the problem of who is the judge in terms of who has the legitimacy to say your workshop can be there and your workshop not because they will raise the whole Pandora's box open about the legitimacy about the IGF.

And I know in the previous past, our esteemed previous Chairman, Nitin Desai, he has taken sort of the approach to say, "Well, we accept all of the workshops" and the only way to reduce the number was by suggesting to merge. And I think that has been pointed out by, I believe it was, Anriette but also others that that is not necessarily the most professional approach.

Because if you have a highly professional group organizing a really well-organized workshop and they are being forced to accept some sort of group of people who are just not professionally enough, then it reduces the quality overall. And I think that just proposal of merging is not necessarily the professional and correct approach.

So I believe it would be better for us if we could find an open, transparent process that clearly spells out these are the criteria we will apply, that is the scoring system we will apply, this is the cut-off number of points that will get you in or not. That takes away sort of the arbitrariness of decision-making. So that would be my suggestion.

However, there is two more things where I believe I would like to see a little bit variation to my suggested very strict regime. And that is, one, as mentioned by Bertrand, I would like to see some sort of a youth corner. I do not expect the youth who are 18 -- 17, 18, 20 years to have necessarily already -- I mean, some may, but not everyone -- that level of professionalism that I would expect from someone who is in my era or Bertrand's age group.

So I would like to make some leeway in allowance to have sort of a youth corner. And maybe it could be joined or in a similar fashion as an experimental corner that allows us for some innovative kind of fashions. But that is the proposal where I would make allowance for some innovation and deviance from the strict sort of professional criteria that I would apply otherwise. Thank you very much.

Intervention 9

Delivered by Jennifer Warren, for ICC/BASIS

Thank you, Madam Chair. Jennifer Warren on behalf of ICC/BASIS. We certainly think these workshops offer great value to the stakeholders that are able to participate in them. But the value can vary by really three things: The quality, the accessibility and the relevance. So criteria should really focus on trying to maximize those who are there to participate both as



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative

BASIS

Business Action to Support
the Information Society

panellists, speakers as well as participants in the workshop.

So a couple of thoughts in terms of criteria. The criteria need to have consequences in the sense that we have the challenge of implementing them. So while we have had deadlines in the past for speakers and such to be identified, there have been no consequences to not meeting those deadlines.

And perhaps a differentiated approach between the types of workshops that Bertrand mentioned would be one way to eliminate that all types of workshops must have the speakers identified by a certain time. But if we want to, for example, pick up on Fouad's point of trying to make sure of accessibility, it is important to know that those workshops that will have very attractive, highly visible speakers will be able to be accessible by being put in rooms that can accommodate all those that want to be able to engage in those discussions. It is not just for the planning purposes, but it is for the benefit of those who are attending which should be a real focus for us.

With that in mind, I am a little concerned by focusing on the reporting out after the fact as being a characteristic of the quality of the panel. Unless we strive to ensure that every workshop has a separate repertoire assigned to it, I am not sure we can determine that the participants who were able to be in that workshop derived lesser value because the after-report was not of a certain quality compared to others.

So I am not sure that is a, as we would say, apples-to-apples comparison. I would encourage us to think about that a little bit more closely.

Also, I would like to suggest that we -- as we look to whether workshops are relevant, we do not discount them because similar topics have been raised previously or because there have been workshops, as I said, on that topic previously. We are in a new location. We have new participants who have not perhaps -- unless they have been following remotely, which is a little bit more recent, have not been able to benefit from the dialogues that many of you who started with WSIS and went through five years of IGF now know by heart there are many new people constantly coming into this space. And we should, again, remember that they will be part of an audience that would benefit perhaps from things we have heard twice or maybe I have only heard once.

So -- and so we are also very supportive of the remote participation and the transcription service. That is a great benefit for enhancing, again, the global availability of our work and our discussions.

The last thing I would highlight is -- and it kind of goes back to preparing the quality of the workshop. While I express concern about using after-the-fact reporting, perhaps requiring or asking at least for some inputs prior to the workshop, not just a two-line description of the workshop, but perhaps a thought piece, what we called in our contribution a white paper, but something to get focused so that when there is a variety of workshops to attend, you have some thoughtful piece to guide you as to where you might wish to go and that will also, I think, enable better follow-up afterwards for Bill and the reports.

So those are our thoughts. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative
BASIS
Business Action to Support
the Information Society

Intervention 10

Delivered by Jeff Brueggeman, for ICC/BASIS

I just wanted to make an additional follow-up comment on how to incorporate some youth issues into the agenda. And I think as others have noted, it is a challenge to think about them in person. I think on the other hand, what better community to reach out with through the Internet and through the new tools that, as Peter was saying, some of us who are a little older may struggle with. So a suggestion may be to really focus on some of the creative remote participation in the area of youth and think about how to incorporate both, maybe, real-time activities as well as some social networking components into ways to do outreach to those communities and try to get them engaged on a more regular basis.

I think that is probably the generation that is least likely to view an in-person meeting as being essential to establish relationships and have a dialogue. So could we take advantage of that and encourage that participation through these online means?

Thank you.

Intervention 11

Delivered by Jimson Olufuye, for ICC/BASIS

Thank you. My name is Jimson Olufuye, vice-chairman for WITSA, speaking through ICC/BASIS.

The idea of remote participation you can say is one of those beautiful outcomes or value addition to IGF when it comes inclusivity. And I want to suggest we should keep it and also bring in new ideas to promote participation of wider group in the remote access to the IGF events.

I want to promote that perhaps we can encourage the national IGFs to also have Remote Participation Working Group or team so that those that cannot attend the main event, they could have perhaps a point, a telepoint, wherein more people can assemble and effectively listen in and participate with a video conferencing solution, you can see what is going on, and the moderators live can also see those that want to intervene live in discussions.

The second thing I think we could do is sensitization. Many people are not aware that this opportunity is there. So with more sensitization and awareness created that by the fact that you are not there, but feeling that you can still participate. So we can encourage the national IGF to organize with the local, remote team or working group that would set up a base for more people remotely to participate in the main event. And also organize a brought-based sensitization to get more people from the developing world to participate in it, the new principle of IGF inclusivity. Thank you.

Intervention 12

Delivered by Marilyn Cade, TechAmerica

Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Marilyn Cade, and I will, first of all, associate myself with many of the previous speakers' comments and note that it would, in fact, be very welcome if additional players who have expressed concerns were able to schedule themselves to spend time with us as we work together to organize what I know is going to be a fantastic IGF in Kenya later this year.



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative
BASIS
Business Action to Support
the Information Society

It is very exciting to me that we will be coming to Kenya and to the African region. And I would like to speak now very briefly just to note a comment about the national and regional IGFs and then perhaps suggest that there may be another, better time to talk further about the national and regional IGFs. They are each very, very unique.

And while all of you who organize a national or regional IGF are aware of the uniqueness of your initiative, I do not think that everyone in the broad stakeholder family does have a full appreciation of the great diversity and the significant implications of the emergence of the national and regional IGF initiatives.

I have been spending some time looking at many of them, and I am the chief catalyst helped by many, many other people in the United States from all stakeholders to organize the IGF USA.

As I said earlier, we will have a remote hub that we will operate from Washington during the Kenya IGF as well as having a number of people there in Kenya. But I think we should perhaps in May, if we could, consider having a very quick round of three or four-minute updates from the national and regional IGFs about the fact they are taking place, not a report on what they are going to do but the fact they are taking place and little bit about what they are going to focus on. That might be informational and helpful to all of the rest of us. And I think it would also be helpful, then, in understanding how reporting-out sessions from the regional IGFs or any special sessions from the national initiatives might fit into the program.

I just want to make one final comment to support Marilia's comments about training of moderators. It is very important that we take that seriously as workshop organizers. I am thinking perhaps that we have not fully appreciated and taken note of the significant contribution that is provided by the remote moderators and the moderator -- the fact that people are having to -- you really need to organize your process differently to ensure effective participation for the remote participations. And I think that both technical and other kinds of training might need further enhancement if we are going to be successful in deepening and growing that particular aspect of the IGF.

Intervention 13

Delivered by Peter Hellmonds, Nokia Siemens Networks

Thank you, Madam Chair. Very quick and more like a question and a suggestion. I believe -- I have seen some remote participation issues where it was difficult to get access, especially during the first day and I would like to suggest or ask even the remote participation coalition that this should not be just set up for one event but something that would be an ongoing endeavour tested throughout the year with tools that are widely available, do not necessarily require downloading of special applications but something that more or less is available through the cloud on an ongoing basis, allowing us to make sure that whatever technologies in use will work at the event of the next IGF. Thank you.

Intervention 14

Delivered by Marilyn Cade, TechAmerica

Thank you.

I will speak as the chief catalyst for the IGF U.S.A. We have a quite unique title, because it seemed, when we first formed the IGF U.S.A., we were going to spend a year and a half



International Chamber of Commerce

The world business organization

An ICC initiative
BASIS
Business Action to Support
the Information Society

determining roles and titles. And we perceived that that would probably not be an effective way to achieve organizing a national initiative.

I say that because for two years before launch being the IGF U.S.A., we actually had two or three-hour events before and after the IGF that were used to brief a wide number of interested parties. And I would just say for anyone who might not yet know that they are ready to start a national initiative, that they might think about pre and post events as a way to begin to build some interest at their international level.

We have a steering group that has roughly 65 people on it, and we held our first steering group meeting to begin to plan the IGF U.S.A. 2011. It will take place in July, probably the second or third week in July.

We pioneered the use of scenarios last year at the IGF U.S.A., and I will just say for any of you who are interested in learning about our experience, you can find a very interesting video story about them done by Janna Anderson's group, imagining the Internet, and that is at IGF dash USA.U.S.

This year we will repeat the use of scenarios, and we also have offered to use scenarios collaboratively with at least one other national IGF, and possibly two. At this point, we will be teaming with the Russian IGF in May to do a mini version of scenarios.

We use scenarios somewhat differently than I think that Nominet just referenced. The program this year will be, again, a one-day program. It will be at the Georgetown law center in Washington, D.C., but there will be three pre-events, two- to three-hour events, perhaps one half-day event, that will take place at American University, one in Silicon Valley. We are thinking about doing a small event at Syracuse University, if possible. And we will be doing an event for our equivalent of parliamentarians. In the United States we call them Congressmen or women. So we will be doing something for the staff and for members of Congress who are interested in this particular issue, that is more of an awareness of what is Internet governance and what is going on in the Internet Governance Forum.

We will have one round of workshops, and cloud computing remains a very hot theme among the steering group, as does the issues related to mobile and online applications, privacy, cybersecurity.

The scenarios that we did last year -- and this year, all participants will participate in scenarios. Last year, we offered workshops in conjunction with scenarios, but this year, all participants will participate in scenarios, and we will then have a plenary discussion about the perspectives. Our three scenarios last year were used to help build awareness about what is going on globally on the issues and perhaps questions and tensions about who should govern the Internet.

So the name of our scenarios were Internet islands, users reign, and governments are beautiful. You must visit the Web site.

This year again we will focus on governance issues and discussions, and we are very enthused that we are now seeing the growth of interest in participation of young people from several of the universities, so we are going to be deepening our participation from young people.

In the past, we have had actually much younger participants, more in the 14 to 17 age. And it has been a small representation, but very interested. So this year we will be moving more into the college-aged as well. Thank you.