

Internet Governance Forum

Hyderabad, India

Open Dialogue

3 December 2008

Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during Third Meeting of the IGF, in Hyderabad, India. 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.

>>:Hello. Can we come in and start the open dialogue session, please. Just come in and sit down, all the participants, so we can start.

>>CHENGATAI MASANGO: We're now starting the open dialogue session. So I'll hand it over to the chairman.

>>B.K. GARIOLA: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, and welcome once again to this open dialogue session.

We had two sessions in the morning. The first one was the multilingual aspects, and the second was access.

Since this is an open dialogue forum, I would also like to put a few questions, and then request the coordinator to start the discussions.

In the morning when we discussed, we had one issue that we need to have an access, and also, we need -- in order to go to a billion people, it is necessary that we have language issues resolved.

If you look at Internet, it is a Caterpillar type of a device which has multiple legs. And unless all legs synchronize, it doesn't move properly. Both the language issues and the access issues are two of the legs. And there are many more to it. So the first point that we had been working in India is to see how do we synchronize these multiple components that are required to make Internet go to a billion people.

Billion people are of different type. They don't work in a common language. They use multiple languages. They don't have resources. They don't have the type of services they are looking for. And, therefore, it becomes important that we view the components in a single, unified matter. That's the first component that I would like to point out.

In this -- When we talk about integrating this and putting a synchronized initiative, the second issue that I feel is important is that we must have some sort of a common intervention.

In India, we have been working for almost 20 years in trying to push the information and communication technology for the benefits.

We found that unless the Indian government intervenes, industry has its own objective functions. It plays a very crucial and important role, but at times it does not orient itself towards the social benefits that are required. And therefore, in India, we are now looking that each of these legs that I mentioned to you has an intervention and initiative in such a matter that industry and the government work together in a supplementary manner so that we are able to push the whole thing to a billion people. We hope that in about two years' time, we will have good enough implementation of the Internet into the country.

The second issue that I wanted to point out is, when we work with the government for this initiative, the government people and political people always ask us, "At what cost? What time? And what is the sequencing that needs to be done?" And I think it's important that all of us would like to understand over a period of time how do we interface and get these.

So I think these two components, I would like to stop here and request for the proceedings. Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much, Dr. Gariola. Now we'd like to start the session.

I am Hidetoshi Fujisawa. I am the chief commentator of NHK Japan Broadcasting Corporation, Japanese public broadcasting.

I have two other co-moderators here, Allison Gillwald, who is participating in the morning session on access, and another person, Patrik Fältström, he participated in the session of multilingualism.

Could you two briefly introduce yourselves.

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Allison Gillwald. I'm director of research, ICT Africa, which is a network of 20 African countries doing policy regulation.

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Patrik Fältström of Cisco. I'm one of the actual coauthors of the standard of Internationalized Domain Names and have been working with internationalization, multilingualism issues for several years.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

Now I would like to start the session.

This open dialogue is intended to be an interactive dialogue which allows IGF participants, which is you, to address questions and comments in relation to the two morning sessions, one on access, and one on multilingualism. It's open in the sense that all participants are encouraged to join this dialogue. But the dialogue must have some structure in order to be constructive. So your questions and comments will be processed by session volunteers who will be going around the floor, and session commentator -- and the session co-moderators, to ensure that the session has not only a dynamic quality, but also one of

coherence. So please write down your questions or comments on cards which will be delivered to you by session volunteers.

I would like you to be very concise in your questions and comments. And please put your name and affiliation as well, so that I can identify you later on in the dialogue session.

As this is an interactive discussion among the audience, there will be no panelists, no speakers, no presentations except for the session rapporteurs. I would like to introduce two rapporteurs from the morning sessions. We don't know where one of them -- could you come up. Okay. Two rapporteurs are Miriam Nisbet, who was the moderator of the morning session on multilingualism; and Anriette Esterhuysen, who was the moderator of morning access session.

Could you very briefly introduce yourselves.

>>MIRIAM NISBET: Thank you, Fuji-San.

My name is Miriam Nisbet. I am director of the information society division in the communication and information sector at UNESCO. And one of our -- as you heard our assistant director general speak a little while ago at the opening session, multilingualism and access, universal access to knowledge, are among the mandates of UNESCO that we're concerned about. And that's part of why we're here.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I'm Anriette Esterhuysen from south Africa. And I work with the Association for Progressive Communications, an international network of civil society organizations working for ICTs and social justice.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you, two rapporteurs. For your reference, I'd like to have reports from the morning sessions from these two rapporteurs.

I will ask a couple of questions to them, and they will be answering to my question on the result of the morning sessions.

First, can you please identify or can you please outline several key messages or points that emerged from the morning discussion on access first from Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Mr. Fujisawa. Easier said than done. Even though we had panelists from the private sector, from civil society, and from government, there was a lot of consensus. I think the one key message is that access needs to be viewed in the context of an ecosystem. One cannot address the access gap without looking at various facets.

So policy and regulation is one. And policy and regulation needs to be conducive to a certain kind of market structure that will encourage investment. Investment has to come not just from one source, but from multiple sources, from government, from the private sector. Affordability is part of the ecosystem. Having access to the infrastructure without that infrastructure being affordable is not going to address the access gap.

Leadership is a key factor. Again, leadership is an important part of this ecosystem. It links to policy and regulation, to investment, and to capacity development as well. So all of these elements form part of this ecosystem. And to make it sustainable, you need a process of institutionalization. You don't just need a one-off policy reform process. You need policy-making and regulation, and regulatory institutions that can adapt to change that can provide continuity.

And secondly, I think the key message is that we still need to grapple with the issue who have does what. What is the role of the state? What is the role of the private sector? How do we collaborate and ensure complementarity, as opposed to working at cross-purposes.

I won't elaborate more on that.

I think the third point was that supply-driven models are not enough to address access. Demand actually exists already, and we can use development and the development I mention to help us understand how supply and demand can work together and articulate more effectively.

And then scale, I think in access, I think there's been a tendency to look at pilot projects, to look at specific technologies, like mobile, for example. But if we're really going to address the access gap at a structural level, we need to look at large-scale initiatives.

And then I think a point that came across was that it's not just about adding more users to the Internet; it's about empowerment. It's about people relating to the Internet not just as consumers, but also as producers and as citizens.

So looking at that empowerment I mention, so access has to result in more than just more people with mobile phones and more people with access to Internet content. And we also talked about the importance of user-generated content. And I think this links to -- where's Maria? -- to diversity.

That's it for now, Mr. Fujisawa.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

Then, Miriam, could you give us probably several key messages coming out of the morning session on multilingualism.

>>MIRIAM NISBET: Thank you.

We talked about a number of aspects of what is a very complex topic, multilingualism. But I think you'll see from what Anriette said, when we talk about access and multilingualism -- and I hope that's something that will be talked about during this dialogue, the intersection, how they're intertwined, how you really can't talk about one without the other -- it becomes even more complex and more interesting.

Let me just mention five points that I think emerged from the morning session on multilingualism.

One thing we talked about is content and the importance of having content in local languages, that people must be able to create and receive information in their local language to express themselves in ways that their peers can understand. That's really one of the key aspects. Of course, how you get there is another aspect.

So the second point that we covered was the importance of localization and availability of tools. When we talk about tools, we talk about software, we talk about hardware. But we also talk about more complex aspects, such as the need for having in multiple languages search engines, browsers, translation tools. These are necessary if we're going to get to people being able to create content.

A third aspect of multilingualism that we talked about is the effort to internationalize domain names. That's something that a number of speakers have already pointed out the difficulties.

The technological sophistication that is going to be required to get there is one thing. The policy aspects and the political aspects, an example being the Arabic script IDN Working Group and how that model can be taken to other language groups, other script groups to move that forward.

A fourth key point was that we recognize that, increasingly, online communication is occurring in mediums other than the written form. You all know that. But recognizing that we're talking about trying to address multilingualism in mobile and multiple media is something that has to be considered.

The last point is that we are concerned that there is not right now a common framework and a common language for addressing these issues. And that leads to a question for this group. And that is, what is it that the IGF can do to move these issues forward?

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

Now I'd like to ask, what are the issues? What are the areas that seems to have general support in the discussion in each session? And what were the areas that need more discussion or are clearly viewed differently from the participants in the morning sessions?

Could you start, Anriette, please.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I'm not sure I have much more to add. I think that there was general consensus on the five main messages.

I think that what we really have achieved in the IGF is a consensus that we need collaboration between different stakeholder groups. And I think we -- I think maybe what there was a sense we need to do more is to be able to share best practice more effectively. So, for example, we had a company like Verizon mentioned some of their best practices. We had a regulator from India talking about how infrastructure has worked in India. But I think we all left the session with a need that we need to share information about these best practice experiences with more detail, and detail at the kind of level and in a way that will influence practice at a broader level.

But I think, generally, in access, we've really achieved consensus. I think we've managed to move away from either market-only or top-down driven models. I think we have an understanding that there's a need for changing market structures, but also for ensuring that areas where markets don't succeed are addressed in different ways.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you. Miriam.

>>MIRIAM NISBET: I think that, yes, I mean, we have a consensus, really, of course, that multilingualism is important, that accessing the Internet in one's own language, in one's own script is important. But we did have a little bit of disagreement, including a challenge from our chair, who is concerned that even by trying to reach -- even though it's important to reach people and address local languages, to build local content, there's still -- at least he's speaking for India -- there's still such a strong need for access and for building capacity for people to access in English, which was an interesting perspective when we started out with discussing how important it was to move this out to many, many other languages, India being a good example, with 22 official languages.

But one thing that I think everyone would agree to is that there's still, throughout the world, an enormous need for building capacity and users for digital literacy, for being able not only to access information, but to be able to understand what to do with it and how to use it once they get there.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Mr. Fujisawa, while you are talking to your co-facilitators, I think maybe one point in access on which there isn't consensus is whether the Internet is a global public good or not. And I think it often emerges, and often people from the private sector, civil society, do assert that the Internet is a global public good and should be managed in that way. But, obviously, that is controversial. People in the private sector would most probably not agree with that, even though they would support some of the principles that emerge from that. But I think that's an interesting issue which there's still scope for a lot of debate around.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much. There were those areas in which you have agreed, and there were areas in which you don't agree.

Interesting discussions. And we'd like to deepen those discussions further in this dialogue.

One thing I would like to remind you is that there are simultaneous interpretation services in several languages, six U.N. official languages, and in Hindi as well. I think it's easier to hear more clearly through the headsets. So if you have headsets, please put on those headsets on your ears, unless you can understand all of the languages.

Now we have questions from the floor as well as from the Web site. Yes, one question from Linda (saying name), I believe. It's a remote participation from New York, through Dimdim.

She asks -- her question is this: How does an Internet model, in particular, compare with general ideas of networks? How does an Internet model in particular compare with general ideas of network? What is the difference between Internet and general idea of network?

Anyone who would like to respond?

Yes. Yes, could you state your name and affiliation as well.

>>:I'm (saying name) from C-DAC India.

The person from ISOC in the morning --

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Could you put the microphone closer to your --

>>:The person from ISOC in the morning summarized a lot of principles that -- from very early on, Internet was adopted at the purely technical level, as a packet switched network as opposed to ideas of telephone network, circuit switched. But, otherwise, the principles of management are fundamentally sort of, in slang, the (inaudible) model, now close to 25 years, 20 years now, and originally through close to 25, 30 years, people questioned it from '98 (inaudible) went down. There is no single point, because no single person (inaudible). So it is (inaudible) rather than the so-called root servers, completely on its own, it manages itself.

So the key thing is, there are many, many instruments which have come over the period of time. Internet architecture board, IETF, things like ICANN. So their role has been more in the nature of, as earlier it was mentioned, open standards, so-called level playing field, lowering the barriers to entry, and anybody can contribute, anybody can inreach, like the person who asked from New York, anybody can contribute, you know, any single person can contribute rather than very expensive way to participate in a standards forum, and things of that kind.

So in short, the in the old days, the Internet is a network of networks. So within an organization, you don't need to ask anybody's permission to get your domain name address. You don't need to ask anybody what should be your e-mail address.

So I think, in short, that is summarizing what epitomizes the principles of the Internet. That is why the Internet Governance Forum is so great, the multistakeholder partnership. Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Does anyone on the floor have any comments? Okay. Shall we move to the next question.

Allison, yes.

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: We have a set of questions around regulatory frameworks and liberalization and trying to bring down the cost of the Internet -- or access to the Internet.

There was a question from the floor that says getting to the next billion is not about liberalization, but the form of liberalization, not about freeing the market, but harnessing market power to this end.

What -- the question, then, is what form of liberalization is needed? How can market power be harnessed to this end? And is this enough to ensure access to rural and poor communities?

And this relates to a number of other questions which speak about the need for public access in addition to other reform, market reform.

We have a question which says, can you share the impact of Internet usage and penetration based on regulatory changes and competition? How can the cost of access be reduced through these?

So perhaps if we could get some input on some of the regulatory requirements or the liberalization sequencing that's required, or the need for independent regulation to ensure the access issues and affordability issues.

Somebody like to respond to those?

>>:Hello.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Another microphone is coming, yes.

>>:Good afternoon. I'm David Appasamy from Sufi Technologies.

The importance of independent regulation cannot be underscored. I say this particularly because of the experience we have here in India. We have heard time and again about what a phenomenal amount of progress has been made in telephony in terms of mobile penetration and so on.

We do have 10 million mobile connections being added on per month. But the sad truth is, when it comes to Internet, and, I mean, nonmobile, I'm talking about Internet connections to homes, after ten years, we have about 10 million connections. After ten years. And it's still not growing.

This is primarily because of the kind of policies that were followed where there was no balance between telephone companies and ISPs. The Internet service provider industry in India has effectively been killed. It's the telephone companies who also do some level of Internet penetration. This is not the way forward. Because Internet telephony -- you know, VoIP as a platform is so limited in India today that the march forward to unified communications is getting crippled. It's all about voice, not about Internet. And it's because we don't have independent regulation, it is all vertically aligned to voice services. And I think this is a good example of what not to do going forward.

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: Perhaps just while the questions --

>>:Yes.

>>:Can I -- yes, thanks.

I want to address the question of the form of regulation.

I mean, the point about ICTs, whether it's Internet or telephony, is that they're not like normal consumer items. In other words, what the final consumer gets is, in fact, the result of several layers, at least four or five layers, which is -- in a highly complex industry.

So competition at the service level simply doesn't work. And we see that. We have particularly in Africa, you are left with the integrated, more or less duopolies and so on. And that form of liberalization clearly doesn't work. So what you need is a form of liberalization that is going to take into account the complexity of the sector itself. And that means liberalizing the layers in different ways.

And I might add, there's no simple solution in different countries. So it is a much more complex form of liberalization than sometimes we hear people talking about. Sometimes in industry, we hear people saying, "Just allow us to do what we want to do, (inaudible), and things will happen." That's partly true and also partly not true. And that addresses the second part of the question, which is about the markets. Free markets. Are we trying to harness markets in order to produce a positive end? And, of course, I believe the answer to be that we have to harness markets, because free markets on their own cannot achieve what has to be done. I mean, examples of harnessing markets are even things like creating a universal access fund, because, after all, what you're doing is putting an expense on the market with the justification, then, of recycling it using a market mechanism, in some cases, back to address the wider issues of the next billion.

On top of that, I think it's been shown quite clearly that in things like fiberoptic backbone, rural areas, the market alone is not going to achieve it. The World Bank has concluded this with regard to Africa. India is a superb example, in fact, of using what might be a faulty mechanism, (inaudible). Nevertheless, they have succeeded in rolling out a huge amount of fiber backbone in a relatively short period, backbone that now means that they can provide not simply a mobile telephony solution, but, actually, in my view, a much better solution, which is one that in the long term can be a lot cheaper than the mobile solution and provide a lot more functionality.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

Could you state your name and affiliation.

>>:Sean (saying name), Nexis research.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: I think we are now talking about regulatory development, which will -- the access for the next billion users.

Does anyone have additional remarks?

>>:Can I?

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Would you state your name and affiliation.

>>:I am (saying name) from telecom (inaudible) of India.

I think if I took the question right, the issue is whether we have an independent agreement, number one, and second, whether it is equivalent to all. And thirdly, what impact the (inaudible) have to generate or effectively implement the access to all in this particular environment of India.

First of all, this is very important that India has an independent regulator. That is the cause of success especially in the sector of mobile. When we are talking about being very successful on one particular field and not on other, we had to look at the complete environment in a way that things are happening. One has to analyze that there are different partners and there are likelihood of one partner being aggrieved for the decision. And that's a common phenomenon which is absorbed across the globe.

The regulator has come out with a consultation process very recently, has given the recommendation on the Internet telephony, offering Internet telephony to a very great extent. And perhaps (inaudible) is going to accept that, which will solve the problem for some things.

But a number of other initiatives have been taken especially to create the infrastructure, to auction the spectrum, to create the -- a lot of applications, killer applications, go to the rural areas. And I will give you some more things which are likely to come up, like all the villages are being marked for communication with some e-mail addresses. Anybody where you are not able to send letters, in time, you can send through e-mail, and one person will access and can translate the particular thing to the local language and hand over to the other people. This is one example.

Similarly, the local people can send the messages using the e-mail to other people.

This is one example. There is the example of (saying name), there is the example of e-education, there is the example of e-health. There are a number of examples, and I won't want to waste much of the time. But I would like to emphasize regulatory is very active, very independent and appreciates the involvement under which we are working for suitable provision of access in different areas.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Could you state your name and affiliation, and could you all make your statement as brief as possible.

>>RAM MOHAN: Thank you. I am Ram Mohan. I work for Afilius. And we are the service provider for dot IN, the country code top-level domain for India.

I wanted to address three specific things that -- three specific questions that have come up here.

You know, one thing that could easily happen is the theme of this session, the next billion, the next billion could be just here in India.

There are certainly enough people here in this country that the next billion Internet users could be just right here within this country.

One of the things that has worked well, 2005, the government of India liberalized the dot IN domain name.

This changed some of the fundamental rules underneath the dot IN domain name.

The results of that are quite dramatic.

In 2004, December, there were 6,000 domain names in dot IN. There are now over 500,000 domain names in dot IN.

It came about with a light regulatory touch, it came about with the cost of the domain name going down. It was reduced to a third of what it used to be.

But it has also come about because of the creation -- it aided the creation of a brand-new marketplace for domain name registrars that did not exist before. And that marketplace has led to job creation, revenue creation, as well as a robust new marketplace. And that is an example of something that has worked. To what our colleague from Sify was saying earlier, if some of the other barriers are removed, the next billion Internet users could be right within this country.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: We have been listening to the Indian example so far. Does anyone have -- yes, please.

>>BRIAN LONGWE: Thank you very much, sir. My name is Brian Longwe. I am the general manager of the African ISP association. And I would like to make a point specifically referring to one of the previous comments about mobile operators overshadowing the conventional or the traditional ISP.

This is an issue that we have been looking at for several years in Africa. I have run, personally, ISPs for about 11 years, and the ISP association in Africa has been in existence for about seven years.

We cannot ignore the fact that in almost every single country in Africa, the mobile operator has more Internet users or Internet customers than any single or even combined ISPs within a particular market.

It is a reality that we have to face and deal with. Convergence in the future.

It might be the mobile operator today. It could be a different actor tomorrow.

The key point is for us not to fight each other but to embrace one another in terms of being able to achieve the goals of access and coming up with innovative and creative ways of using whatever infrastructure, be it fixed, be it wireless, be it mobile, or be it light tomorrow. We don't know.

We have to adopt and embrace every single option possible to be able to reach the next and the next and the next billion.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Can anyone else speak about the role of public policy in stimulating investment in infrastructure to enhance access?

>> Okay. Hello? Yes.

I tried to reach --

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Could you state your name and affiliation. Alex Corenthin. I don't know if I can continue in French.

Alex Corenthin from Senegal.

I prefer French but if you people want to take the headphone.

To know how the Internet to be made accessible to all, especially in rural areas. How could this be regulated. I think that behind that, we have the issue of universal service. The Internet, in most regulatory frameworks, is not actually part of universal service.

Communication is basically only through post office or by voice. Internet is not even considered.

So that's the first issue we have to consider.

And I believe that most operators need to realize that it's in their interest to have as broad a market as possible. But in Africa, many of the peoples are concentrated in cities. So the rural zone is not a market people look at so much. So often there is not access provided in rural zones unless there is a political will. And political will needs to make sure that access is provided as a development fund to provide the infrastructure. And so that the people have the means to access even if there's a minimal profitability to these operators.

So I think that's the largest problem now for regulators to find some agreement about.

Now, as I was saying, we have the telephone, voice, cell phone, regular phones, land lines or post office as the main means of communication. So the issue now is do we want to have large capacity for the territorial or two speeds, one for the city and (no audio).

So high bit rate in urban city areas and rural areas would have a low bit rate.

So we have the main issue of universal service, and second we have the issue of financing universal service.

Now, there are some innovation and strategy -- innovative strategies, I could give you an example, available to help us with this.

Some operators have determined that there are specifically rural markets that they would provide a license to with specific access conditions in place for wireless, wire max, CDMA, et cetera, in order to provide high bit rate access for them.

That's what I contribute. Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay, any questions and remarks which have been presented from the floor? Could you introduce them, Allison?

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: Sure. I think the interesting thing from the regulatory thing that has come up is the tensions that exist from the policy point of view between getting investment in networks and necessary incentives for that and creating open access networks.

So that tension that really exists between telcos, traditional telcos and ISPs is really one that needs to be confronted from a policy point of view.

At the moment, we pretend we are doing everything for everybody and kind of falling between two stools.

So I think that was a really interesting observation and I think it doesn't detract from Brian Longwe's point that, in fact, in a converged environment you want to be using any platform that doesn't deal with the issue of the tensions there around investment anyway.

And just remember of course when we are talking it's not just mobile and fixed platforms that are converging, but particularly in the African context, the possibilities with traditional broadcasting or not traditional broadcasting networks as they go digital.

But I think this raises some interesting questions, both around the universal service questions which have arisen there, and the question of tiering services. How acceptable is it to have these different quality tiers of service around access for rural and urban areas.

I think politically that's a very difficult thing for governments to manage. Hence, universal service funds in order to create quality services between the two.

So there are some questions about who funds that.

And particularly, is the IFG able to be a mechanism or a forum to facilitate funding of broadband in rural areas.

That's one of the questions.

And then perhaps just to link that question, because it really is around market efficiency versus, you know, market failure and the need for strategies to deal with uneconomic areas. There's a question around what billion are we talking about. Are we talking about the next billion or are we talking about the last billion?

It seems, the comments is, as though we are speaking about the last billion, whereas in fact we haven't dealt with the issues of the next billion.

And I think perhaps if we could get some input on that, I think that does go to the question of creating market efficiency to deal with that pent-up demand for maybe the first billion, and then possibly dealing with market failure issues around the last billion and how we get access to those at an affordable rate.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Anyone would like to respond?

Yes.

>> Myself, (saying name). I am a student.

I would like to ask that what is the future planning of IGF about the awareness of Internet?

Because in India, whatever I think, and not only India, there are a number of countries in rural area that where there is still not awareness of internet use. Still, they don't know what is Internet and how it does work.

What is the future planning to awareness?

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

I would like anyone to respond to the questions posed, several tiers of services as well as the limit of the expansion of the Internet users, and are we talking about the last billion or are we talking about the next billion?

And some other --

>> Fuji San. Can I?

Two specific points.

One is that in India --

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Yes, excuse me. Could you state your name and affiliation, first.

>> I am (saying name). I have also been involved with the Internet policy evolution in India and currently with Microsoft.

One of the things which worked very, very well in India has been the ICT policy which has been technology neutral. Let me give you some examples. One was in the case of mobile telephony. Initially it was only DSL, then the government allowed CDMA, and today the license is totally technology neutral.

Second, as somebody was mentioning about view IP.

So earlier the license said only SIP or ISOC 323, and since last year the license says you can use any technology.

Second thing is in terms of awareness, which the gentleman just mentioned, I think in terms of awareness what happens is once something starts touching the common man, it becomes very important and also relevant.

So what's happened is that in India, people have started using, for example, Internet for railroad booking, for train booking. And that's an example through which, even if somebody doesn't have a computer, doesn't know how to use a computer, still gets the benefit out of the Internet. So we should look at those examples also where it might not be a direct contact but it could be a mediated or assisted effort but still it delivers benefit to a whole a lot of people.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

Dr. Gariola would like to speak about whether it's the last billion or next billion issue.

>>B.K. GARIOLA: I think this question is very difficult. It all depends upon from where you see. If you want to see from the industry perspective, you know the next billion is the easiest to get by. If you look from the government's perspective, the last billion is more important because in democratic system they are the ones that go and get work.

So it is becoming clear now in case we need to go to the last billion, that's what the government of India is trying to do. The government or any nation should be willing to invest. The next billion could be left to industry and the market forces.

But the problem that one finds is the last billion and next billion are not going to be on different infrastructure. The infrastructure will remain the same.

So what will happen is certain investment is going to come from the industry, assuming that, let's say, for example, again, the Indian examples are the only ones that we have.

The second tiers down, third tiers down are getting connected. It's not a difficult task. But that doesn't satisfy the government because a million people or 75% people are in the village.

So therefore why the investment on the next billion may come in a fairly good amount from the industry, the investment on the last billion will have to come from the government on the same common theme.

So what we are now trying to do, what we talked about, is it possible to use a dot fiber, like in U.S. when you had a dot com bust, a lot of governments have taken over the fiber and built Internet 2. It's important for us to really look at how the resources have been built can be used. So my feeling is it is both that we want to attack. One will be done by industry predominantly, and the other by the government integrated.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much. Could I invite some comments from the panelists from the morning sessions?

Yes, please.

>> I think we have already talked about this particular issue about whether it's the next billion or.

(no audio.)

I think the very important issue we get is whether we are going to subsidize from the USO a particular service to be provided in a particular area or.

(audio cutting in and out).

Provide even the last billion connections.

Now, from government perspective point of view, the important issue is to create (poor audio).

More and more can go, competing themselves and provide services.

Somebody talked about the USO fund. In India we have already incorporated Internet in the USO fund and therefore expenditure from the USO fund is also being done to provide services in the rural areas.

Now, optical fiber connectivity, creation of the infrastructure, creation of the applications and firsthand information to the role of people who are not aware about the Internet and the advantage of this combined together will drive people to connect to the Internet and go along up to the last billion. That's the plan we are looking for.

Thank you.

>> Yes, please.

I would just like to make a comment here because I find --

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Could you state your name and affiliation.

>> Louis (saying name), (saying name) Society Agency, Portugal.

I feel a little bit uncomfortable about the way we are talking about the next million and the last million.

As a matter of fact, the next million, I think what we are understanding by these words is the million that can be -- the billion that can be reached by markets, general market operation. And the last billion, we are talking about like those that have to be hated by public policy because otherwise they would be excluded. And that's not really a separation that we should do.

The chairman already pointed out that in terms of using infrastructure, it's the same. And what we should aim at is the next billion should be a mix of the two groups.

And public policy has to do with both parts. One part has to do with better market regulation and to, in fact, make the market forces work well.

And also, public policy has to do with the other part of including those who have not been included.

So I propose that when we talk about the next billion, we include both the excluded or in risk of exclusion and also the ones that will be touched by just better market.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much. I would like to invite someone who hasn't spoken yet. Yes, please.

>>PATRICE LYONS: Yes, my name is Patrice Lyons. I am corporate counsel to the Corporation for National Research Initiatives in Reston, Virginia.

I would like to step back and ask you to take another cut at what the next billion people will be.

What I would like to look at and focus on is an enabling environment for children, because they are another group of users, new users.

I have been involved in some research projects on advanced distributed learning environments.

I've also been working with digital library development.

Now, to have a welcoming environment for children where it is easy to use, interesting, and perhaps improves on the learning that they then have in their schools would perhaps get them working on the Internet and contributing eventually to the improvement of the Internet for other people as the years go forward.

So that's the next billion that I would like us to talk about as well.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

I believe the access and multilingualism diversities are very closely related and now we are touching on the issue of multilingualism and diversity.

Are there any questions from the floor on the -- yes.

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes. Miriam?

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay, please.

>> Thank you.

Indeed, in the spirit of multilingualism, I would like to speak French. It's more of a comment I would like to make.

I'd like to establish a link with what you just said a few moments ago and with what was said this afternoon.

Something that seems key to me in this discussion, the follow-up of connectivity, when we talk about we're all communities.

[Two languages on audio]. In Africa, for example, learning to read and are going to school in a single language.

[Two languages on audio].

Then you have a divide or a split.

[Two languages on audio] is available on the Internet.

[Two languages on audio] what's available at home.

Now, there's some documentation on this, and there's a vision of openness of access to the people, and that must go through linguistic diversity. Linguistic diversity must take into account a maximum number of languages.

And also, bearing that in mind, I'd like to make a comment, I didn't get a chance to make this morning.

I represent the world network for linguistic diversity called MAAYA. It's a multistakeholder, multi-actor organization which works specifically in the area of linguistic diversity.

And in this discussion of Internet governance, a group which has not been included enough to date is precisely the linguists. They are not involved in the discussion about multilingualism and linguistic diversity.

Their work is not just for translation and interpretation but also scripting.

So it's important to have a dialogue between the technical experts and the linguists.

So this is just an idea I would like to get across here.

Please think of the linguists and include them in discussions that take place in future on this very significant issue.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

There's confusion in the simultaneous interpretation system.

In that case, please look at the screen which is described in English.

Do you have related remarks and questions?

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yeah, first of all, I think it's interesting to have multiple languages on the same channel when we have a multilingualism session. Sometimes it doesn't make things easier.

But to connect multilingualism with access, we have got a number of interesting questions here which we would like to hear your comments on.

And that is had a to do with, also, creating an interest to access the Internet. Interest to create local content.

So there are some explicit questions of, for example, is it the case that, if it is the case, it is easier to create local content, will that also attract more local users?

Another similar question which has to do with local exchange points and access. If it is the case that we create more local exchange points, which means that the actual user experience to access local content gets better, will that help the interest and growth of local content?

If it's faster to create content in English on a server in the U.S. than to create content locally on a server locally, will that have an impact on the amount of local content that's created?

And there are a number of questions that are similar to that.

Is there anyone that would like to comment on that? That these drivers, local exchange point, local content, more users, do they like sort of -- maybe it's hard to say which one is driving which.

Yes.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Yes, please.

>> Go ahead.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you.

Patrik, I will try to make a few comments. I think there are different ways of dealing with multilingualism and with content, and some of them have to create enabling environment. But I think access is the most fundamental driver.

I think Patrice's point about children, if more children can have access and create their own content in multiple languages, it will transform the Internet.

And I think it's already happening.

If you look at social networking platform, like Orkut for example, which has exploded in Brazil, and I think users are enormously powerful and I think content exists. I think poor people have content. Non-English speaking people have content.

I really think that access is, from my perspective, a primary driver. But I know I am not addressing all your questions, and I want to add another question, and that is about open standards and openness and open source in the context of diversity. Do people feel that that is one driver for diversification and creation of content in multiple languages?

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Yes, please.

>>DAVID APPASAMY: Talking about local content. David Appasamy, Pacific Technologies.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: But first, what is local content? What's the definition of local in the first place?

>>DAVID APPASAMY: I will tell you.

You heard this morning about 22 languages. We have 15 official languages, and if you look at every state in India -- India is, in fact, very much like the European common market. Each state has its own ethnic group, language, culture, et cetera. So it's actually a conglomeration of different ethnic groups who all have their own languages.

And a good indicator of how these languages are doing is language newspapers or magazines. And in India, the most widely circulated, the most-read publications, are in the local languages, not English. There are only about 100 million people who are really proficient with English.

And if you take, for example, where I come from, the leading newspaper is "THE HINDU." But if you take the leading Tamil newspaper, it has a far wider circulation. And many of those readers also read "The Hindu." So the primary language is the local language. And in our experience in creating our portal in six languages four years ago, is that if you create the content in the local language and make it available, people will come. So it's a question of making it available. Of course there are challenges. We know that. There has to be a Unicode standard. There has to be a standard keyboard and all of that. But if you make it possible, create the content and make it available, language users come on.

It's a question -- I suppose it's like chicken and egg. But if you take local language publications as an indicator, clearly, languages are very, very important in the Indian context. Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

Is there, in the audience, participants from China or from any country in Africa where there are many languages, local languages, and this multilingualism --

>>:Hello from Africa.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: -- is an issue for the Internet.

Yes, the person in the middle.

No, no, no, no.

We have a participant from China, I believe.

>>:Good afternoon. My name is (saying name). I'm from the embassy of the people's republic of China.

I have two comments. One thing is that we are in recession. And that's due to the financial crisis because of lack of governance and monitoring.

What we can learn from mistakes of the financial or cyber combination of the mistakes that brought the world into tragedy, that Internet governance that we can refer to.

The second is making the point about the last billion and the next billion. I want to match with education. You can't rely on the private investment to put the last billion of the children are able to go to school. You must have something, the public funding put together with the private funding that helps. For instance, like an infant structure, the government has to play the leading role to provide the people the channel to access the Internet. You can't rely on those private sector that is can invest in such a broad and wide investment.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Could you comment on the issue of multilingualism in China.

You have many languages. And how are those --

>>:We do have multi languages. We do have Mandarin as a predominant of the languages. We also have Mongolians, we have Tibetans. We have even Oiga (phonetic) languages. We believe that the languages, that the focus is for the local development. If we only have access for the people without providing the opportunity for development, and the people, they will say why we have to pay for -- lots of money, buy a computer and software, speeding, updating, we have to continue to pay. And there is nothing, the benefits come from, only the information, nothing to do with the daily development. We don't need it.

So we must create an environment for the local people, they can find the jobs, they can use the Internet to stimulate the development in the local area, so, therefore, the people, they have incentives to use the Internet.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Question. Go ahead.

>>CHARLES SHA'BAN: Thank you. Charles Sha'ban. I'm based in Jordan.

I want to reply to Patrik's question, which I think he said correctly that there's a good connection between multilingual and access.

From experience in Jordan, most of the Web sites are hosted in the U.S. servers, or used to be like this. Now, most of the companies host their Web sites internally. How this happened, when we had more access and more -- competitive access, which you have at least -- most of the people are able now to host their own servers. Before, the problem was mainly prices. The link to get two or four meg, used to pay thousands. Now it's much better.

So the answer to Patrik's question, I think, yes, if you host your own Web sites on your local servers, you will push more to have more local Web sites in your own language, like Arabic, for example. Because when you host it in U.S. for example, sometimes the software and the tools, which in the morning they talked about, doesn't accept sometimes except Latin or ASCII. So you will have problems.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: I think you have brought up a very important issue of the relationships between the multilingualism, diversity, and the access issue.

Yes.

>>:Thank you, sir. The question has been -- Brian Longwe, from the African ISP association.

The question has been asked, what is local content. And rather than answer it, I'd just like to mention that there are probably two imperatives with regards to local content. One is new and innovative ways of using the Internet in a locally relevant context, which none of us know today what innovations will

come out tomorrow. Some examples of these include the M payments and so on and so forth, the social networking that has already been discussed. However, the other and probably the most crucial is moving other existing forms of information and content, especially transactional data, onto the Internet platforms that we know of today. And just as an example, there's an application that was developed in South Africa called mix it, mix it, which basically allows the sending of up to 50 messages on a mobile phone at the same price of a single SMS. And this has seen an incredibly huge uptick amongst the teenage population in South Africa. This is just an example of the -- one way in which innovation can be able to use the existing access platforms and include a previously excluded category of society. The children were not able previously to afford the, you know, everyday and common use of this, because they have very little pocket money. But now, with their very little pocket money, they are able to communicate and interact much more effectively through the innovation that this particular application has given. Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much. Person in the middle, please.

Okay.

>>JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, member of the board of ICANN, but I'm speaking here in a private capacity.

Listening to the whole open dialogue of this afternoon, I am struck by the fact that these conversations, this debate seems to present the next billion or the one after that almost as an objective in itself, an aim in itself. And perhaps that's how humanity advances, by fixing global objectives. What strikes me at the same time, though, is that in most of these interventions, it has not been shown that the Internet could also be used to further other global objectives.

As you know, today, humanity is urban to the height of about 20%, 22%. By the year 2050, between 50 and 60%, maybe more, of humanity will be urbanized. Now, that is a really major, major challenge for human history.

So my question is, how can we ensure that the Internet can be used as one of the chief tools to make that urbanization happen in a harmonious and fair way?

There are also other global issues which represent some of the greatest challenges for the next 50 years: Access to water, public health, energy, et cetera.

So my question is really, should we be looking only at the figures of the Internet and a bit at the content? Or should we turn it another way around and say that, in addition to all of that -- and I'm not denying the value of what has been said, but I would say shouldn't we also consider that this is a prime tool, potentially a prime tool, to reach all those other major objectives and challenges.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

Yes.

>>:Yeah. I'm (saying name) from the DAISY Consortium. And working as the coordinator for developing countries. I'm coming from New Delhi, from Indian environment.

The issue being discussed, of course, which I would want to draw attention to, one is the next billion, and the last billion. According to (inaudible), discrimination doesn't exist, actually, because when we talk of the expansion of a basic service like Internet access, we can't be choosy. We can't leave marginalized sections. It would really not be something which would create a conducive society.

Secondly, where the language issues come, we are talking of content in local languages. It is beyond any doubt that it is the content in the local language, relevant content in the local language, which would attract people to spend and to spend their time and resources to get to Internet. The motivation for the end user to use Internet lies on what that person needs to do every day and whether Internet is actually serving something out of that or not.

One major issue of local languages is if the content that we are putting on the Internet, is it really complying to convertibility? Because the people who are going to use the content are not going to use it only in the way -- in one way. People use -- people perceive content in many, many different ways.

So there is a very, very important aspect of content, whether it is convertible to different formats, to different medias, or not.

Today, we have seen this example that we are saying that if this audio which is being spoken is not getting translated into different audio, those people can see it on the screen being transcribed. Means that there is a lot of people who are comfortable in looking at the content rather than hearing it. There's simultaneous conversion, convertibility happening to the content here, which gives access to the content to as many people as possible.

So that is one very inherent quality of content which we need to ensure, which would actually bring us to that -- help us bringing Internet to the next or to the next billions of Internet users.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

We have one more respondent on the questions posed in this part of the dialogue.

Please.

>>:Yes, Jacques (saying name). I represent the international association of computer workers, International Federation of Information Processing.

I believe that we should think about the local content and not to considering, like, the latest marketing survey, something that can sold to people who do not have access to the Internet. And I remember, I visited some time ago (inaudible). And I was told that we will only be happy when the peasants will know actually the price for which they're selling their goods, without having any intermediaries. And what is underlining this remark is that local content should be in line with the needs of the people and not in line with the created needs, the true needs of the people. And these created needs, additional

needs, they will be something which will be created in line with the logic of the market. And it is something that we have been seeing up till now. And this is why the question of local content regulation, the regulation of all of these questions, you can see that the liberalization of these markets in Europe was done with a goal to create new markets. And this -- we need to protect the content, protect the infrastructure, and use the IPR, intellectual property -- protect intellectual property. But we are creating markets. So when we say that we have to protect local content, production at the local level, we first have to know what the needs of the people are. And we should study these needs before saying that we have come up with some things that may be used by the populations. I would like to insist on this fact, on the need to actually know what the needs of the people are and ask them, and we'll see that people's needs differ from one place to another.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: I would like to see if there is anyone who would like to respond.

>>:On the issue of content in multiple languages, now, the previous speaker raised the issue of usability of the content. And the speaker before that raised the issue of convertibility of content between different languages.

So the concept of semantic Web is also coming up, Internet as the Web, but the next step is semantic Web. So the knowledge content of the Web content should be able to be represented and translated into multiple languages. So that's possible by the use of semantic Web, by converting the Web page content into a kind of knowledge representation in frames. Which can also be converted to other languages.

So this should be the other solution possible for knowledge utilization and translation within multiple languages on the Web.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

I think we have been hearing very interesting comments and remarks. And if there is any question or remarks from different aspect --

>>PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah. There is one comment that has been actually returning three times here. And it's not something that people ask or want to bring up for discussion. And that is to point out that when talking about multilingualism, we don't only talk about written languages, but also, like several people already mentioned, that people communicate in voice, pictures, et cetera. So -- and converting and creating those conversion tools for voice and other kind of translation might be even harder than the textual multilingualism that we normally think about regarding the Internet. Specifically, this has come up in a couple of questions and comments regarding the semantic Web. And that is a reminder to everyone.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Yes, Allison.

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: I have one last set of questions that really seem to be people wanting to make comments on the notion of the public good of the Internet, the nature of the Internet as a public good, and of connectivity as a utility, envisioning connectivity as a utility.

>>:Yeah --

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: You want to comment?

>>:Sorry. I have a couple of comments. I am the person who raised the question about the next billion and the last billion. So I hope you'll excuse me intervening.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could use your exclusive powers to get the technology in this auditorium working overnight. Because it's not a good example for Internet Governance Forum.

Secondly, I'd like to just respond to the Frenchman by saying, as far as I understand, markets are a very good way of finding out what people need.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Could you state your name and affiliation.

>>:Yeah. It's on the form. It's (saying name). I'm from intellect in the U.K.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

Yes.

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: I'm just wondering if the people who want to comment on the public good. We have Peter Hellmonds from this morning's panel. Perhaps he would like to do that. And then one or two last questions have come in.

>>PETER HELLMONDS: Yes, thank you.

Sorry for my voice. It seems it's a bit lower than normal.

Yes, on the question of the public good nature of the Internet, I think it's important to distinguish between the public good nature of the Internet and the ownership of pieces of the Internet. And I believe we from the private sector and from the business community believe that the ownership can very well be in private hands. Parts of it could also be in public hands, as the Internet is a network of networks. So even the governmental intranet, if it's connected to the big Internet, it's government-owned, but then it would be part of the big Internet.

I think the public good nature of the Internet comes from its interconnectedness, from the end-to-end principle, from the ability to innovative at the edges. And the ability to allow anyone to get online and get connected, those are the public good aspects and the nature of the Internet. But it doesn't mean that a public good is also public property in the sense of ownership. So that's a comment that I would like to make to that.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

Allison, do you have another remark?

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: There's one set of questions that hasn't really been addressed, and I'm not sure if there's the time now. But perhaps just to flag it for the secretariat to pick up, is the question of harmonization, regional harmonization, and what can be done in order to collaborate at a regional as well as a local and global level.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

We have a question about the role of IGF. The question is as follows: Can IGF be used for exchange of experiences regarding, for example, how can Denmark in number one place in OECD member status? Can IGF help creating several groups as the Arabic script IDN Working Group? Can IGF help facilitate funding of access? Those questions.

Does anyone want to respond to this question about the role of IGF in enhancing the multilingualism and access? Specific role.

>>:Actually, I have a supplementary question to that.

I don't know how many of the IGF proceedings, publications or documents are actually in multi- -- different documents. Because if that is not so, that is the first action point I would like to recommend.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. There's another respondent.

>>PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: I can comment a little bit on that, actually, the last question.

The -- we are working on in the Advisory Group and also the secretariat to translate the documents to all the U.N. languages. And I hope that you have seen an improvement to this meeting compared with the other ones. But, of course, everyone can always be better.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you.

Yes.

>>:Thank you. My name is Fin Peterson, from Denmark.

You mentioned that Denmark have the highest penetration on broadband. And, of course, we can share the information how we have done that.

And what I will emphasize is that we have chosen a market-driven approach. So it's private investments in order to get access to the Internet and broadband. Of course, to have investment there, you've got to have regulatory framework. And we have talked about regulation. And a regulatory framework is not only independent regulator. It's part of the --

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Go ahead.

>>:They don't like independent regulators? Okay.

It's -- independent regulators is part of a regulatory framework. You've got to have regulatory stability, and you've got to have regulatory transparency. That is quite important. So regulatory certainty is important. And you have to have a proactive way in order to facilitate regulation, not have detailed micromanagement, but have a competitive attitude toward that.

In Denmark, we do not have any (inaudible) except for frequencies. You don't even have to notify to the regulatory authority in order to have quick access. But also, as a regulator, you must choose your -- let's say, your tools and change them. In the beginning, we attached many -- great importance to service-based competition. But service-based competition is only to start the process. In the longer run, and what we are focusing on now, is to have facility-based, infrastructure-based competition. And it's important that you have different infrastructure. You might have cables, you might have normal telephone lines, you might have fiber. But wireless and mobile, that is important, as many infrastructures, the better the competition.

But looking on government point of view, well, the Internet and access to that, the access is not important in itself. But what can you use it for? And, of course, there is a lot of private content there. There should be much more government content there. There should be many more e-government services.

We can now see, and which has also been touched upon, is that there's user generation content to a large extent now. And there's more peer-to-peer. That's why the access to the Internet is not only the speed that you download, but also what you can upload. And I think we should have focus also on that in the future.

The last thing that I will touch upon is that it is the skill. It is the e-skill which will be important. And we can see even in Denmark where the population have a high degree of education, there's still a lot of people who are not able to manage a computer and the Internet. So what we should be looking at in the future in order also to have the last billion people is already now to look at the skills. It's not necessarily e-inclusion, it is not necessarily elderly people, but also young people.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much for explaining about the Denmark case.

But can market-driven approach work anywhere in the world? Anyone? Yes.

>>PETER HELLMONDS: Thanks Fuji-San. Yeah, I think I wanted to pick up on one of the questions here regarding whether the IGF can help in the financing. And then the market-driven approach I can try to tackle.

I think, first of all, we need to sort of correct a misconception about what the IGF can achieve.

The IGF has no money. The IGF Secretariat is supported by donations from a couple of donors, and a very low key. So you cannot get money from the IGF. And if that is the purpose of the question.

However, I think what we have been talking about in terms of how to get access, we have been talking about certain ways of how you could do it.

And I think what both my colleague from Verizon, Jacquelynn Ruff, has mentioned and I is, if you set up a regulatory regime, as described by my colleague here from Denmark, lightweight, regulation, as minimal as necessary but as effective as necessary, and you allow private sector to provide the networks and the access and provide the training and so on, then you have a chance to create the right incentives in the market that the private sector will find the money, and they will do the financing.

But I think you really need to think about creative approaches to set the right incentive structure. And if you create disincentives and if you create lots of red tape and bottlenecks, then you will not get financing in the market.

The private sector, normally -- currently, the end of 2008 and beginning of 2009 will be a roller coaster, probably, until the financial markets have somehow settled and adjusted. But in general, the private sector is able to get any number of financing that is necessary if you have clear expectations of being able to make good use of your investment and get some returns on the investment.

So that's the question of finance.

And the question of market access, perhaps someone needs to refresh my memory about exactly what that question was. I can pick it up again.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: I asked whether the market driven approach can work anywhere.

Denmark is a very market-oriented --

>>PETER HELLMONDS: Anywhere, yes. The short answer is yes, and the little bit more extensive answer is yes, if you set up the right environment.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: What is the right environment?

>>PETER HELLMONDS: What the right environment is? I think I just outlined it. You basically want to set an incentive structure where private sector participants can do what they want to do.

It doesn't mean completely free, because you might have one who wants to buy up the whole market, be a monopolist, and you would have a less in terms of the quantity and you would have higher prices than necessary.

So you want to introduce competition, sufficient competition that, really, you are reaching the efficient sort of intersection between supply and demand.

And you want to increase incentives that companies innovate to bring down prices and so that you can have expanded access there.

So that's the kind of incentive structure. The regulatory system and environment, the licensing. The availability of spectrum is also part of it.

And I think right now, there are a couple of issues in Europe, for example, when we go into digitalizing the broadcast, the TV, we realized that this frees up quite some spectrum. And the question is, we call this digital dividend, how do you distribute the digital dividend. Do you auction it off? Do you reserve it for more TV broadcasting? Or do you say, hey, we have some spectrum left over. We can expand access by doing the right thing.

So, there we go.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much, Peter.

There's one question posed to Dr. Gariola. Could you read the question and answer the question?

>>B.K. GARIOLA: The question is not really for me. It is for the honorable Minister.

And the question is that, basically, should be public liabilities be connected to the Internet.

The answer is yes. In the speech, the honorable Minister mentioned we are setting up what is called a National Knowledge Network, and the idea is that this knowledge network is a multi-gigabit -- multi tenths of gigabit backbone which will cover approximately a thousand locations. And the idea is that we should be able to connect most of these liabilities using that system.

The limiting factor there is the reach and ability of the telecom service providers to be able to get the link. But as far as the plan is concerned, the next 24 months, that system should be up and running.

I think that's all that I would like to say because it's the Minister's question. Beyond that, I think he is the one who should be really answering.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

We are almost coming to the end of the session, and thank you very much for giving us a very insightful, enlightening openings and remarks and proposals.

I think something new, something -- new initiative will come out from this session, which will be sort of deepened in the next session in 2009.

I would like to ask Allison and Patrik to wrap up this session. How do you assess the session?

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yeah, we are also running out of time. We are supposed to end in two minutes.

>> Okay. Maybe very -- two very, very brief comments, building on what was said about the private sector.

I think the concern is how you make sure that, where there is no market incentive, people are not left out.

And for that, maybe one thought. One has been done very successfully with the Grahman Bank (phonetic) in Bangladesh maybe should be connected also to this discussion and connecting the next billion, or the last billion.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Could you make the comments very brief.

>> (no audio).

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: There is no sound. You have to have another microphone.

>> My name is (saying name), I am from India.

Now, one problem you find is that a lot of investment has to go into multilingual computing from the government. Ultimately, it's a public good. And it affects those members of society who don't really have much of a say in policy-making, because the policymakers themselves, they are fine with English.

Now, one role I thought the Internet Governance Forum plays is you have some kind of a space where countries can make statements on what they have done for multilingual computing, which would affect access a big deal. So that's in a way kind of putting pressure internationally on governments to invest in an area which really affects the poorer people who do not have much of a voice in policy-making.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

We are really running out of time.

Last comment from Mr. Kawamura.

>>HIROSHI KAWAMURA: My name is Hiroshi Kawamura, one of the panelists from the morning session.

What I wanted to say is the converting from the verbal language to script is not the only way to increase the local content or multilingual contents. Synchronization of textual contents, audio contents and the graphical contents will be the mainstream to increase the local contents.

The Daisy standard is going to implement that.

Thank you.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much.

If we have disagreements in opinions, please say all those after the session.

Now, could you wrap up the session.

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes, really quickly.

In a multilingualism point of view, what I remember from this is that people pointed out that multilingualism is definitely not only written language; it has a lot to do with access and creation, because the next billion users should definitely not only be listeners but also speakers.

Creation of local language -- sorry, local content and management of local content is important.

We also have heard several discussion of what is local content, and I have not heard anyone mentioning, which I personally think is a good thing, that local is geographically local. It's culturally local or language local or script local. And I think that is something which was not said but I think between the lines, that is what I heard, specifically when the Internet goes more global.

Let's see.

I think that was basically it.

Probably a lot of things I forgot and you have to bash we mouth afterwards for that.

>>ALLISON GILLWALD: Right. It's also far too much to capture here, but perhaps one of the main things that came out in terms of connecting the next billion, which is the theme for this session, is that we are talking about the next billion in terms of pent-up demand which has to happen at the same time as addressing the last billion.

I think the strong sense came through that you cannot address one first, sequentially. That you have to address both at the same time.

And currently, our inability to provide affordable access is because of existing barriers in many of our countries in terms of market entry.

I think the point was also made, though, that despite liberalizing markets, it was very important how that was done. And it wasn't simply a matter of opening up markets. Very often with infrastructure industries, you cannot get the kind of perfect competition that will allow for the efficient allocation of resources, and therefore you need a regulatory framework that will provide certainty and stability, and also incentives for investment. But that public policy framework in which the regulatory framework exists needs to address public policy issues around market structure and competition and regulation, but it also needs to address issues of market failure, and questions of universal service and of ensuring equity between those who have -- urban areas that have access and those that don't.

So clearly there are a lot of challenges to connecting the next billion but there are solutions if we address them.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much, Allison.

Now I would like to ask Dr. Gariola for the final closing remarks.

>>B.K. GARIOLA: Thank you. I think I must thank the participants for having contributed immensely in the dialogue and the discussion that we have.

I must thank my colleagues here who have been so amply prepared for answering the questions and preparing the questions. And I think I would at the end thank you all to ensure that the deliberations and discussions that we had will have some kind of documentation prepared.

Thank you very much. All of best.

>>HIDETOSHI FUJISAWA: Thank you very much for your active participation in this session.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: See you all tomorrow. A reminder from the Secretariat. Do not forget to hand in your headphones. So take the headsets with you and hand them in outside.

Thank you.