

Response to questions about national IGF structures: Bulgaria

1. Effectiveness of national IGF structures?

What is your experience with the effectiveness of your national IGFs discussions? How do you make sure that your national IGF discussions do have an impact on the policy discussion and on national legislation process? How do you make sure that the relevant stakeholders get together and have a constructive exchange?

How do you make sure that your national IGF helps people to better understand the challenges related to Internet Governance?

There are practically no explicit Internet Governance Forums held in Bulgaria. The reason is that the Internet Governance-related problems are not popular in the country. Solving these issues would not bring money to the companies which would organise such forums which is why they are not investing in them. In contrast, IT companies such as Microsoft, Cisco and Oracle, as well as the telecommunications firms working in the country, often organise events to promote their products and services, but these are purely commercial and do not pay attention to the IG issues.

However, the IG problems are discussed online – at blogs like <http://isocbg.wordpress.com/> and <http://nellyo.wordpress.com/>

2. European Approach on Internet Governance?

What is "European" about the Internet Governance Discussion in Europe? What can Europe contribute to the global Internet Governance Discussion? What are European perspectives, best practices and how should they feed into the global IGF?

The IG problems are not regional, but global. Still, Europe can contribute to the global discussion, mainly thanks to its well developed infrastructure and good regulatory framework. Unlike the US, where rules are made to encourage the business rather than to protect people, Europe is more conservative regarding certain areas of IG. For example, its privacy protection rules can ensure excellent protection of the user, as far as they are properly enforced. This approach can be adopted by other countries which are planning to elaborate and put into practice privacy protection regulation.

3. European IGF: mandate and objectives?

Is there a need/desire for a European IGF? If yes, what should be its mandate and objectives? Which stakeholders should participate?

If there is a European IGF, its objectives should be to identify the best European IG practices, the key IG problems at European level and contribute to the global IG debate by sharing the best practices and pushing the problems up in the agenda. In terms of shareholders, representatives of the European Commission, the national governments, business, NGOs, activists and students should take part: everybody who has certain experience with IG issues and can contribute to the overall discussion on the topic.

4. European IGF: structure and working methods?

How should such a regional forum work? How should it be organized and how should it be funded? How should it link to national, global and other regional Internet governance initiatives? How could it help to improved e-participation in internet governance in Europe?

Probably the cheapest and most Internet-related manner to run such a forum would be via the Internet: through the creation of an online platform. At the same time, several times a year (once or twice) regular meetings should take place: in this way, higher involvement in the project would be encouraged.

The participants should be the representatives of different groups which are linked to the IG issues: all the groups of stakeholders mentioned above.

In terms of funding, large governmental institutions should be approached for the purpose (e.g. European Union), as well as individual donors. A third option would be to seek support from large companies. However, this could question the objectivity of the project.

Andreana Stankova, Bulgaria