

EuroDIG Plenary 4: Arrangements for a European IGF and Future EuroDIG events

Responses to questions about national IGF structures: Switzerland

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?

In Switzerland, there is a certain "tradition" of multi-stakeholderism and inclusion of civil society from the WSIS process when business and CS was included in the governmental delegation. Afterwards, the continuation of the Internet Governance discourse was difficult because it was not at the national or public agenda any longer. Nevertheless, the Swiss OFCOM continued the dialogue with stakeholders in the frame of a (national) Tri-partied Platform. There are several foras in the country where policy discussions go on (in science, the Swiss academies as well as in minor parts of CS), but the "impact on the national legislation process" is small and not evident. Having no sufficient basis and capacities for the moment (after the WSIS-hype ;-)) we try to link discussions and processes up with IGF consultations and the EuroDIG.

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?

As we repeatedly discussed in the context of EURALO – ICANN's European At-Large Organisation established in spring 2007, there are specific traditions, concerns, cultures and sensitivities in Europe like privacy, data protection or public services etc. which are different from the global level. There was a long-lasting believe in Europe that government regulation of traditional media and broadcasting (one-to-many) was good for the public audience and thereby promoting democracy. This standard setting and regulation schemes between national governments, the EU and the Council of Europe are under challenge now regarding new media and the Internet (many-to-many). And new mechanisms and rules have to be developed on the European level now, including not only governments but other relevant stakeholders as well. The European dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG) is such a new opportunity for an inclusive and people-centred approach and discourse. The regional/European perspective on IG issues may be substantial and important for the global discussion at the IGF later this year.

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?

YES, there is a need and EuroDIG is just a second attempt for it! Regarding the objectives, please see about the "Mission" on the EuroDIG Website <http://www.eurodig.org/>. There are still a lot of open questions on format, procedures, representation and regarding content and agenda setting of course. But we may know more after the 2nd edition in September 09 in Geneva ;-).

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?

The 2nd version of EuroDIG looks already better than the first was in terms of **inclusiveness**. Any European IGF must include ALL parts of the continent and all portions of European societies and audiences. We must

take care that representation of stakeholders will be balanced as well. There are desires and expectations that EuroDIG should be more “officialised” – what may effect openness, representation of other stakeholders and the **bottom-up approach** we followed so far. DiploFoundation, its ECBPIG and its expertise in the field should play an important role in this process. Funding is still a problem as there are only private sponsors at the moment. Funding of future events should not limit representation of CS actors. I think, the linking of national initiatives (like in UK, Germany, Spain etc.) shouldn't be a problem, as the initiators and actors are also involved on the regional and global level. The question how we get more Internet users and advocacy groups from all parts of Europe involved will be one of the biggest challenges.

Neuchâtel/Switzerland, August 09.

Wolf Ludwig

EURALO / Comunica-ch