Internet Governance from a Government Perspective

Department for External Economic Relations

Juuso Moisander

FORMIN.FINLAND.FI

Our objective

- To develop IG according to WSIS principles with full multi-stakeholder participation taking into account the internet's technical development, expansion of it's user basis and their geographical distribution

- The Security, Stability and Resiliency of the internet

- Narrow and Broad:
  - Infrastructure vs. legal, economic, developmental and sociocultural

- Narrow: ICANN, broad: IGF is the cornerstone but there's room for others

- No single entity can claim the broad IG for itself

Govt of Finland and IG

- WSIS Follow-up MFA/dept for External Economic Relations
- Information Society and ICT: WSIS-process and ICT Trade Policy in one package (+support from other depts and ministries)
  - National WSIS coordination
  - Finnish Internet Forum
    - To educate and engage new stakeholders
  - Influence international development on different fora
    - ICANN/GAC, IGF, UN/CSTD, ITU, EuroDIG
  - Bring the international perspective to domestic processes

Development

- Number of internet users will triple in the next 3-5 years
- Almost exclusively from developing countries using mobile devices
- Many of these countries get engaged only now

  …and don't trust/know any other way to participate than the UN?

  – Support development themes in IG
  – Support civil society development
    – Use of development funds (IGF, UNCTAD/CSTD, GAID)

UN Processes

- IG on the UN agenda since WSIS days
- Narrow or Broad IG?
  - Infrastructure vs. legal, economic, developmental and sociocultural
- UN participation is already happening at IGF, ITU, WIPO, UNESCO

  …but some want more:
  - IBSA, CIRT, China & Russia with their friends
  - …with many more proposals to come towards WSIS+10
  - …so what should we do?

UN Processes

- The ICANN model delivers, so let's keep on improving it
  - …but we're being too silent in the UN
  - …and are not looking sufficiently for common ground and provide sensible alternatives
  - …but our track record is good (GA, CSTD, ITU plenipot, GAC)

- Satisfied with the current state of IG
  - Current model has made internet what it is – the cornerstone of our economies, a source of innovations and economic growth
  - Core values secured

Conclusions

- What's working in the IGF?
  - This year showed the strength of the model
  - The fundaments are pretty much OK, but funding and outreach/awareness could be improved

- Any new model proposed in the UN would not be multi-stakeholder
  - Not acceptable
  - UN processes are just too slow for the internet
  - Let's focus on the real issues