FINISHED FILE

WSIS FORUM
DEFINING INTERNET UNIVERSALITY INDICATORS AND ACCESS POLICIES
TO SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2030 SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT AGENDA
15 JUNE 2017
13:30 CET
ROOM C

Services provided by:
    Caption First, Inc.
    P.O. Box 3066
    Monument, CO 80132
    800-825-5234
    www.captionfirst.com

                        ***
This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication
Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in
order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

                        ***

        >> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Welcome to the UNESCO high-level
session on Defining Internet Universality Indicators and
Access Policies to Support the Implementation of the 2030
Sustainable Development Agenda. My name is Raul Echeberria.
I am vice president of global engagement at the Internet
Society. (Audio cutting out) its inception. From a previous
position in a different organization, I had the opportunity to
support this work from the beginning, together with our
colleagues from NIC Brazil, and now it's really moving forward
and taking form. This is, in my view, very important. We
need these kind of indicators for governments to measure
themselves and analyze data on policies and the impact of
their policies, but also to act as motivators for other
governments to improve their situations.
        The Internet Society, we have seen always the Internet is
an instrument for development, for human, social, and economic
development, but also as a platform, as a tool for improving
the exercise of human rights across the world. So human

rights has an importance that we (audio cutting out) facing a situation in the world where the digital gap is becoming more and more relevant. (Inaudible) is really paying a high price for not being connected because the Internet is a (Inaudible) these people are being left behind, and this assumption that we cannot (Inaudible) and development. The only way that people can take advantage of (Inaudible) the technology and if they can feel how that technology could serve. One of the arguments that we have used many times in discussions about (audio cutting out)

Sometimes measures that are taken trying to deal with (Inaudible) decisions. So I really think from the (no audio) to the community will be very helpful in that sense. One of the multistakeholder instances, one of the (Inaudible) agreed very much those (inaudible) -- is nice (Inaudible) multistakeholderness leads to openness, and openness (Inaudible) and inclusive discussions, and inclusive discussions lead to more access. (Inaudible) human and social development. (Inaudible) decision of organizing those open consultations in different places, taking advantage of (Inaudible) to the outcome of the work.

So having said that, I give the floor to a very famous person, that's (audio cut out) Director General for Communication and Information. Before that, he was the special rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression at the UN Office (Inaudible) who knows Frank La Rue for a long time. He has done a very impressive job (Inaudible).

The last thing is that Frank La Rue is from Guatemala. (Inaudible) I have to thank that he is here because he has other commitments and (Inaudible). He is also called to participate in some human right (Inaudible).

>> FRANK LA RUE: (No audio)

Participate together in broadband commission and in other initiatives. What we always say is we complement each other's mandate. (Inaudible). We have a science sector in UNESCO which engages on research and investigation (Inaudible) we now discover that ICT technologies are crucial for development. The new Agenda, the 2030 Agenda, establishes 17 goals, but Goal 16, we believe that ICT and Internet is an essential tool for all the 17 goals.

(No audio) information, all the public to all the information. This is where the new technologies come. Information is today development. The same way we can say (Inaudible) part of the human rights aspect. So we have to have this holistic perspective of it. (Inaudible) and now

this has been ratified by the new Agenda, the SDG Agenda, and also by the Paris Agreement, by the way, on climate change and global warming.

(Inaudible) these four principles were established with the idea of creating a common ground. And the four principles Raul was mentioning are right there in your screen, where the R.O.A.M. principles, on purpose doing the word, game of words on roaming. The rights-oriented, openness, accessibility, and multistakeholder.

What did we mean about these four principles there? Number one -- and this, again, is the emphasis and the focus we have -- it has to be with a human rights approach. It has to be the exercise of rights. This is crucial because otherwise it doesn't have any meaning for us. It is -- it can be many things, like I said, it is fantastic if it's business, it's fantastic if it engages scientific development, it is fantastic if it gives satisfaction to those that are promoting it, but ultimately, the ultimate goal has to be the exercise of fundamental rights by the population. And this we have to keep reminding ourselves all the time, especially when states feel that they would like to limit the use of this technology, precisely because they see people exercising their freedom of expression or their access to information.

Secondly, the "O" is the openness. We believe this has to be a technology that is at the level of cost of everyone, that we can have open resources, that these resources maintain a degree of neutrality that can be used by everyone without having huge limitations of cost or of different regulations in different countries. This is very important for us because this is what will make these technologies affordable. In one of my reports as Rapporteur, I even said that this is so important, as important as having potable water, the free flow of information, that if need be, these are services that should be subsidized by the state as a fundamental necessity for the global development policies of the state and, therefore, should be almost free or free if possible. In many countries, we have, interestingly enough, there is an interesting project called (?) where the state maintained control of the broadband, and they made every public school a wi-fi service provider, and therefore, with that, they could guarantee free access to all the children and to the community just by getting closer to the schools and get part of the access to the frequency. So this was very important for them because immediately every school was able to interconnect among themselves. They are now able to have common textbooks. They are able to have one single common library nationally.

All children have the same electronic library, the same books, whether it's in the biggest school or the smallest school. This is an important approach.

Then the "A" is for accessibility. We insisted that accessibility means yes, we have to take Internet connectivity to the furthest places possible. In the Broadband Commission, we have always insisted that the priorities to interconnect the next billion people in the world. But as UNESCO, we always say yes, but there has to be a specific decision or who are the sectors of population, which are the communities we want to give this service to? Yes, we have to build a broader infrastructure of connectivity. That deals with Goal 9, for instance, in the SDGs. But we also ought to use mobile technology. But we want to make sure that connectivity is available for rural population, for the poorest of all populations so they can effectively be able to develop and access information necessary for their daily activities and their daily development. This means that we also have to have in the software but also in the content that is relevant, we have to have a diversity of languages, diversity of cultural approach. We have to respect this cultural diversity of the world and a diversity of scripts. We are doing in UNESCO the Atlas of Languages of the World, and it's interesting to see how few of them are -- many languages are only oral languages, but eventually we want languages to have a written script but all of them have an expression on Internet. This doesn't seem possible today, but I am sure it will be possible in the near future. It doesn't seem feasible from an economic perspective because it may not be big business. Some languages are rather small in the amount of population, but it feels important in terms of the respect for those identities and for the preservation of those languages and that identity.

So this is a crucial issue on, yes, accessibility, but with a purpose, with a purpose of supporting development, with a purpose of supporting the exercise of rights that we said, with the purpose of establishing active citizenship and strengthening democracy because today we believe we cannot have two tiers of development. And I must say we thought it was going to be the big equalizer, it was going to give access to everyone on information, but it was also going to permit everyone to be able to speak out on public policies, to participate in their daily political life. And to the contrary, we have noticed with grief that in reality, what has grown is a bigger digital gap. The same thing happens with the gender gap. We thought this was going to be the big equalizer of women and men, and today we still see that this

is a serious problem around the world. Even the access of
women to Internet is limited in comparison to the access of
men. I can always say an example in my country, in Guatemala,
we did an experiment in rural areas to train leaders on
digital Internet. We tried to see who already had experience.
We tested out a little bit who knew. To our amazement, we
were surprised 95% of men, the boys, already knew a bit of
Internet because of the cafe net, and they had a friend who
had already taken them at least once or twice to a cafenet.
But we were surprised that 95% of the women did not because
their husbands did not give them permission to go to a cafenet
because of the men.

It was surprising how huge the gap was in our country
that we did not perceive because we are a very urban society
from the capital city. These are issues we want to discuss,
who are we building access for? What type of democracy are we
generating? How well informed are people today, in the days
we are disputing information and the possibilities of this
information to make decisions, to make clear decisions for the
future?

And the fourth principle is the multistakeholderism. It
took me a while to be able to pronounce the word. (Laughter).
This multistakeholderism is important because it was the
guarantee that Internet policies would be decided by a vast
and open debate, and this is crucial and important. It is not
only those intellectuals that conceive the projects or those
corporations that develop the new technology or those states
that are trying to regulate the technology or those that are
actually selling the services. It is, in reality, in the
interest of all sectors of society and, therefore, we are all
affected. Last week I was here at the ITU on a conference on
artificial intelligence. And we were talking about that. The
great benefits it will have for health, education, and many
other sectors, but also with the great dangers it also
implies. Everyone should be able to know, and everyone should
be able to participate in this debate at their level, their
level of knowledge.

So here is where we are determined to make the experience
of the IGF, for instance, that began as a very global
experience, I think initially, with the thought of keeping us
all arguing about stuff in a very distant and remote forum
away from the decision-making process, but in reality, it
became a more important forum, it became very relevant, and
today we are reproducing it at a regional and especially a
national level. And I strongly believe that these national
IGFs, these national experiences of multistakeholder dialogue,

can be the first step for people learning what debate on these matters, bringing all sectors together, can be.

Now, our next step for this is to establish indicators. I will let Andrea develop this point. The indicators are a crucial element because they will allow us to measure the four principles we want to apply that were approved by consensus in the General Conference of UNESCO, all the 195 Member States, which was important. If those are becoming a reality, if they don't become just one more resolution of a UN body. And this is the issue we want to engage with all of you here today, to encourage you, to participate in promoting these and promote the four indicators and eventually using them in development of your own countries.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, Frank, and this is incredible the way that you connect everything, democracy, freedom of expression, development, gender issues, all the things and also aligned with the principles that have been proposed for this project and also with this view of human-centric Internet that I agree very much with. So thank you very much for this enlightening speech.

Frank said at the beginning that he would speak less than the 15 minutes that he had for speaking, but I am learning that he is not trustable.

(Laughter)

Okay. So now let's move to the next speaker. Before that, let me explain how it will work. Also, the main objective of this session is talking about the Internet universality indicators, but also it will be presented in knowledge society's policy, another UNESCO policy instrument which offers multiple diagnostic lenses for exploring each society, supporting the collective formulation of aggregate policy responses for the different countries.

And Anriette will present the project of the universality indicators in ten minutes, and now I cannot be strict with Frank because he is the boss, but from now I will be strict with the time. So you have ten minutes, Anriette, but -- and after Anriette, we have a panel with five very distinguished speakers that I will introduce one by one that will speak five minutes each about those topics.

So Anriette Esterhuysen is the Director of the Association of progressive Communications, APC, working with information and communication technologies, ICTs, to support social justice and development. I should add that APC was founded in 1990, is probably one of the pioneer organizations in this field, and working not only in the promotion of connectivity, but also with this social component with a big

orientation into human rights.

So Anriette, it's a big honor to have you here.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks, Raul, and it's a big honor that you once worked for APC, one of the famous people that once worked for us.

I am here in my capacity as APC, which is the convener of the consortium that has been contracted by UNESCO to form this study. We refer to ourselves as the Internet universality indicators consortium. I would like to introduce some of our partners around the room. We have three research institutions from the Global South, Research ICT Africa, and we have Alison Gilwalt here. (?) Based in Sri Lanka that does research in all of Asia. And the dialogue on Internet Society, which does research in the Latin America region. And ICT Associates are a consultancy based in the UK but works all around the world. We have David and Andrea in the room. But we are essentially the research team. The real beauty of this initiative, we hope, is that while we are quite a small team, we want to work in a very interactive way and as consultatively as possible for two reasons, because we believe that what we develop as indicators will be stronger if there is a lot of input, plus we think if we create awareness in the broader community of people that are concerned with Internet-related issues and rights-related issues, they are more likely to make use of it.

So Frank has outlined very clearly where this comes from. These indicators are not intended to measure everything about the Internet. They are very clearly going to be linked to the R.O.A.M. principles and to the agreements that have been made by UNESCO Member States. And they will be both qualitative and quantitative. At this point, we really are just exploring what people feel these indicators should be prioritizing. So we have not developed any draft indicators yet. We are just, at the moment, trying to learn about indicators, other indicators that exist, what works in those -- in the use of those indicators, and what does not work.

We are anticipating that there will be these five categories that you can see on the screen. Four of them are linked to the UNESCO R.O.A.M. principles, but then cross-cutting indicators are emerging as a real priority because it's sometimes very difficult if you are measuring or if you are trying to measure the state of the Internet to separate accessibility from rights, for example. So we feel the cross-cutting indicators will be very important.

Something that's vital -- and this is clear in what UNESCO wants, and we fully agree with this -- these indicators are not intended to produce ranking of countries. This is not

a Freedom House type index where we say a country is free or not free or half free. This really is -- these are indicators that are trying to encourage dialogue, trying to encourage more learning and engagement, dialogue at the national level, so therefore, they'll provide information that's there to bring about more positive change rather than to say these are good countries and these are bad countries. We do not see the world in that way.

I think, you know, I don't really want to say much more. We anticipate that the structure of the indicator framework could look a little bit like this, if you just go down here, where you could have a category such as rights, and then different issues. Freedom of expression might be such an issue. And then you look at different indicators that can help you understand how freedom of expression is operating or not. Means of verification, obviously very important, particularly if we want to use it for dialogue. It's good to always have evidence. So that's really what we have.

I think I'll close just by pointing you all to this website that we've created. Can you all see that? This website is at the UNESCO domain. The URL is actually very simple. en.UNESCO.org/Internetuniversality. It's available in six languages. We are very happy to be able to say that it's available in Chinese, French, Spanish, Russian, and Arabic. And I'll tell you more about the project, but most importantly, it has this, which is an online Web form. Is it getting there? We had some difficulty with ITU security, which for some obscure reason blocked access to the online consultation. But ITU fixed it.

(Laughter)

It was a joke, and the ITU technicians have fixed it.

So please note this because this is where we are asking you to tell us what you think is important. And this online consultation is an opportunity for you to share what you dislike about measuring processes you have been a part of, what you think the gaps are, and what you would like this project to produce.

So that's really all, and just to add, I think it's already been stated, we are having many face-to-face consultations like this. The project timeline is roughly running between now until April next year, by which time we'll have some draft indicators out. And then it's back in UNESCO's hands.

Thanks very much.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Anriette. It's great that it is being developed in this bottom-up manner. I think it

shows the new way to do things. It's great. So very happy to see that, and I encourage everybody to take a look on the website that Anriette has shared, participate in the online consultation.

Okay. Our next speaker. So Anriette, you didn't give me any work with the time. (Laughter).

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Civil society is used to not having as much space as anyone else.

(Laughter)

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: So our next speaker is Mr. Alexandre Barbosa. Alexandre was one of the first supporters of this project. He is the head of the Regional Center on studies on information and communication technologies in Brazil, known by CETIC.BR. This is an organization that is linked to the Brazilian Internet steering Committee and the NIC.BR. He is a researcher, a coordinator of the nationwide stand-alone ICT service project for the production of ICT-related statistics on the access to and use of ICTs in several segments of society and capacity-building programs in several methodologies in Latin America. Also Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa.

The work that CETIC.BR has done in Latin America is the highest level and one of the most outstanding works that are known in the region about ICT indicators. Glad to have you here, Alexandre.

>> ALEXANDRE BARBAROSA: Thank you, Raul, for these kind words, and good afternoon, everyone.

Let me thank UNESCO for inviting me to be part of this very special panel. And it is, indeed, very happy to me to be here since not only for me, but also for my organization, the Brazilian Network Information Center, for several reasons. And firstly it has to do with what Raul has just said, because like NIC, we are articulated by UNESCO America. So to position the paper that was a background paper for UNESCO that would later be titled finding indicators for development, so this is very important to us that we are involved in the very beginning of this process. And also related to this background paper that was discussed in the IGF in Bali in 2013, many years ago, NIC.BR also hosted broad consultation with the Latin America stakeholders, something similar to this, and I guess that both Raul and Frank La Rue will recall this meeting. It was very important in this process. And this was made during the Net the NETmundial, which was the global stakeholder meeting on the future of Internet Governance that was held in Sao Paolo.

Also we very actively participated during the WSIS+10

reviewing process, which also has to do with this work that we are talking today. And during the Connecting the Dots conference that was mentioned by Frank in March 2015 in Paris, where this draft was presented, it was called Keystones to Foster Inclusive Knowledge Society, Access to Information and Knowledge, Freedom of Expression, Policy and Ethics on a Global Internet. In that particular conference, the Brazilian delegation has made a contribution to include indicators and a framework for measuring Internet development. And finally, the output document was included not exactly as we proposed, but this idea was there, which was promote research into law, policy, regulatory frameworks, and the use of the Internet, including relevant indicators in key areas of the study that was just presented by Anriette.

So NIC is very much involved in this very -- in the very beginning of this project, and we also were involved during the revision of the Knowledge Society Policy Handbook that took place exactly in Raul's country, Uruguay, last year in February. So this is one of the reasons that this is very important for us to be here.

Well, I would like to make very few considerations about what has been presented and about the R.O.A.M. framework. This framework incorporates a set of values that potentially apply across different social aspects of the Internet. Moving to a very limited individualistic view of technology, as was mentioned this morning in the panel, into a broader view that incorporates a rights-based Internet concept approach. This applies an Internet that is aimed to promote human rights protection, building an environment that supports human rights and where the content has the same human right protections as rights of line.

Besides, since ICTs and the Internet are recognized as horizontal enablers to our SDGs, the proposed R.O.A.M. framework will be very important in monitoring the progress countries are making in achieving the SDGs; therefore, they are very relevant for policy making. These will be really very important instruments into policy design.

It is also important to highlight that since the R.O.A.M. framework is broad and encompasses several and complex social aspects, including human rights and ethics, some aspects of the framework can be measured, as said already, by consultative approach, but also will require other approaches, like qualitative approach.

From the quantitative indicator aside, I would highlight that survey methodologies, such as Internet infrastructure and connectivity, level of Internet penetration, Internet users,

ICT skills, provision of open data, et cetera, you can find already existing data sources, and we are here at ITU that compiles very important database on ICT access and use of Internet, and also the supply side. So we have here both the demand side and supply side already existing indicators, and from the qualitative methodology approach, that we will certainly be needed in this project, we will have to have common frameworks to better analyze the situation in each country. So it is very important that we map existing data sources, and we have besides ITU and the partnership on measured ICT for development, we have frameworks that also will help in many dimensions, especially in the A dimension, accessibility.

It is also important to mention that many countries, by their ministers and regulators, provide administrative data and also now the big data sources are very important.

So just to conclude, I think that as we are very much involved in the beginning, we are willing to cooperate with UNESCO and APC in probably piloting something in Brazil or helping face-to-face offline consultation in the region, as we already have made in the past.

So these are my initial remarks, Raul, and I would like to congratulate UNESCO and also APC for this very important initiative. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, Alexandre.

So our next speaker is Jeremy Millard. He is chief policy advisor of DTI Denmark and research fellow at Brunel University in United Kingdom. And he undertakes selective assignments on eGovernments, e-Governance, public sector innovation, the knowledge society, open and social innovation in Europe, North America, Africa, and Asia. So Jeremy, that's based on this description you create huge expectations.

(Laughter)

>> JEREMY MILLARD: Thank you very much for the invitation, and thank you for inviting me to be here on a very important occasion. In fact, I was in Brussels yesterday, and on a two-day conference with the western Balkan countries looking at the open government and open data and eparticipation. I was meant to be speaking today, but I got the invitation, I've got to be in Geneva, right, to meet my old friend and also to be with you people here. So I am very pleased by that.

A very quick background because I've done a lot of work on indicators, eGovernment, benchmarking for the European Commission, UN DESA in New York, gap surveys. I have a lot of experience in playing with indicators (Laughter) in a good

way, I hope. But I've been scrubbing with my paper a little
bit. I have been asked to change what I was going to say in
five minutes because I was one of the authors of the Knowledge
Society's Policy Handbook, which was already mentioned by
Alexandre, and I was asked to just briefly talk about that, so
I will do that. And my specific comments on the Internet
universality will maybe come up during the discussion.
Otherwise, I can do it privately. Right? Is
        >> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: That might be better.
        >> JEREMY MILLARD: No, no, they are quite positive,
actually.
        Basically, I am a historian as well. Okay? We should
all be historians. And you know what Henry Ford said? He
said lots of things, but one of the things: History is bunk.
Remember that? He meant that means history is rubbish. But
he didn't mean ignore history. He means learn from history.
So very quickly to look at the knowledge society in a
historical context, if you go back to the pre-Industrial Age,
the main source of knowledge and information was academia, the
universities. Didn't really come from anywhere else, but they
were tightly linked to religious and contemplating God and the
natural sphere of things at that stage. Then we had the
Industrial Revolution, and suddenly we had another axa
providing knowledge and information, and that was businesses.
They got together with academia, the steam engine,
electricity, you know what happens next. And then the third
stage was the Information Society. Once the government
started to get involved and said look, this is important. We
should have a national strategy for science and technology to
support business. Right? Is and that happened in the '50s
and '60s and '70s very widely. And then that was what people
call the triple helix. You heard of that.
        Then the quadruple helix came along because people like
UNESCO said what about civil society? Of course, they are a
source of knowledge and innovation as well. Perhaps the most
important. So we had the quadruple helix, if you remember
that.
        But now we -- and this is where the knowledge society
comes in -- all axes are involved in that context. Okay? And
with -- that's the main change from the information society
to the knowledge society. In the information society, we talk
about looking at data but organizing data in appropriate ways
to solve problems. In the knowledge society, there's a strong
focus on seeing knowledge as a commodity in its own right,
something to be produced by all those actors I mentioned, to
not just solve existing problems, but to forge ahead and look

for new areas of openness and avenues to see how we can develop the human condition and link very closely to the SDGs.

There may actually be also a fifth stage, which we hint on in this book here, sustainable knowledge societies. There is another source of innovation I haven't mentioned yet. That is nature. Nature as a resource for knowledge and information, not just in a passive sense, but in a more active sense. Okay? If you think about the way people are looking at biotech, looking at the way living things work, this is very, very important source of knowledge.

One of my slogans in the last couple of years has been if you have a problem in human society, it may be nature's already solved that problem because nature's been innovating for the last 10 million years -- 10 billion years; right? Maybe we can look to nature for some help on that. But also we need to make sure that nature continues to be robust and to support our living systems as well. So the sustainable information knowledge society is extremely important.

In the last minute I have, I will just comment a bit further on what Frank was talking about because we do cover in this Policy Handbook here, what is the difference? What is it that IT, information technology, does best, and what is it that human beings do best? This is a very critical discussion at the moment with AI and robotics. We know for example that we are being told that artificial intelligence and robotics is going to even wipe out the jobs that we people here are doing and you are doing in the next ten years. Maybe. There is a big question mark over what's going to happen with jobs and employment. I'm not so pessimistic as that, but I think we have a struggle on our hands. But if we look at what technology does best, IT and machines, it's very good at data mining, getting data, working with data, producing algorithms, crunching data, very, very complex tasks. Okay? Human beings can't compete with that. It can beat us at chess, the IBM Watson computer, it does everything if you like.

But human beings, we still have -- I hope we still have a unique set of capabilities. We have empathy. We have emotional intelligence. We -- this there's huge jobs in the caring sector, in the teaching sector, in everything where human emotional intelligence and empathy make sense. That's a huge number of jobs, I think. In the creative industries, which have been recognized in the last five years or so, and we need to put more effort into based upon culture and identity, some of the things Frank mentioned.

So although boundary between what machines do best and what people do best is shifting, we have to be very aware of

this and focus on what makes human beings the most important axa in this game. Right? When I, on my death bed, hopefully in many years, I want to hold the hand of a human being, probably my wife, not a robot. I don't know what the Japanese are thinking about, but let's have another discussion.

So anyway, you can find a lot of this discussion in here. And lastly, but very briefly, we are not just highly philosophical as I have just been discussing, we also focus very much on different forms of innovation, and we provide a template for how a country or city can actually develop a knowledge society, and we divide this into four or five phases: looking at contextualizing and diagnosing what the issues are; creating a vision and goal setting; analyzing and designing your knowledge society policy; implementing it and recognizing this takes a long time, probably at least ten years, so you need continuity; then updating and sustaining it, and of course, monitoring and evaluating as you go along. So there's a lot of, I hope, useful information in here. And I know that UNESCO would like to have feedback on that if you have anything. It's meant to be an open, living, working document.

Okay. So I hope that's given you a flavor of some of the interesting things in this, and I hope I have contributed a little bit to this discussion. Thank you very much.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Oh, yes, Jeremy. Yes, you contributed. Thank you for bringing those concepts of sustainability, of knowledge society, and especially was very interested in how you say as nature being a source of innovation. So thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Dr. Andreas Brandner, managing director and CEO of KMA Austria. Andreas is founder and CEO of Knowledge Management Associates, KMA, and is also a researcher in the field of knowledge management. His research and interests focus on knowledge politics, knowledge management and strategies, and implementation. And I understand that recently, he is also founder of a new endeavor. It's the -- sorry -- Knowledge for Development Partnership that is based here in Geneva, and I am sure that you will mention that in your speech. Please.

>> ANDREAS BRANDNER: Thank you very much for this introduction and invitation to be here. It's a pleasure to be here at the World Summit on the Information Society, and I am happy that the statement has developed from information societies to knowledge societies, just as also in the history of businesses, the focus was previously on information management and nowadays is on knowledge management. Because

people understand that information is just one part in a divided picture of knowledge society. Yes, my organization, Knowledge Management Austria, has been advising organizations, companies, public administration in knowledge management. And three months ago, we established the Knowledge for Development Partnership, which provides a multistakeholder platform for global partners to advance knowledge societies. The headquarters is in Vienna, but it has been established here.

I have been encouraged, since you mentioned that people are -- we should be historic. To also refer to my art background, I have also studied some art history, and that's why spontaneously, I put this slide here on the screen. What you can see here is a piece of art that's called "The Columns of Knowledge," and it has been produced by an Austrian artist, Helmut Margreiter, in 2008, and it represents two different elements of knowledge and knowledge societies. The left one represents the proven knowledge, the knowledge that we have developed and the scientifically proven over a long time. It's polished, it's perfect in its shape, it's shiny, brilliant. Somehow it represents excellence. Whatever we can do, we put it in this left column. It's great, and we love to look at it. But of course, it's closed and we cannot add anything anymore. And if we get closer to it, we even reflect, we see ourselves in it, just as we see ourselves when we look into history. It is good to have this kind of excellence and proven knowledge, but it is not enough. We have to step beyond the proven knowledge if we want to master the challenges of the future. So we have to step beyond the known and explore the unknown, and this is represented by the other column. It's a triangle. It's open in its shape. It's on the outside, here we have in nature, where the knowledge is blossoming, growing. The knowledge is not left or right. It's in between. Knowledge is not an object we have. It's a process. It's a process of thinking. It's a process of your mind where we think, what can we use from the past and what shall we leave behind us?
Where do we want to go? Which knowledge do we have to create? And I think that this is a nice metaphor. And on the bottom, it's like symbolizing a book, one page we have read and the other is still unknown.

This just gives a background that if we talk about Internet universality, what do we find in the Internet? Is it information, data that had been produced in the past? Or do we want more? Do we want to access also people with whom we co-create the future? I think both is needed.

And in my brief recommendation, I would like to extend

the view of Internet universality a bit. First, I was very not surprised, but I found the four universality criteria great. When we talk about the human rights as a bottom line, I would say okay, then we should also determine a target line, and I think the Sustainable Development Goals give a good target in this regard to say knowledge is a resource to determine one's own future and life, to care for one's health, to create fair income, dealing with unexpected situations and cultures, to consume responsibly, to protect wildlife competently and the environment, and contribute in the wider sense to the economic and societal development. So these are the goals. We should not focus on the bottom line. We should focus on the Sustainable Development Goals as an object.

     When we talk about knowledge, we have to understand that knowledge is not something that is accessible from everywhere by everybody. Knowledge is something that is very local. Because when we want to access information in the Internet, maybe, I don't know exactly, but a huge percentage of the knowledge that we need affects our life in our livelihood, in our environment, in our city, where we live. What does it tell me if I live in Uganda that I can access the Internet information in Geneva? I mean, yes, it's great to have policy and everything documents, but most of my life I spent probably in Uganda or in somewhere else. And this is why we need the local contextualization, also of the Internet, that the Internet is global, is an idea, but the Internet is very much connected with local realities, with local knowledge, and with local communication.

     In the Knowledge for Development Partnership that we have established, we have created an agenda, an agenda, Knowledge for Development, which has been published some months ago, also with the contributions of the Director General of UNESCO. And in this agenda, we propose to establish local knowledge partnerships, multistakeholder partnerships, to discuss what are the objectives of the partners to develop the knowledge ecosystem and what everybody can contribute. And this knowledge partnership is also extremely important to determine the right indicators. Because without people having targets in their specific context, how shall we use the indicators? What is good, what is bad if I have no target? But if we have this context of a partnership, we can determine targets, we can determine responsibilities for actions, we have distributed dialogue, how we proceed. We have structure to review and interpret results because who can interpret the results of Internet in Uganda better than the Ugandans?

     So this is some of my initial ideas. Our focus in The

partnership is to focus on cities. Cities are the natural hubs for knowledge societies and for the creation of distribution of knowledge. And if they take responsibility of the linkages with the rural areas and the global connectivity, then cities can be the good anchor point for knowledge society development, for Internet development, and to use indicators in the proper way. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, Andreas. A lot of things to think about. And I like that you used this piece of art. I wonder if you are the artist because you explained it very well.

>> ANDREAS BRANDNER: It's an (Inaudible). The column is in Vienna. Maybe some of you know Vienna. This is here at the heart with the President's palace.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mira Milosevic. She is the director of the Global Forum for Media Development since March 2017. She is a media expert who was director of media development programs at Association of Newspapers and News Publishers, and she has served as chief platform officer at India Voices and as Director of the Belgrade-based Media Center. So welcome.

>> MIRA MILOSEVIC: Thank you. I would like to thank our colleagues from UNESCO for organizing this panel and for including us with this important discussion.

Most importantly, Global Forum for Media Development that I represent is a network of more than 190 media development, freedom of expression, and media assistance organizations in more than 70 countries around the world. All of our members share one common goal, and that is to help development of professional and plural information ecosystems in different systems around the world.

We have cooperated really successfully online developing something called Media Development Indicators that have been adopted by UNESCO in 2008. And these Media Development Indicators have been used successfully over the last ten years to assess national media landscape around the world and were very helpful for us to lobby and argue for implementation of freedom of expression as a basic right.

Development indicators that I mentioned identified five principal media development categories -- those regulatory systems, plurality and diversity of media, economic playing field and transparency of ownership, media as a platform for democratic discourse which links really well to what Frank La Rue was saying earlier, professional capacity building and supporting institution for journalist media, and infrastructural capacity.

UNESCO has continued to develop these indicators, and in 2015, an additional sixth category has been added dealing with viability of journalism and media.

And back to present now and here at World Summit on the Information Society, we talk a lot about multistakeholder Internet Governance process; however, still here most stakeholders and most discussions are focused mainly on the technical, physical, and logistical layers of the Internet. And I am very happy to be in this panel because we are slowly moving to including content from the perspective of human rights especially in this debate, and my network and all our members support this idea that content needs to be added to all our discussions on Internet Governance and especially to Internet universality indicators.

The fundamental norms that you talked about, R.O.A.M. principles, we subscribe to those, and we think they are very useful, of course, rights as part of R.O.A.M. principles are very important for us. And all the rights that are part of international civil and political rights, but especially freedom of expression.

So when we speak about Internet universality indicators, I hope that you will take into consideration all six categories of Media Development Indicators that I mentioned earlier and scrutinize them from the perspective of Internet. Especially those that are often overlooked in the Internet Governance debate, so media or Internet as a platform for democratic discourse, plurality, which I think is one of the key discussion that is we need to have, plurality of both sources and owners and diversity of content. That's something that's very difficult to apply to online and Internet spaces, especially with Internet mediators. And professional capacity and viability of journalism, and how are we going to fund journalism and professional approach to information in the future.

Some of the subindicators that UNESCO has been using for media development have been the pillars of our information systems and pillars of our democratic systems, such as self-regulation of print media, which again is very difficult to apply on Internet, then public service content or public service broadcasting. Of course, public service broadcasters operate in Internet sphere, but again, if you speak about social media networks that are now source of information for more than 40% of citizens in many countries, there is a big question about public service content, et cetera.

So it will be a huge task for UNESCO to develop these indicators, especially to include standards and benchmarks.

Most of these areas are really new, and we are still struggling to see relationships and correlations between some aspects of Internet infrastructure; some aspects of Internet intermediaries operations; and human rights, freedom of expression, and diversity of content. And some of them we still don't fully understand, so that's additional challenge for you to be able to tackle all of this.

I will speak in the next section a bit more about private sector and its impact on private sector, again, private sector actors in the Internet sphere. But just to conclude, when developing new sense of indicators, we also recommend that you look at existing, which I am sure you will, existing indicators for experience and pointers.

Last but not least, we've been involved with UNESCO, and 200 other national and international NGOs in advocating to include access to information into Sustainable Development Goals. That's one of our successes that in 2015, access to information has been adopted as Sustainable Development Goal of 16.10, and we are looking forward to these indicators as part of the monitoring mechanism of implementing these indicators. But also of monitoring, but also monitoring other Sustainable Development Goal targets, such as Internet access, affordability, access to justice, and anticorruption. And thank you very much for this debate. We will facilitate distribution of information of your consultative process.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much, Mira, for your very concrete recommendations and observations. I am sure that Anriette will take it into consideration for your work, and for sure, I am sure that the global development, the Media Development Indicators you mentioned were, in fact, source of inspiration for this work. So that is very useful to have your perspective from that -- from the media, your media perspective is very useful in this discussion. Thank you very much.

Last but not least, we have Mr. Balazs Zorenyi. I say that correctly? Good. He is the director general, Communications Network, Content and Technology Unit, Digital Economy and Skills, European Commission. He is working on economic and holistic analysis on ICTs, providing the evidence base for policy making. Background, he has background in telecoms, and he is responsible for the Digital Economy and Society Index, currently working also with ITU and OECD.

Thank you, Balazs. Welcome.

>> BALAZS ZORENYI: Thank you very much for the introduction and also for the invitation. I am very happy to be here. And first of all, let me give you some information

about the Digital Economy and Society Index. Does it work?
Is it better now?

Okay. So first of all, let me give you some information
about the --

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: I think the idea is that you use
these devices, so when the speakers are closer from you, you
hear better. But the audio is distributed by those things.

>> BALAZS ZORENYI: Okay. So I would like to introduce
the Digital Economy and Society Index in the way how we
collect and analyze data in the European Commission in the
area of ICTs. So we have a benchmarking framework, and we
collect more than 200 indicators. The key source that we use
is surveys implemented by the national statistical institutes
with the coordination of Eurostat, the director general in the
Commission responsible for statistics. And the Digital
Economy and Society Index is based on a selection of
indicators from the Eurostat surveys and also some alternative
surveys. And the objective of having this index is to measure
the progress in the area of digital in all the European Member
States. It is a benchmarking exercise where we compare the
performance of countries and, at the same time, we also look
at the progress over time. Currently we have four years of
data, so we can already look at trends.

I am very happy that you have this initiative here, and
also because one thing which is very difficult for us is to
answer the questions on how Europe is performing in general.
We have very limited data that we can compare with other parts
of the world. Although we did try to develop the Internet
DAISY, as we say, where we made some compromises on the list
of indicators to have something which we can compare with at
least some countries. We managed to develop a report where we
have 15 countries outside Europe. But I understand that when
you look at worldwide, there is much less comparable data than
within the European Union.

So in this index, we measure -- we have 31 indicators
structured around five dimensions. In our concept, we first
look at the two foreign foundations of having a flourishing
digital economy and digital society. The first one is
connectivity, which looks at broadband networks and the use of
broadband networks. The second one is human capital, which is
about skills, the ability of people to benefit from the
Internet through their skills by using the services. And the
other three dimensions are about the use of ICTs by people, by
businesses, and by the public sector.

Regarding Internet universality, I can see, of course,
big differences, but also similarities. I would in no way

like to propose you to add to have, let's say, a structure which is similar to DAISY. I understand you have a completely different approach, and I think it is a very good approach, and it's very good to see that you have a completely different viewpoint on this subject. What I particularly like in your concept is to go below, let's say, the pure national data and look at plurality or look at different groups of the society. Where I see a big challenge in general is how to measure indicators around children. In the European Union, in the big surveys that we have, we look at -- they look at the people aged between 16 and 74, so I see a methodological issue there.

Let me have a couple of remarks on let's say some of the aspects of Internet universality, and the indicators that we have at hand. Then we start with accessibility. This is, I think, the dimension where we have, I think, the largest number of indicators collected already in the European Union. So in accessibility, which is to some extent for me a combination of indicators from broadband connectivity and also from the human capital dimension of the DAISY, we, in our studies, we look at the availability of different broadband infrastructures and also in the use of these infrastructures, the penetration, the take-up of Internet. What is important for us is that we make a difference between basic broadband and high-capacity or next-generation access or high-speed broadband. I think this is getting more and more important. It will not be enough to have a slow broadband connection in the coming years to be able to benefit fully from the services on the Internet.

We also look at affordability. We measure the prices of broadband, and we present the minimum price that one can get on the market as a percentage of the income to have comparable measurements, to have a real measurement on affordability.

For the skills part, we developed the framework which we call the Digital Competence Framework, where we have a fairly long list of questions to have an understanding of how much people could do online or with digital services, not necessarily online. These are structured around four categories. We look at information, communication, problem solving, and software-related skills, and we use this concept to develop an indicator, let's say a small composite indicator out of that measure of skill levels of the society. And we have a big skills problem in Europe. We can see that 44% of the population have insufficient skills based on our measurement.

In the skills part, we also look at skills from the point of view of the labor market. So we look at graduate in

science, technology, and mathematics, and we also look at the percentage of people who work as ICT specialist. I understand you may not have that strong focus on the economy in the Digital Economy and Society Index. We have one dimension which purely looks at technologies, information technologies, as they are used by the enterprises with a special focus on small and medium enterprises.

As another dimension, let me mention I work in open data, which was a bit mentioned earlier. We look under the public services dimension on the way how public administrations make data available, how transparent they are, and there (Inaudible) quite a complex framework purely on open data, where we look at the different open data policies of the Member States, we look at the open data portals, how user friendly they are, what capabilities they have, how you can download data, in what format, how can you reuse data, and we also try to capture, to some extent, the impact of open data policies.

This, as most of the data is quantitative in the DAISY, this is an exception here. We rely on a questionnaire which gathers qualitative data around whether a country, for example, has developed a framework to monitor the impact of open data.

So just one last remark. I understand that you do not want to have ranking in this (Inaudible) but one thing that came to my mind was looking at the broad nature of the concept of Internet universality, you may end up with a large number of indicators, and I understand if there is no aggregation in some way, it may be very difficult to develop an understanding quickly about how the country performs.

With the DAISY, we managed to go beyond what we normally can reach with imports from data, and we were very happy that the data went into domains of mainstream media and also to high-level political discussion. I think it helped a lot to influence the way how policies are done in Europe.

Thank you very much.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Balazs, and I think all those experiences will be valuable for this. Thank you very much.

We have time for a couple of comments or questions from the audience. I see one hand there. Please identify yourself.

>> Richard Hill, Association for Proper Internet Governance.

I just had a comment on the human rights. As I understand it, human rights are equal and indivisible. So one

must respect all of them at the same time. Now, of course, in some areas of the world, some rights are more at risk than other rights, and in fact, that also depends on your individual in certain areas, certain races or certain genders are more discriminated against than others. I live here in Switzerland, so there's no significant restrictions on freedom of speech, unless you want to do hate speech, which I don't want to do. On the other hand, I suffer from privacy issues. If I were a female, which I were not, it would be gender discrimination and so on. I wanted to make that point. It's not just those. It's also right to development, right to discrimination, right to freedom from discrimination, and I think those are perhaps more important than freedom of speech. Thank you. Which is not to say freedom of speech is not extremely important.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Richard.

Do we have any remote participants? Okay. So I have -- please, go ahead. Yeah.

>> Okay. My name is (audio cut out)

My name is Haro Pardi. I am from UNESCO. I just wanted to make a suggestion because I worked in the field in Caribbean as well as in Arab states and Asia Pacific. I have specific experience related to many development indicators. I am pretty sure these indicators will not fly if you don't go to at least one or two countries to apply those indicators. It will not work because if you look at it, there are mixed success for millennium development indicators because it has to be owned by the country.

For example, is it (?) it didn't fly, but in (?) it did fly, it flew. The reason is simple. The owners took it to the logical end. This is one thing. That's why after the indicators were finalized, please take it to one or two countries to pretest or apply it.

That's all I want to say.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. In fact, we have an offer here on the table. Okay. Please, go ahead.

>> Good afternoon. Stephen Wyber from the International Federation of Library Associations. This isn't the first meeting on the Internet universality indicators I have been to, so I apologize if the question is something that has been covered elsewhere. But I think the point made by the UNESCO colleague there about bringing things together and looking at one country is particularly interesting. We are looking very much in the library field at what's the right mix of policies, what are the mix of legal and financial and environmental issues that come together to make for a good universal

Internet. And the question was on the base of the indicators put together here, what scope is there to look at the right mix, and what scope is there to try to identify, especially over time, what are the ingredients of success that countries should be looking to put into place in order to make sure that the Internet is truly universal? Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you. Any other comment? Please.

>> Hello. I am UNESCO chair, and I have been following these indicators from the beginning. I particularly like the acronym because I think it sticks.

Working in media and information literacy and having done recently a comparison of policies in Europe, it came to our attention that actually the level of critical Internet literacy in countries is important for indicators, and I wanted to hear what your thoughts were about that because this is really a field that is absolutely lagging and behind, and yet coming to the fore now for the wrong reasons, which are fake news and dark web. How can we do this in a positive way for all young people, but also for the population at large because we haven't reached out to the general public. We do not have a public debate at the moment about Internet Governance and the rest, and I would see these indicators as an opportunity to do a massive critical literacy 101 course worldwide and locally.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Okay. One more, then I will come back to the panel. So please go ahead.

>> Thank you. I just wanted to actually emphasize that point. I think a lot, with a lot of the indicators, even the broader access indicators and others, we are trying to measure things online that we think are desirable that don't even exist offline. So we don't have human rights offline, but we expect them to be online. And I think what actually happens with these kind of digital inequalities is that they are actually amplified online. So they mirror what's happening offline, but they are actually amplified online. And I think the important point about measuring them in countries is not simply that these rights or, you know, opportunities exist or don't exist. That's one measure. But the other measure is how evenly people can exercise those rights, which is very difficult to measure. And yeah, so I think that the vulnerability of people to exercise those rights is an issue even when you have them.

And the other thing that's come up in some of the other consultations, an important thing, is not just measuring the existence of rights or access, whatever it is, but actually

measuring the implementation. And one of the best examples of this is around open data policy, which numerous countries across the world have signed up to but very few actually have.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. I think that you made a very important point about the ability of exercising the rights and not taking the rights for granted just because there are no restrictions.

Okay. I think that we are in time, so I will give the opportunity to each of the panelists to make a very short intervention. When I say short, I say maybe 30 seconds. And I will start to my left, so Mira, please, you are first.

>> MIRA MILOSEVIC: Oh, this is difficult. All good questions. One on human rights, yes, they are all equally important, and not exclusive in relation to each other. I agree on media literacy, and I think a lot needs to be done, and I agree with you, as well, that exercising the rights online is even more difficult than in physical environments. I think I have used my 30 seconds.

(Laughter)

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: You are the best one. (Laughter). Please.

>> JEREMY MILLARD: Okay. I will speak pretty fast. My biggest issue with what I have seen in terms of indicators -- and I realize I hadn't seen the last version, which precisely was what had just been talked about, digital literacy, which I think is extremely important, and it's very challenging. But part of that which no one has mentioned is the idea of co-creation, being online, being able to co-create content, co-create your own software. I am thinking of things like Arduino and Raspberry Pi also hardware as well as software. So I think they are out of scope of what's going on here, but they are critical things, and I won't go into the post-truth discussion. I have views on that as well.

But the one other thing which I think is really missing maybe is related to Internet Governance. We've got along in the last five to ten years with the idea of network neutrality, which I know Obama pushed a lot. I understand it's now being maybe undermined in the new Administration in the U.S. I won't mention any names. But net neutrality basically means that everybody can send their information and receive information on the same basis, and so the big companies and the big interests cannot charge for separate high-speed lanes on the Internet. This is a critical issue, I think. So some of those Internet Governance issues. And some countries have different policies on this. So that, I think, without embarrassing countries, that could be extremely

important as well to look at.

Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. So I will let Anriette to the end, so Alexandre, please.

>> ALEXANDRE BARBAROSA: Thank you. Very quickly, I do agree with my previous colleagues related to human rights, but I would like to add what has been said by UNESCO representative about the need of pretesting the model, and I would also recommend that in terms of data collection, we also apply the multistakeholder approach because there is no single data source for this. We need multiple data producers and multistakeholder is essentially to data producers have the ownership of this process. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Alexandre.

I want to focus on two topics, first the indicators, how to combine which are the right ones. I think we should be humble in this regard. On a global scale at UNESCO or here at WSIS, we cannot decide which are the right indicators for everybody. We should leave a certain responsibility to these local partnerships to decide how do I combine my activities, my strategies, and how do I measure the results through indicators. It's not about right or wrong. It's the question of how they are used.

The second about literacy. Literacy is, of course, one of the most recognized topics in Internet universality and so on. At least is it is one of the issues most regularly addressed, not solved. I want to say literacy is not only about the literacy of the user; it is also very much, maybe even more, about the literacy of the producer because if you produce a report of 300 pages, put it somewhere as a PDF document, do you expect that anybody will read it?

And we had this time when we researched about ten years about the hunger in Africa and how many people have starved. We cannot help them anymore. We should, rather, be very short and timely to provide information that is relevant to solve the problems in the future. So the international organizations and the government and all the partners should rethink their knowledge strategies. How do I provide knowledge that creates value to the partners? Then the Internet makes sense.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Good points. Thank you very much. For the people that are coming into the room for the next session, we will finish in just three or four minutes, so I appreciate your indulgence and patience. We started later than expected. Thank you very much. Yes, yes, I am working. It was just information for the people.

So please, Balazs.

>> BALAZS ZORENYI: I just wanted to mention one last thing in connection with the rights, that on privacy, we have a new research which is a special model in the survey which looks at privacy online, and we found some contradictory or interesting statistics that 73% of people are concerned that their activity online is recorded, but still 71% is happy to provide personal information. And only about one-third of people check whether a website is secure when they provide such information. So there is a lot to do in this area.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much.

So Anriette, could you make some --

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Last words. Thanks, Raul.

So thanks very much for the questions and the input. On the pretesting, we were hoping to build that into this phase of the project. Resources were not available, but I can assure you that both ourselves, as the consortium, and UNESCO are determined to have it done in partnership with others.

What I want to say to people who have responded is use the online consultation platform, and be bold. Tell us what we should prioritize. Be ambitious. We will be the ones who have to do the reality checking on what's possible or not. And think differently. For example, Allison's comment on level of public debate. Think about this. Use the cross-cutting categories. If you feel it doesn't fit your issue, your concern, under one of the R.O.A.M. principles, use the cross-cutting category and tell us what you feel we should be prioritizing.

So thanks very much, and Raul, thanks.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Okay. Thank you very much, everybody. It has been a very interesting discussion. There is a huge challenge now that is not only to process all the open consultation, but also to move from the description of the principles to concrete indicators. We have received a lot of good input today and comments. The links to Sustainable Development Goals, the assumption that we have to live with. The concept of sustainable knowledge societies and the ideas of the local contextualization of the indicators, to be careful that we include all the different aspects that we don't limit that to infrastructure, and there were some examples mentioned about the media, the development indicators. There are other indicators than the ones presented by our colleague from Europe, and there is a proposal of using a couple of countries as a pilot for testing the indicators. There is maybe we have to schedule another day for spending three or four hours on discussing the issue,

but this is another discussion.

So thank you very much, and sorry, my apologies to the organizers of the next session for -- sorry?

>> Can I make an announcement? Thank you, Raul.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Yes, sure.

>> Thank you, everyone. Actually, we are having the next session consecutively. Maybe just in a few minutes because we need to move our second panel to the stage, and please be patient for a few minutes. We are starting the second session about the counter-radicalization and extremism in just a few minutes. Thank you.

>> RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Let me ask for a round of applause to the speakers.

(Applause)

(End of session, 15:10 CET)

<center>***</center>

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

<center>***</center>