IGF Community Public Consultation: Taking stock of the 2018 work programme and 13th IGF and suggestions for 2019 and 14th IGF

Submitted by Marilson Mapa

marilson.mapa@gmail.com   Private Sector – GRULAC

A) Taking Stock of 2018 programming, outputs, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the 13th annual IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?

The usual protection to Internet Service Providers worked very well. The lack of ethics and disrespect to the world population by ISPs, RIRs and Registrars was not discussed, but was premeditatedly set aside as if these companies were not primarily responsible for this tragedy. It is the consecration of the nefarious GDPR. Criminals no longer need to hire Privacy Protection, just write REDACTED FOR PRIVACY on WHOIS. Privacy is required by malicious people. People and businesses do not want privacy, on the contrary, they pay to be known, they need to be known, and the information that would be in WHOIS is on their websites and on social networks.

B) What suggestions for improvements could be made for 2019? (Please focus on programming, the outputs preparatory processes, community intersessional activities and improvements for the 14th annual meeting and beyond.)

Addressing cyber security with seriousness, without hypocrisy. Put in the dock the real responsible for the irritation and damage done to the population. Why without hypocrisy: We all know that people's personal and financial data is worth gold. And this information is eagerly sought after by ISPs with invented scammers. This explains the usual reaction of ISPs to protecting the "owners" of domains denounced for illicit practice. One of the people who became billionaires selling such data runs the risk of having their arrest sought by the US Congress. The other tech giant, called BAADD by The Economist, received a € 1 billion fine from the EU. To discuss cyber security without considering the obvious is hypocrisy, not to say complicity.

C) How could the IGF respond to the recommendations made by the UN Secretary-General during his speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony?

I disagree with the terms used in the main question of Mr. António Guterres: ***"Today, one of our most important questions is how do we keep the IGF relevant?"***

He states in the question that the IGF has been relevant. I assert that the IGF has been omissive. The IoT, Big Data and AI will be run by companies that have been characterized by a total lack of ethics, by illicit activities and an excessive greed. Thanks to the omission of governments and institutions such as the UN, CCE, UCE, ICANN, Scanners ...

D), E) and F)

No Comments