PAUL HERMELIN

Chairman & CEO, Capgemini

Good morning. Some people have come back from the break, but so far cyberspace is less popular than Asia. People may be more interested in topics where they see a crisis and potential risks of war. However, we have daily wars in cyberspace so it is worth being paid attention to. I am honoured to facilitate this session. My name is Paul Hermelin and I run Capgemini, which is a large consultancy company based in France. Before joining Capgemini I spent 15 years in public service in France, so I have experience in both the private and public sectors. We have prestigious speakers. We will hear from Mr Carl Bildt of the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Mr Bildt was Prime Minister of Sweden for several years. We will also hear from Mr Chang, who runs a media company in Korea, and Mr Meir Sheetrit, who is a member of the Knesset in Israel. Mr Sheetrit has particularly good knowledge of the security issues that Israel faces.

I would like to start with a little introduction. The name of the session includes the word 'cyberspace'. 'Cyber' refers to cybernetics and robotics. I personally prefer the word 'infosphere' because it is a sphere of information. We should try to address this question in the context of the issue presented to this conference as a whole, namely how to build a global governance? The cybersphere is developing very quickly. It is one of the major determining factors at work in our society in terms of contribution to GDP growth. Most people are not aware of it and it is not something we should be proud of, but the information sphere accounts for 10% of global carbon emissions. That is behind the carbon emissions of transportation and some other sectors, but it is steadily growing. The amount of hours spent online by the world's population is too growing very rapidly. People in the developed world spend more hours in front of their mobile devices and PCs than in front of their televisions. Cyberspace is the primary source of leisure in the developed world.

The infosphere has been a notable agent of change. Information moved at great speed online during the Arab Spring and the Obama campaign used new models of political campaigning that utilised the Internet as an extraordinary vehicle for communication and political conviction to win electoral victories.

What are the key features of the infosphere? First, it is truly shaped and dominated by an innovation flow led by private corporations. The first big development was the emergence of personal computing driven by a combination of IBM, which invented the PC, and Microsoft, which dominated in what was called Wintel at the time. Wintel was a contraction of the words 'Windows' and 'Intel'. Windows was Microsoft's operating system and Intel was the manufacturer of the chips that were found in most PCs.

I watch the audience and most of you communicate through the use of a smart device, such as mobile phones. These are the new interface into cyberspace. We are connected all the time. One of the problems employers face when recruiting younger employees is that young people remain connected even during working hours. You cannot prevent young netizens, in other words citizens of the net, from remaining connected to the Internet at all times. They remain connected to their online communities, such as Facebook or LinkedIn, all the time. They are the innovation drivers.

What attempts have there been at public governance? The media news is full of stories dealing with the post-Snowden earthquake. People probably guessed it was happening, but it was exposed in the open that one of the superpowers was collecting and controlling intelligence from the information flow on the Internet. This has triggered an ongoing shake wave. In the US we therefore have a combination of massive private innovators calling for moderation and an attempt by the US federal government to remain in control and collect and scrutinise data from the Internet. The tools that we call Big Data allow for the collection of massive amounts of data and to extract intelligence from it. The other superpower, China, tries to build barriers and walls of protection to try to be immune to that potential information invasion.

If you look deeper into Internet governance it is very interesting to look at the technical governance of the worldwide web itself. The first body that was created is called the Internet Architecture Board. It was put together by technical people, so the first thing they thought about was how to maintain the integrity of the Internet's architecture. The

second body is the Internet Engineering Group, so still engineers dealing with technical problems. The third body is an attempt to deal with global governance. It is the Internet Society or ISOC. The Internet Society defines itself as a non-profit, non-governmental international gathering of professional members who place themselves in charge of standards, technology, education and policy issues. The people therefore who feel empowered to manage all of the political issues of this gigantic sphere of communication that mankind has invented are a gathering of non-governmental international individuals who think they drive the future of that sphere. I think that is the challenge we face.

In May 2011, President Sarkozy, who was running the G8 at the time, tried to convene an eG8, the E referring to electronic business. I attended that conference and it was a strange confrontation between government representatives and business leaders trying to find a compromise. Frankly, the conclusions of the EG8 were rather limited. The conclusion, as always with these diplomatic documents, was a common agreement that we need to give a new impetus to freedom and democracy – that goes without saying, but why not restate it? – and try to articulate the basic principles of the information sphere. Those principles would be freedom, respect for privacy, respect for intellectual property, acceptance of multi-player governance – which is a nice principle but nobody knows what it truly means – cyber security and protection against crime.

As I said, I attended this conference and there was a very interesting meeting between President Sarkozy and several US business leaders. What is striking is that any attempt to regulate or control the infosphere has become obsolete before the attempt even gets approved at the international level. There was recently an attempt at the EU level to regulate data treatment and transfer as to how data should be handled and transported out of the EU's physical borders. There was an EU summit convened by President Hollande of France and their main decision was that they could not agree on precise principles, so they postponed the question to 2015. That just shows that the speed of international regulation and global governance just does not match the speed of innovation. What is seen as key today will become obsolete very soon. The main challenge of the infosphere is the discontinuity between the majesty of international governance and the way technical innovation blossoms.

Just a few days ago Facebook tried to buy Snapchat, which has no revenues yet. Young Americans use Snapchat to send videos and these videos can sometimes be provocative, so Snapchat came up with an innovation whereby the little video self-destructs after 15 seconds to protect privacy. The rumour is that Facebook offered USD 2 billion to buy Snapchat and the offer was rejected. There are already applications available to instantly copy a Snapchat video to a PC to store it before it self-destructs. That is an example of the speed of innovation and the counter reaction, which makes it very difficult to regulate.

We are in a world of entrepreneurs, small and large. Google is working on the Google car, which will be an automated car, and they are able to do that thanks to their dominant position in the infosphere. Netizens who have been born into this world do not necessarily understand the concept of privacy. I asked my daughter if she felt at risk putting so much information on her Facebook profile and whether she might regret it one day because an employer would have access to a lot of private information. Her answer was that if she did not put that information online an employer would think she is a very secretive person and not hire her. It is a new world with new behaviour.

I would like to end my introduction with something that I find to be a paradox. A few weeks ago, , an impressive list of US companies challenged the US government on the issue of spying on the Internet, which they thought was harming their economic performance. They asserted that people would not use technology they do not trust and that the government had put this trust at risk and needed to help restore it. The companies that issued this challenge were Microsoft, Google, AOL, Twitter, Facebook, Yahoo, Apple and LinkedIn. Therefore all of the Internet giants thought that their business was more important than privacy and security and said to the US government that the ways in which the government was known to try to control and spy on the Internet harmed the trust netizens have in technology provided by those businesses. I do not know how the US society will overcome that contradiction.

Putting global governance at the heart of this conference was absolutely the right thing to do. The main problem we face in the growing influence of the infosphere is how we can build a government that will not just think backward and look to control things but will be able to manage the contradiction between the speed of innovation and the time it takes to attempt to make any rules or regulations that would not destroy innovation.

That is my introduction. I will now turn over the floor to Mr Chang. Today we have representatives from the private sector and representatives from the public sector, who are the potential regulators. Mr Chang, I turn the floor over to you.