UNITED NATIONS
COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Questionnaire on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Compilation of contributions[1]

1. Review of IGF vis-à-vis Tunis Agenda[2] – paragraphs 72 to 80

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
With regard to paragraphs 73 to 80 we believe that the IGF has mostly done well in adhering to its mandate. Paragraph 80 does need more consideration. It states:

- 80. We encourage the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet as a means to support development efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals.

Regional and national IGFs have emerged, and are growing from strength to strength, but they should make a more concerted effort to reflect on how the internet can support development efforts. The IGF has avoided being a forum that deals with "ICTs for development". It tried to limit its discussion of development to "internet governance for development", a topic that is very difficult to define. We propose a broader approach.

In reflecting on paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda our view is that the IGF has been effective in the following aspects of its mandate:

- 72 a - "Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet".

This is evident from discussions in workshop, and main sessions during the first 5 IGFs.

- 72d - "Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities".

IGF sessions, including workshops, best practice forums, round tables and main sessions, and speakers and participants at these sessions reflect a huge degree of expertise from the above-mentioned communities. The convening of the annual conference of the academic internet network (Giganet) before every IGF every year is further evidence of the IGF's success in implementing this aspect of its mandate.

- 72j -"Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources"

While this discussion has not been exhausted, we do feel that the IGF has, particularly since the Hyderabad IGF, created space for such discussion. Some of the more controversial aspects of this topic, such as the respective roles of governments, business, and other stakeholders in the management of critical internet resources, needs more exploration.

- 72l -"Publish its proceedings".

---

[1] A list of all contributors can be found in Appendix 2 to this document
[2] Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (WSIS-05/TUNIS/DOC/6(Rev. 1)-E)

We commend the secretariat for its excellent work in publishing the proceedings of each IGF, and for using different approaches to the publication every year. However, we think that there is a need for a more concise document that summarises proceedings, and that consolidates key messages that emerges from each IGF. This would make it easier for newcomers to the IGF to have a sense of what was covered at previous IGFs. This is discussed further below.

Aspects of the IGF's mandate which we believe have not been implemented effectively enough are:

- 72b - "Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body".

This has been achieved in part, but not fully. To do so more policy-making bodies need to participate. The IGF also needs to recognise that in the context of the internet:

  – there is increasing overlap between international public policies and and national public policies and the IGF needs to respond to this. An example of this would be policies that impact on access to internet infrastructure, and the freedom of information, expression and association on the internet. Recent shutdowns of the internet ordered by national governments also demonstrates this overlap.
  – the definition of the range of public policies which fit into the broad category of 'internet governance' should not be too narrow, otherwise it will exclude important emerging issues.

- 72e - "Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world".

The IGF has facilitated excellent dialogue on extending access, but not enough policy-makers from developing countries have participated in these discussions. The IGF should consider how it can reach and 'advise' developing country policy-makers (and other stakeholders who can influence access) effectively. Providing advice requires more than dialogue and debate. The IGF should generate advice in the form of messages targeted at the various stakeholders, and policy forums, that can influence access, for example, messages directed at the ITU, at national communications regulators, at mobile telephony and internet service providers, at national governments.

Issues such as public access facilities (in community centres, libraries, schools, etc.) should also be discussed.

The IGF has tended to approach access from a supply perspective, rather than a demand perspective. It needs to considers the public policies that can impact on both demand and supply.

- 72f - "Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries".

Achieving the above is not easy. The MAG has endeavoured to do so through various means, including through introducing 'development' as a main session in the 2010 IGF. But this is not enough, participation from developing countries requires investment of effort many actors, including developing country governments.

We propose that the secretariat and the MAG initiates discussions with developing country governments very early on in the preparation for each IGF. It can use its base in Geneva to invite missions from developing country governments to briefing sessions on the IGF, and on how developing country governments can participate in shaping the agenda through the open consultation and MAG process, and the submission of workshop proposals.

Focused discussions with developing country stakeholders should become part of the preparatory process. To some extent this is happening, e.g. in the case of Latin American countries where there is usually a multi-stakeholder discussion among participants from Latin America present at an open consultation. Other developing regions should copy this model.

Financial support for participants from developing regions need to be increased, and administered in a transparent manner.

We propose in particular that an amount is budgeted to support speakers from developing countries.

A notable success in achieving this mandate has been through regional IGFs in East Africa and Latin America.

- 72g - "Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations".

The IGF has done well in identifying emerging issues but we would like the MAG to be more pro-active in this area. We also believe that the MAG should find a way of making recommendations for follow up on some of these emerging issues. We propose using working groups to develop recommendations on emerging issues that need to be brought to the attention of the general public and relevant bodies.

- 72h - "Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise".

The IGF has made a commendable start in supporting the development of regional and national IGFs which have had a strong capacity building dimension. However, this task has not been systematically addressed and has a rather ad hoc air to it.

- 72i -"Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes".

It has embodied the WSIS principles in its own practices but, in spite of several IGF stakeholders organising workshops on this topic, it has not been addressed sufficiently.

For example, human rights, central to the WSIS principles, remains a sensitive issue at the IGF.

Meaningful multi-stakeholder participation (through, for example, shaping the agendas and outcomes of internet governance processes) in internet governance and public policy processes also needs more focus. Simply having people from civil society, government, parliaments, international organisations, business, and the technical community in one room is just a beginning. A good beginning, but still just a beginning.

- 72k - "Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users".

Excellent progress have been made in some areas, for example in addressing issues such as child protection and online safety. Spam however, has not been significantly discussed since the first IGF. The IGF could also be an important venue to deepen discussion and debate around freedom of expression and freedom of association on the internet, net neutrality, commercialisation of the publicness of the internet, and the impact of intellectual property regimes and trade agreements - such as ACTA (Anti- Counterfeiting Trade Agreement) on access to knowledge, among other issues.

Norbert Bollow:

I think that stronger efforts should be made specifically with regard to making sure that the Internet governance dialogue which happens at the IGF is not conducted for its own sake, but with the strong goal in mind of greater ICT deployment empowering people to achieve freedom from poverty, and with the goal of achieving concrete, measurable results in this regard. It is not enough for the number of people with some kind of Internet access to be increased. Rather, it is important to also explicitly work towards making sure that the desired benefits from greater ICT use will also be achieved.

A friend in Kenya recently wrote to me: "My brief comment on the issue of the Internet is: Many promises have been given but none has ever been fulfilled. Secondly most of the connections are faulty, slow and very expensive." This touches on fundamental issues of integrity which the IGF needs to resolve before it can be truthfully said that the IGF has fulfilled its mandate.

Brazil:

1.1   Brazil believes that fulfilling IGF`s mandate is crucial to the enhancement of the multi-stakeholder environment of the global Internet Governance. In the last five years IGF has succeeded in facilitating an increased trust among stakeholders and has contributed to the arrangement of valuable experiences in capacity building and networking, all topics which are related to itens "d", "h" and "j" of paragraph 72.

1.2   A necessary step to be taken by IGF, however, is related to its mandate listed in itens "a", "b", "c", "f", "g" and "i" in the same paragraph 72. They are all linked to the dimension of global policy dialogue on Internet governance, what should become a clear approach when elaborating IGF agenda. The participation of stakeholders from developing countries and the designing of a clear outcome from IGF are also crucial itens of that deserve further development.

Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA):

The Tunis Agenda lays out the IGF's mandate and objectives at paragraph 72, which are, in summary, to facilitate public policy discourse between relevant stakeholders to foster the sustainability and robustness of the internet, facilitate development, and help find solutions.

The format and structure of the IGF is also laid out in the Tunis Agenda, that is to say a multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent structure that does not have oversight functions but rather emphasizes the complementarity between all stakeholders involved in this process.

The IGF successfully embodies the Tunis Agenda design, and no major changes are required to ensure the objectives of the Information Society continue to be achieved. The mandate, format and structure of the IGF permit Internet operators, such as CIRA, to participate in valuable policy and governance discussions.

CIRA wishes to emphasize the usefulness of the IGF as a platform for dialogue, free from the pressures of negotiations. The spreading of the IGF model to regional and national IGF processes is a witness for its validity. Changes to the IGF's structure could eliminate the technical community as a stakeholder in internet governance developments, which would be detrimental to both the technical community and to the continued development of the Internet.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:

In terms of its principal mandate, the IGF seems largely to be on its way to becoming a unique global forum for multi-stakeholder dialogue on Internet governance. However it is important, for this purpose, to keep up the on-going process of evolutionary innovation evident at each successive IGF meeting. To keep up the interest and engagement of stakeholders it is important that the IGF take up the most pressing global Internet governance issues and seek a policy dialogue on them, with the objective of such a dialogue helping processes of real policy-making in these areas. Overall, IGF's success will be judged by how much it manages to influence these real policy-making processes. If this is taken as the central criterion of success, one can say that IGF is moving towards fulfilling its mandate, but

not quite yet there. It needs to continue to pursue structural evolutions that (1) enable "effective and purposeful policy dialogue" on "issues that require most urgent resolution" and (2) strengthen links with institutions and processes of real policy making.

In this connection, the IGF must extend its effort to "facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet" (paragraph 72(b)) and "interfacing with appropriate inter-governmental organisations and other institutions on matters under their purview" (72(c)). We give some recommendations on how the IGF could do this in sections 2 and 5 below.

The IGF has also not been able to make any significant progress towards fulfilling its mandate under section 72(e) of "advising all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world," and section 72(g) of "identifying emerging issues, … and, where appropriate, making recommendations." Our suggestions for how the IGF might make better progress in these areas follow in sections 3 and 4 respectively.

The IGF has however, had considerable success in at least three areas:

1.   Getting stakeholders with very different worldviews to begin talking with each other, and at least start to see the other's point of view, if not accept it. This is a very important initial step because it is widely recognised that Internet governance requires new and different governance and policy models beyond exclusively statist ones.
2.   Building capacity on a range of Internet governance issues among many newer participants, especially from developing countries with under-developed institutional and expertise systems in Internet governance arena.
3.   Triggering regional and national initiatives for multi-stakeholder dialogue on Internet governance, and forming loops of possible interactivity between the global IGF and these national and regional initiatives.

Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, (a), asks the IGF to "Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet." There can be no doubt that this discussion is beginning to take place. The participation, the increasing quantity and quality of workshops, even the controversies that arise, are proof that this discussion is taking place. The continued interest in workshops is an indication that this process is still dynamically growing and needs to continue so that discussions may cover all aspects of the debate and include all actors, particularly in areas such as rights, inclusion and others, which have not been adequately addressed.

The Tunis agenda also calls for "development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional level" similar to the IGF. As already noted, some national and regional processes are already taking shape. IGF should further encourage such processes and seek to establish formal relationships with these initiatives, including through IGF Remote Hubs.

EUROLINC:
The IGF mandate is stated in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda. It contains 12 points:
a) Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet.
Partially implemented.

b) Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body.
It does occur within IGF meetings to the extent that some people from other bodies attend those meetings.

c) Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.
Same comment as under b).

d) Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities.
It does occur within IGF meetings.

e) Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.
What is the developing world opinion on this item ?

f) Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries.
We have not observed action on this item.

g) Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.
Finally some emerging issues did emerge within the initial thematic framework. No recommendations.
h) Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.
What is developing countries opinion on this item ?

i) Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.
The mullti-stakeholder principle is constantly promoted, with mixed results.

j) Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.
Some taboos, but not all, are now acceptable subject lines.

k) Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.
Nothing substantial we know of.

l) Publish its proceedings.
The preparation of yearly IGF meetings has been rather informal, leaving behind a lump of heterogeneous material. A commendable editing work has been produced by dedicated individuals and resulted in three paper books (as we know). As such their merit is to exist. However, this very demanding achievement is quite difficult to exploit, mainly due to lack of indexing and cross-referencing. Computer based tools are obviously required to leverage the wealth of information delivered within IGF conferences. The IGF structure has not been designed for such a task. We might think of an association with an existing UN organisation for the preparation and the exploitation of IGF conferences (ITU, UNESCO, or others).

European Telecommunications Network Operators Association (ETNO):
The Association of European Telecommunications Network Operators (ETNO) considers the "Tunis Agenda for the Information Society", adopted in the Tunis session of WSIS, as the main reference document setting future global commitments with regards to Internet related issues, relevant to both public and private sectors.
The Association and its members are fully committed to it.

Today it is widely accepted that when it comes to policy on the Internet, a government, or governments, or intergovernmental organisations, cannot proceed alone and that they are one but a very important player in a field with many players. Given the nature of the Internet, if the principle of multistakeholder dialogue is not kept, soon after the evolution of technology or other factors will repeal any policy that is not produced in cooperation with the relevant stakeholders. Yet, much remains to be done and certainly there is room for improvement.

ETNO believes that the continuation of inclusive multistakeholder dialogue is an absolute necessity and the Internet Governance Forum should be utilized for that dialogue. In addition, governments or intergovernmental organisations can become more open as regards multistakeholder participation and more transparent.

UNITED NATIONS
COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Finland:

Finland believes that the IGF has been successful in fulfilling its mandate as stated in the Tunis Agenda. Despite of its young age, it has become an extremely popular platform among all stakeholder groups. Some of the most essential factors behind its popularity derive from its mandate. Firstly, the IGF is primarily a discussion platform with no negotiated, binding outcomes. Secondly, it is completely open and multi-stakeholder. Thirdly, it is organized in a bottom-up manner with the capacity to evolve and improve year by year. These basic principles should be maintained as we discuss the improvements to the IGF.

Furthermore, Finland would like to underline the IGF ´s role as an important catalyst for further discourse, decision making and action in other fora. The numerous regional and national IGF initiatives which have sprung from the global IGF are the best demonstration of IGF´s success. The IGF should not be assessed only by its once-a-year global meeting, but also through the various processes which it has generated at national and regional levels.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):

The Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC) views the established Internet Governance Forum (IGF) process as being very successful in the manner in which it has reached out the broad group of stakeholders in an effort to fulfill its mandate in the Tunis Agenda of being truly "multistakeholder". As an organization representing the business community within the IGF process – this has been critically important to all of our membership.

The emphasis on facilitating multistakeholder dialogue with the very light touch of an independent secretariat has been a success. The contributions and level of meaningful dialogue that this format has fostered over the last five years has been a hallmark of the success of the IGF.

The GIIC also recognizes the continued growth and evolution of the IGF agenda and meetings as an outgrowth of the very organized and open preparatory process each year. As an active participant in this process, the GIIC has benefitted from the opportunity to engage with many different stakeholders in this non-binding, engaging environment designed to foster greater understanding and dialogue.

The GIIC feels that the Tunis Agenda has truly created a new and successful tool with the IGF structure, and we advocate for its continuation in the future.

Hungary:

On paragraph 72.; points a. – l.

The mandate of the IGF has been completely fulfilled. In particular:

a.   key elements: Internet sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development have been high on the agenda of all IGF meetings;

b.-f., h.-i. Cross cutting international policy issues, exchange of information, expertise have been widely considered among the participants: different stakeholders, intergovernmental organizations, delegates from developing countries;

g.   All the emerging issues, e.g. cloud computing, Internet of Things, RFID usage, social networks, on-line payments, etc. are on the agenda of the annual IGF meetings;

j.   A series of discussion were held on critical Internet resources;

k.   Topics of Internet security, use and misuse of the Internet which are of particular concern to everyday users are regularly discussed in annual meetings.

l.   IGF proceedings have been issued.

On paragraph 73.-79.

All requirements have been met. The Internet Governance Fora regarding its working and functioning have been organised and held in a multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent way. IGF has been an unique forum with a neutral, non-duplicative, non-binding process with no involvement in a day-by-day operation of the Internet.

On paragraph 80.
Multistakeholder processes, meetings and discussions have been developed at national, regional and international levels in order to support further economic and social developments and objectives including the IADGs.

ICC BASIS:
The IGF preparatory process has been successful in obtaining input from a diverse collection of stakeholders and implementing changes and enhancements to the IGF meeting on a continuous basis.[3] The IGF meeting agendas have evolved in response to community input and format changes have been made to accommodate remote participation and the emergence of regional and national IGF meetings.[4]

The IGF is addressing the items in its mandate in paragraph 72-80 of the Tunis Agenda, and facilitating multistakeholder dialogue that is inclusive and meaningful. It has also continually evolved and improved. The IGF's lightweight independent secretariat and decentralized multistakeholder preparatory process has proven to be effective. It serves as a process, which discusses, facilitates interfaces, advises, strengthens and enhances, identifies, contributes, promotes and assesses, helps and publishes.[5]

Substantive discussions take place on all issues including those that foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet, and accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world, critical Internet resources, security and privacy issues and the use and misuse of the Internet.

The IGF is, in and of itself an excellent human and institutional capacity building opportunity on a wide range of complex policy issues, best practices and the policy approaches and choices that impact them. And, every year new issues are being brought into the process. One cannot help but come to an IGF and leave having gained insight and knowledge.[6]

Every IGF brings together organizations engaged in cross-cutting international public policy issues, and participants learn about their work programmes and activities, the status of discussions on particular issues, and those on the horizon.

A wide range of stakeholders who connected at the IGF are now actively involved in the work of other organizations. This is an important value add for all. Not easy to measure but still very real.[7]

Many stakeholders have commented that it is a 'one stop shop' for them to get information, make contacts, share experiences and develop their understanding.
Excellent outputs include: the real-time transcripts of the sessions, the Chairman's report, substantive inputs and the synthesis and background papers. Additionally, the archives of information provide an important ongoing resource to all stakeholders.
This unique forum offers us all a chance to speak, but also to listen; it allows us to discuss all relevant topics candidly. It maximizes all participants' time by increasing their understanding instead of negotiating texts, which is a major strength.
The IGF is also a catalyst for change, and new opportunities for cooperation, collaboration and coordination.

Participants have become more receptive to each others' perspectives and concerns. As participants have adapted to this open environment, we have seen rhetoric reduced. In turn, we benefit from more informed decision-making by all.
The mechanism by which the forum operations, consistent with paragraph 73 of the Tunis agenda enables an evolving framework that builds on existing structures, emphasizing the

---

[3] Tunis agenda para 72
[4] Tunis agenda para 72
[5] Tunis agenda para 73, 74, 77, 78
[6] Tunis agenda para 72
[7] Tunis agenda para 72, 79

complementarity between all stakeholders, and ensuring a lightweight and decentralized structure, while enabling preparatory processes to make use of logistical support.[8]

We are pleased to see the UN Secretary General has periodically reported to UN Member states on the operation of the forum, and has through the UNGA resolution extended the Forum's mandate.

We believe the IGF's effectiveness stems from its unique constitution as a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process that enables the participation of all stakeholders. It has no oversight function and does not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations but does involve them to benefit from their expertise. Of course, it is important to also recognize that diverse matters relating to Internet governance continue to be addressed in other relevant fora.

The Tunis agenda was ahead of its time in recognizing that multistakeholder processes would evolve at the national, regional and international levels – and that these are an important contribution to the Millennium Development Goals.

India:
Introduction: An examination of the specific mandates given to the IGF in section 72 of Tunis Agenda will reveal that most of them refer to a policy-related role (72a, b, c, e, g, i, j, k), and some to a capacity-building role (72 d, f, h). While recognizing that there is some degree of overlap between the two functions, recommendations for improvements to the IGF should separately address these two different roles of the IGF.

Global Public Policy Issues: The Internet is inherently a global phenomenon, whose strength and value lie in its inclusiveness and global connectivity. For the same reasons, the economic, social, cultural and political impacts of the Internet are growing quickly and exponentially, necessitating urgent and important global public policies in many diverse areas. Governments and other stakeholders require an appropriate policy forum where key global Internet policy issues of common concern are discussed inclusively and different policy options debated, with tangible movement towards effective policy development processes that redress these shared concerns. The fact that there is no effective and inclusive global policy forum to address these important emergent issues was firmly recognised by the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS process, and the IGF was set up to fill this critical gap, to some extent. It is recognized today that if the internet is to grow in its role as a powerful catalyst for global connectivity, openness, freedom and socio-economic development, timely addressing of global public policy issues of common concern is a vital necessity. The primacy of the policy-related role of the IGF over its capacity-building functions is, therefore, important to keep in mind when seeking improvements to the IGF. This is especially so in view of the fact that the capacity-building role has perhaps been more in focus in the first five years of the IGF's existence.

Capacity-building: India believes that the IGF has succeeded in good measure in bolstering the capacities of various stakeholders through open and inclusive dialogue, awareness generation, dissemination of information and best practices, national and regional initiatives etc. The IGF's open, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent character has significantly contributed to such capacity-building. While a promising beginning has been made in this regard, much more needs to be done to enhance capacity-building, as pointed out in the UN Secretary-General's Report of 7 May 2010 on the 'Continuation of the Internet Governance Forum'.

Conclusion: While the IGF has achieved some success in capacity-building, it has not done as well in contributing to public policy making, especially global public policy making. It has struggled to evolve an effective format and methodology to make meaningful contributions to global Internet-related public policy. We are, therefore, of the view that it is this area of less-than-satisfactory progress that the recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the IGF should largely focus on.

---

[8] Tunis agenda para 73

A more detailed review of the IGF's performance vis-a-vis specific elements of IGF's mandate as provided in para 72 of the Tunis Agenda, from our perspective, is given below:

REVIEW OF SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF THE TUNIS MANDATE AND SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS:

72   (a): Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet.

The paragraphs preceding para 72 of the Tunis Agenda mandating the creation of a "new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue—called the Internet Governance Forum" clarify the context and purpose of the creation of the IGF and make it amply clear that the key remit of IGF is to deal with global policies in the area of the Internet. It is also clear that the primary mandate of the IGF is to identify gaps in addressing significant global Internet-related public policy issues. This is also reiterated in para 4 of the UN Secretary-General's report, which states: "The main function of the Forum is to discuss public policy issues relating to key elements of Internet governance, such as those enumerated in the Tunis Agenda".

Recommendation: In order to meaningfully realize the IGF's mandate in this area, such a global policy dialogue should, in the first place, identify and place on the global agenda, key global Internet-related public policy issues of common concern and interest. There should be focused debate on these specific issues among a wide range of stakeholders, eliciting different views and opinions. Thereafter, existing convergences and divergences on specific issues should be identified and attempts made to synthesize recommendations on areas of convergence, while delineating specific alternative options on issues where there are multiple views. These should then feed in to multilateral and other policy-making processes, to ensure that the IGF makes tangible contributions to global policy-making on internet-related issues. This would, in our view, ensure that the high quality of discussions and the valuable contributions in the IGF discussions are appropriately factored into policy- making and are not allowed to go to waste. By focusing on meaningful outcomes in specific areas of public policy, the IGF would be bringing in value-addition and contributing productively to the global discourse on internet governance, as envisaged under the Tunis Agenda.

72   (b): Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body.

This two-fold mandate of the IGF makes it clear that the IGF's role is to: (i) link various agencies and bodies dealing with disparate but inter-related internet-related issues by bringing them together on a common IGF platform to dialogue with one another, and (ii) to proactively identify and initiate deliberations on issues that are not being addressed by any agency. We believe that this is a very important element of the IGF's mandate since the Internet impacts in some way or other, almost all economic, social, cultural and political spheres of life. This gives rise to many cross-cutting policy issues which simultaneously fall in the remit of more than one existing public policy-related global/ international body. The IGF has been given the specific role of facilitating discourse between these bodies on such cross-cutting issues. In our view, the IGF has not specifically addressed this mandate. While representatives of some of these bodies may be attending the IGF, what is required is to put in place specific formats and procedures to get all relevant bodies together around specific cross-cutting policy issues, so as to facilitate a focused dialogue and possible ways forward on addressing these issues.

Recommendation: This will require sufficient preparatory work to be done in engaging with the concerned bodies sufficiently in advance with regard to the specific policy question(s) that are sought to be discussed. It may also require developing background material, including through requesting the services of subject-matter experts. Once an engagement among the concerned bodies is ensured at the IGF in a format that facilitates clear focussed discussions towards possible outcomes, it will be necessary to sum up the discussion, identifying areas of

further work while feeding the required inputs into appropriate internet policy-related bodies. Since policy issues are often complex and do not get resolved in a single meeting, but require a sustained engagement, it will be necessary for the IGF secretariat and its core management/ preparatory body (the MAG at present) to maintain sustained contact with the relevant bodies, including requesting reports on progress on the concerned policy issue within these bodies.

72   (c): Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.

This mandate flows from the previous one, but builds further on it. It specifically identifies 'intergovernmental organisations' and 'other institutions' and asks the IGF to interface with them on 'matters under their purview', which widens the scope of issues to all internet policy-related issues, not just cross-cutting issues. In our view, the IGF needs to do more in regard to this very specific and clear mandate.

Recommendation: As elaborated in the preceding recommendations, we believe that to fulfil this mandate, the IGF needs to discuss internet-related key policy issues currently being dealt with in various 'intergovernmental organisations' and 'other institutions' into the IGF's multi-stakeholder policy dialogue for focused deliberations and take the outcomes of this dialogue back to these bodies for their consideration, consistent with their respective processes.

a)   Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities.

We believe that the IGF has delivered well on this mandate. The IGF's unique multi-stakeholder, inclusive, democratic and transparent character has contributed greatly to the free exchange of information and dialogue among competent experts from the academic, scientific and technical communities.

Recommendation: To further optimize on the diverse expertise and rich dialogue in the IGF, as suggested by the UN Secretary-General in his Report, it is recommended that: (i) There should be a more streamlined format for the meeting, with clear and strong linkages between the workshops/'Dynamic Coalitions' and the main sessions. (ii) Discussions should be focused on specific and clearly defined themes (iii) There should be more synthesis of discussions, with delineation of recommendations or alternative options. (iv) The exchange of information and best practises should be documented in a better way to ensure their durability and enable more purposeful use by different policy actors and other stakeholders (iv) Provide for more equitable participation and representation of stakeholders, especially from developing countries, both in the preparatory processes in MAG and in the IGF to enable a more inclusive dialogue and exchange of best practices.

b)   Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.

This mandate recognizes the global inequities with regard to access and affordability of the Internet and highlights IGF's special responsibility towards the developing world by specifically tasking it to propose ways and means to enhance the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world. Keeping in view the importance of this task, we believe that while some progress is being made at the IGF lately to bring development issues in focus, much more needs to be done to realize this critical element of the mandate.

Recommendation: Currently, there is no format or process in place whereby the expertise shared at the IGF and insights coming from its discussions, can be shaped into a set of 'advices' or recommendations towards spreading and fostering the Internet in developing world, as mandated by this sub-section of paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda. To be able to do so, the IGF needs to not only focus more on development issues, but also design the

necessary processes whereby it can shape and deliver the necessary advice, as mandated. A proposed format/process is attached in the enclosed annexure[9].

72 (f): Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries.

With its inherently multi-stakeholder and open format, the IGF has enabled, to a great extent, an inclusive and broad-based dialogue among different stakeholders. However, nominal openness and inclusiveness should be converted into a substantive one by extending 'protective discrimination' to ensure proportionate representation of groups that otherwise suffer structural exclusions. It has been acknowledged, even in the UN Secretary-General's Report that the participation of developing countries (both governmental and non-governmental) in the IGF is not adequate, and it needs to be enhanced and strengthened, as this part of IGF's mandate specifically requires it to. This is even more true of various marginalised groups coming from these countries. Remote participation cannot be considered as a substitute to the physical participation and engagement of developing countries and their stakeholders. Some specific suggestion regarding this are provided in the section below.

Recommendation: (i) As mentioned in the UN Secretary-General's Report, a better funding mechanism with enhanced funding should be put in place to enable greater participation of developing countries in the IGF and its preparatory processes. A special Fund could be created for this purpose. (ii) Provide innovative educational and training resources on a range of internet issues to enhance developing country expertise in the area (iii) Avail the services of relevant intergovernmental and international organisations in delivering customized technical assistance in this area to developing countries.

72   (g): Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and where appropriate, make recommendations.

The Internet and today's global, Internet-mediated society, is a fast-changing phenomenon. Very important policy issues get thrown up at a bewildering pace, and due to the essentially global nature of the Internet, most of these issues are global in nature, that require to be addressed/resolved at a global level. The Tunis Agenda clearly recognises such a context and imperative vis a vis global Internet Governance, and therefore, specifically mandates the IGF to take note of such emerging issues, and address them adequately and in a timely manner. Recognising that the IGF is not a policy-making body, it clearly mandates the IGF to furnish its recommendations on such emerging policy issues. However, the IGF has, thus far, been unable to come up with any such recommendations, or even develop internal processes to be able to do so. In our opinion, this is an area of most significant under-performance for the IGF in its first phase, and the Working Group's Report should recommend improvements to the IGF in this area by outlining specific measures to enable the IGF to fulfil this mandated role.

It may help to clarify that 'emerging issues' here clearly means 'emerging policy issues' (as per earlier text of section 72 of Tunis Agenda; for instance, the opening sub-section 72a mandates the IGF to 'discuss policy issues') and not just cutting-edge technology issues in themselves. This point is being made here to highlight that there are often 'emerging policy issues' in areas which are technologically mature. Certain issues can still be of emerging importance to developing countries long after they have technologically 'emerged'. Global inter-connection regimes, for instance, which was identified as a key public policy issues by the WSIS, has not ceased to be a key issue that still requires to be addressed adequately. In fact, more complexities may have been added to this issue vis a vis global network neutrality-related issues. A policy issue remains 'emerging' until it has been resolved to some significant extent, or, at the very least, processes of addressing it are well under way.

Recommendation: Some may take the view that the mandate for the IGF to provide 'recommendations' is only with regard to a very small set of 'emerging issues'. The above discussion, however, should make it clear that this mandate is rather broad, and extends to all

---

[9] See Appendix 1 of this document

unaddressed current and emergent policy issues, which still await satisfactory resolution. The term 'emerging' is mentioned in the Tunis Agenda not to limit the recommendation-giving role of the IGF to a few cutting-edge technology areas, but to highlight the fact that in the area of Internet Governance, new policy issues keep emerging at a rapid rate, and the IGF should be alive to recognising and addressing them in a dynamic manner. The IGF should devise its format and processes in a manner that would enable it to fulfil this central aspect of its mandate. A proposed format is in the annexure.

72   (h): Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.

Participants from developing countries have simultaneously benefited from participating in the IGF and also contributed substantially to its proceedings. As the mandate clarifies, IGF's capacity-building function should not be limited to a one-sided transmission of expertise from the North to the South. It has to be an equal and mutually beneficial dialogue that also benefits from the 'local sources of knowledge and expertise' from developing countries. IGF's mandate gives clear and specific guidelines as to how the IGF format and process should be shaped, to ensure adequate and equal participation of diverse sources and forms of knowledge, especially from developing countries.

Recommendation: While the IGF has developed an open and participatory format which attracts expertise and participation from diverse areas, more needs to be done to enable diverse participation from developing and least developed countries.   The format and preparatory process have to be suitably modified, as indicated in the annexure. Some other specific recommendations in this regard have been made with regard to para 72 (f) above.

72   (i): Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.

WSIS identified many high principles that should inform information society policy and practice generally and Internet governance in particular, specifically in the Geneva Declaration of Principles and other WSIS outcome documents, including the Tunis Agenda. In this sub-section, the Tunis Agenda clearly mandates and authorizes the IGF to play a watch-dog role vis a vis the adherence of broader global processes on internet governance, to the globally accepted WSIS principles.

Recommendation: The IGF should have an express role and set up the required format and process to assess and report on how different Internet Governance processes are aligned with WSIS principles. (i) One way of doing this would be to have one session dedicated to this discussion in each IGF meeting. In this session, representatives of intergovernmental and other organisations engaged in particular aspects of internet governance can be invited to brief the IGF about the processes underway in their respective organisations and to what extent they are aligned with WSIS principles. The IGF discussions pursuant to these presentations can be distilled into observations/recommendations that can be fed back into these organisations for consideration. This should also be included in the IGF's report that is submitted to the CSTD and ECOSOC for its consideration, since CSTD is the focal point in the UN system for follow up of WSIS implementation. (ii) A Working Group can be set up under the MAG to assess and report on this aspect of the mandate to the annual IGF.

72   (j): Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.

Whereas the mandate of the IGF extends to all Internet-related policy issues, the Tunis Agenda specifically highlights the need to discuss issues related to critical Internet resources. We are glad to note that after initial hesitation among some stakeholders in the first two years of the IGF, discussion on critical internet resources is now on the agenda of the IGF.

Recommendation: We note that critical internet resources represent only one part of a large gamut of global public policy issues related to the Internet. However, critical internet resources represent a very important public policy area that requires continued engagement, and the IGF must seek to address the specific policy questions that arise in this area.

72   (k): Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.

This sub-section mandates the IGF to keep the context and needs of everyday Internet users in focus. The IGF should help find solutions to the diverse issues that everyday users regularly face, many of which have global dimensions. Such issues of everyday use of the Internet that are global in their implication do not have any forum for addressing them, especially in case of users from developing countries, since most of global Internet business is based in the North.

Recommendation: To be able to fulfil this part of the mandate, the IGF will have to put in place a more deliberate and focussed strategy including coming up with appropriate policy recommendations in these identified areas, related to everyday use of the Internet. The suggested process in the Annexure may be seen.

72 (l): Publish its proceedings.

Recommendation: While a Chairman's summary of the IGF proceedings is published at present, and it serves as an important resource, more specific policy-related outcomes will need to be published, and forwarded to the concerned bodies, with a view to fulfilling the various parts of IGF's mandate as discussed above. Such a report also needs to be submitted to the CSTD, ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly.

Internet technical and academic community
The Tunis Agenda specified that the IGF:
"in its working and function, will be multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent".[10]

The Tunis Agenda further specified that the IGF would:
"(f)acilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body".[11]

It was also convened in such a way that:
"The IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process. It would have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet".[12]

The IGF mandate is clearly defined in paragraphs 72.a through 72.l of the Tunis Agenda. As an open and inclusive process for Internet public policy dialogue, it encourages all stakeholders to engage freely in discussions, share information and best practices, build bridges and strengthen relationships among themselves.

See below for a selection of examples demonstrating how the IGF has met its mandate, as per Paragraph 72, in its first five years.

Paragraph 72	Examples of how the IGF has met the specific mandate
a. Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the	Public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance have been a key theme of IGF main sessions and workshops since its first meeting in 2006. These discussions have fostered the identified elements in the development of the Internet, as individual participants

---

[10] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 73
[11] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72.b
[12] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 77

Internet.	return to their home organizations and put into practice what they have learned in an incremental way.
b. Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body.	Issues that do not fall into the scope of any existing bodies have been discussed at IGF. For example: - Cloud computing, with its associated cross-cutting public - policy issues related to security and privacy - The stability of the Internet. In particular, the ISOC-ECLithuanian workshop in 2010 on threats to the stability of the Internet5 brought together representatives of the Internet technical community—including RIRs and content providers (Google)—government officials, regulators, etc., to discuss this topic of vital concern. A typology of problem types was identified, as well as areas for future work. - Child online protection. At a number of IGFs, there have been main sessions and workshops that have enabled a sharing of experiences and best practices and measures taken in different countries. - · Social networks. The complex interaction of policy issues pertaining to privacy, data sharing, retention and security.
c. Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.	Intergovernmental and other organizations can and frequently do interface with the IGF by: - Participating in the IG preparatory processes (through written submissions, at face-to-face Open Consultations, or through remote participation options at Open Consultations). - Organizing workshops in areas of their expertise at the IGF. - Producing reports for their members on their activities and analysis of discussions at the IGF. - Perhaps there could be greater efforts by the IGF MAG and Secretariat to disseminate invitations to participate in the IGF to appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.

d. Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities.	The IGF has been able to facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and make full use of experts through:
	- The process of open calls for workshops, which facilitates workshop proposals from the academic, scientific and technical communities. For example:
	  • Every year since 2007, the ccTLDs, through CENTR, have coordinated a workshop where the main topic is to share information on ccTLD best practices.
	  • Root server operators have also held regular workshops to exchange best practices in DNS operations.
	- Encouraging multistakeholder representation in all main sessions and workshops
	- The organic bottom-up development of Dynamic Coalitions
	- Engaging stakeholders from these communities (for example, ICANN, RIRs, ISOC, etc) in providing financial and in-kind support of the IGF to facilitate the attendance of relevant experts.
	- It is clear that the technical community, as the main

	producer of technical and operational Internet expertise, is one of the most active contributors to the IGF process.
e. Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.	Access has been one of the main themes in all IGF meetings with main sessions and workshops held to discuss, in particular, issues pertaining to availability and affordability of Internet access in developing countries. For example: - There have been workshops on Internet exchange points (IXPs) almost every year. - Discussions on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) at IGFs[13] have contributed to the implementation of IDNs in several countries around the world. - There have been workshops on the advantages of open standards and open source software with a focus on accessibility, affordability, and inclusiveness.[14] - The APC, with the business and technical community, has also conducted a workshop to identify a possible new approach to development.[15]
f. Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries.	Open Forums The IGF holds Open Forums, which allow existing Internet governance mechanisms to strengthen and engage new stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, in their processes. At IGF 2010, there were the following Open Forums: ▪ Arab ICT Organization ▪ Council of Europe ▪ ICANN ▪ ICC (International Chamber of Commerce) ▪ OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe) ▪ UNESCO Diverse approaches to engaging stakeholders Fellowships and support from DiploFoundation, ISOC ambassadors, remote hubs, and youth-focussed activities are all way in which stakeholders who support the IGF have assisted in bringing new stakeholders into the process. IGF Village In addition, the IGF Village, a collection of stands highlighting Internet related activities and organizations, has also been a more informal way of engaging IGF participants in the activities of related Internet governance organizations. Regional and national IGFs

---

[13] For example, "Arabic Script IDNs: Challenges and Solutions", IGF 2009, http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/chronocontact/?chronoformname=Workshopsreports2009View&curr=1&wr=90

[14] For example, "Open Content and Open Licensing in the Arab World: Opportunities and Challenges Facing their Use and Applicability", IGF 2009, http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/chronocontact/?chronoformname=Workshopsreports2009View&curr=1&wr=103

[15] "Reaching the Next Billion(s)", IGF 2008, http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/workshops_08/main_access.htm

	As was pointed out many times at the first CSTD WG on improvements to the IGF, regional and national IGFs have been an invaluable way to engage new stakeholders in Internet governance mechanisms. In many cases, regional IGFs have spun off national IGFs: this is a clear case demonstrating the success of enhancing stakeholder engagement in Internet governance processes at many levels.
g. Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.	Each IGF holds a main session on emerging issues. Emerging issues identified in the past include: ▪ Cloud computing (IGF 2010) ▪ Impact of social networks (IGF 2009) ▪ Web 2.0 (IGF 2007) There is also the opportunity for workshops to discuss emerging issues, with many workshops focusing on the above emerging issues. An example of this discourse between different bodies in a workshop setting was the ISOC-ECLithuanian workshop in 2010 on threats to the stability of the Internet.[16]

h. Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.	At each IGF, there have been a number of main sessions and workshops aimed specifically at capacity building in developing countries:
	- To assist building capacity with regard to the overall IGF process, there is a Setting the Scene main session to begin each IGF
	- There are specific workshops conducted. For example, to name just two of the many capacity-building workshops at the most recent IGF in Vilnius:
	  • Best practices as a way of building capacity - what has actually been done to solve specific problems
	  • The Internet and FOSS: Applications and Challenges for Africa

i. Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.	The IGF embodies the WSIS principles, so through its own activities promotes the use of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes. The themes of the main sessions at the IGF are also an embodiment of the WSIS principles. In addition, the IGF has included a number of community-organized workshops that examine and encourage the use of WSIS principles. For example: ▪ Implementing the WSIS Principles: A Development Agenda for Internet Governance ▪ Code of good practice on participation, access to information and transparency in Internet governance, Version 1.0
j. Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.	Since the first IGF in Athens, critical Internet resources have been discussed as part of the main sessions as well as in workshops. This has included management of IP addresses, domain names, IDNs, and root servers, etc.
k. Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday	Since its inception, the IGF has included a number of workshops on issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet that are of particular interest to everyday users, including:

---

[16] IGF Workshop 28 Report: Priorities For The Long-Term Stability of The Internet, 2010, http://www.isoc.org/pubpolpillar/docs/20101007_igf-workshop.pdf

users.	- Child online protection - Threats to the stability of the Internet - Freedom of speech on the Internet To build on the foundation workshops have created in this area, perhaps the IGF could elevate such issues to main sessions perhaps a year or so after they appear in workshops. The "Emerging Issues" session could be used as the initial step into main session status.
I. Publish its proceedings.	Over time, the IGF has refined its publication of proceedings to the point where it now publishes: - Chair's summary - Transcripts of main sessions and workshops - Video archives of main sessions and workshops - Reports from workshops and open forums - Annual book of proceedings In addition, the preparatory proceedings for the IGF are also published: - Submissions to open consultation meetings - Summary of preparatory discussions (both open consultation and MAG meetings) - Transcripts of preparatory discussions (both open consultation and MAG meetings) - YouTube interviews with a range of IGF participants

We also believe that the IGF has been able to successfully fulfill its mandate due to its unique model as defined by the Tunis Agenda. In particular, it:

- Has effective working modalities and procedures that are multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic, and transparent.[17]

- Is a forum that does not negotiate decisions:[18]
As a forum that does not need to negotiate text and resolutions by the end of the event, the IGF successfully enables free and open exchange of information, knowledge, and practices by all participants.

- Is supported by multistakeholder voluntary funding:
As stated in Paragraph 78a of the Tunis Agenda, the IGF has drawn upon "any appropriate resources from all interested stakeholders". As well as financial contributions, many stakeholders have contributed in-kind resources to the IGF. This voluntary funding and inkind sponsorship acts as an effective feedback mechanism. Diverse funding from a cross- section of the multistakeholder participants who form the IGF community demonstrates that the IGF is of value to the wide spectrum of stakeholder groups.

- Is led by an independent Secretariat[19] based in Geneva where the Internet policy networks and the history of the WSIS lie:

An independent Secretariat has enabled all stakeholders to feel they can trust the Secretariat to be unbiased and not unduly influenced by any one interest.

- Has inspired national and regional efforts to establish multistakeholder processes on Internet governance:

---

[17] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 73
[18] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 77
[19] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 78b

The establishment of national and regional IGFs, while not formally tied to the IGF, is one of the most important achievements of the IGF. Because of the success of the multistakeholder IGF model, stakeholders have chosen to replicate the model for Internet governance discussions at regional and national levels. National and regional IGFs are also an embodiment of Paragraph 80 of the Tunis Agenda, which encourages, amongst other things, development of multistakeholder processes at the national and regional levels.

The democratic, transparent processes specified in the Tunis Agenda to facilitate multistakeholder dialogue are essential to maintain open communication among participants. It is important that these founding principles be maintained as the IGF moves forward.

Iran:
1.   The global policy dialogue role of IGF as mentioned in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda is important. However, the contribution of the IGF towards international management of the Internet along with the principles mentioned in paragraph 19 of the ECOSOC Res. 2010/2 has not been clear and should be enhanced.

2.   IGF mandate is primarily to fill a gap at global level multistakeholder dialogue on Internet governance and should not be limited to regional or national levels.

IT for Change:
Paragraphs 72 to 78 of Tunis Agenda that deal with Internet Governance Forum (IGF) are prefaced with a number of paragraphs that lay out the context in which the IGF was created. These preceding paragraphs express the concerns of the world community regarding the important global Internet policy issues that have remained unaddressed, and the need to move forward on these, including through new institutional developments. It is important to situate the rationale and the mandate of the IGF in this context. Paragraph 72, which lays out the mandate of the IGF, is also clear on its primary global Internet policy role. It is therefore vis a vis IGF's contribution to global Internet policy making that its success should be evaluated and, accordingly, improvements in the IGF sought.

The second role of capacity building that is also associated with the IGF is an area where it has done quite well in its first 5 years. This significant achievement of the IGF should be noted in the report of the Working Group (WG) on improvements in the IGF. However, the main parts of the report should concern itself with areas where the performance of the IGF has been less that satisfactory, in which context alone the needed improvements can be suggested. This, in our view, is the clear mandate of this WG.

Specific sub-sections of paragraph 72 speak about the role of IGF in discussing key policy issues, giving relevant advice and recommendations in different policy areas, interfacing with international organisations concerned with IG issues and facilitating a discussion among them on important policy issues. It is difficult to see any significant achievement of the IGF in most of these mandate areas related to its primary role of contributing to global Internet policies. These required functions of the IGF should dictate the needed improvements in the IGF.

Lithuania:
Lithuania believes that IGF fully complies with the mandate and objectives set in Tunis Agenda.
Lithuania considers that there is some space for improvement in the areas related to par. 72(b), 72 (f), 72 (g) and 72 (k) of the Tunis Agenda.

Marilia Maciel:
It is useful to start by commenting on Agenda items in which the IGF worked well – points that should also be encompassed in the final report of the IGF WG - and then focus on the ones that need improvement.

The most positive aspect that needs to be mentioned is the openness of the IGF. Openness can be understood here in a broad sense, which encompasses:

a) Low barriers for participation. There is no need for accreditation and any interested person or organization can attend the meetings

b) Multistakeholder space for policy-dialogue. The IGF is a unique environment in which all the sectors involved with internet governance can share their views and concerns, and exchange best practices (TA, par 72, d; par 73, a). The benefits of multistakeholder dialogue have been widely recognized by the IGF community, such as: the rich content of the debates, the ability to leave behind entrenched viewpoints and engage in true dialogue, strengthening internet governance regime by developing a common culture, a common terminology and guiding principles.

c) The high level of transparency of the IGF, vis-à-vis other organizations. Webcast and captioning is available is all meetings (IGF and preparatory meetings). Videos and transcripts are archived in IGF website for future reference (par 72, l)

d) Openness to innovation and flexibility. This was fundamental to allow the emergence of bottom-up initiatives, fostered by the community, such as the creation of dynamic coalitions, remote participation and the emergence of regional and national meetings (par 80)

Nonetheless, there are some points encompassed in the mandate in which there is room for improvement. They are commented in detail below:

If we take into account the mandate set forth in par 72a and examine the programs of the IGF meetings during the past five years, it is possible to notice that a considerable number of relevant issues have been addressed. Topics that were at first considered too sensitive, such as the Management of Critical Internet Resources, were gradually included in the agenda.

Nevertheless, the report of the WGIG[20] has enumerated a number of public policy issues that are relevant to Internet Governance and some of these issues still need to be mainstreamed in the Forum, such as: interconnection costs, meaningful participation in global policy development, intellectual property rights and consumers' rights.

Although the programme of the IGF has been decided in an open manner by the IGF community along the years, during open consultations and MAG meetings, the obstacles to include developing countries in the process of agenda-setting have lead to an unbalanced participation on the discussions. This may help to explain why some of these public policy issues - which are key to development- have been overlooked.

This leads us to the need to strengthen and enhance the engagement of developing countries in Internet governance mechanisms in order to fulfill the mandate set forth in paragraph 72 d. Some ways to enhance the participation of developing countries will be discussed below, such as: improving remote participation, conducting more meetings online throughout the year, providing fellowships to attend the IGF, strengthening capacity building (par 72, h) and outreach.

If it is true that the IGF has been a valuable space for policy dialogue of many internet governance issues, as mandated by par 72 a, it is also necessary to acknowledge that this space has been insulated from other bodies in the Internet governance ecosystem. The IGF has not interfaced appropriately with intergovernmental organizations and other institutions, as mandated in paragraph 72 c and paragraph 77, nor has it consistently facilitated the discourse between bodies dealing with cross-cutting international public policy issues regarding the Internet, as mandated in paragraph 72b.

It should be acknowledged that, on the one hand, the lack of clear outcomes from the discussions that take place in the IGF render the task of establishing dialogue with other bodies more difficult, and have made it impossible to fulfill paragraphs 72, items e, g and k. On the other hand, it is important to stress that other bodies in the IG regime, particularly in

---

[20] Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance. June, 2005. Available at http://www.wgig.org/docs/WGIGREPORT.pdf

the UN system, have not been proactively involved in the IGF discussions and have not provided enough support, which could have been valuable to improve several aspects, such as capacity building.

Regarding the institutional aspect, it is important to notice that although paragraphs 73 b (put in place a lightweight structure for the Secretariat) and 78 b (establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau) have been implemented, it is necessary to evaluate if the human and financial resources available to date are sufficient to carry out the tasks of the Forum, particularly after implementing the improvements under discussion by the Working Group.

WSIS principles:

When it comes to an assessment of the embodiment WSIS principles in Internet governance processes (par 72, i), the result is mixed. First of all, the Geneva Declaration does not state clearly what the WSIS principles are. Chapter B named "An Information society for all: key principles" is more dedicated to establishing goals in several areas (ex: infrastructure, access to knowledge, etc). Some general principles could be inferred from the text, such as "29. Each person should have the opportunity to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge in order to understand, participate actively in, and benefit fully from, the Information Society and the knowledge economy". In addition to that, it is not clear how the IGF would have resources to assess the embodiment of these general principles in other Internet governance processes.

It should be mentioned that most of the IGF community has understood that the WSIS principles are the ones embodied in article 48 of the Geneva declaration (which corresponds to article 29 of the Tunis Agenda) and in article 31 of the Tunis Agenda[21] Paragraph 29 reads:

"(...) The international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations. It should ensure an equitable distribution of resources, facilitate access for all and ensure a stable and secure functioning of the Internet, taking into account multilingualism."

Paragraph 31 reads:

"We recognize that Internet governance, carried out accordingly to the Geneva Principles, is an essential element for people-centered, inclusive development-oriented and nondiscriminatory Information Society. Furthermore, we commit ourselves to the stability and security of the Internet as a global facility and to ensuring the requisite legitimacy of its governance based on the full participation of all stakeholders, both from developed and developing countries within their respective roles and responsibilities."

Paragraph 29 enumerates several important principles, which have been well advanced in the IGF, such as transparency, multistakeholder participation and democracy. Important discussions have been also advanced about how to foster access and multilingualism.

When it comes to paragraph 31, more needs to be done to integrate the IGF in the effort to build a people-centered and development oriented Information Society, and to include developing countries in the Internet governance ecosystem.

In addition to that, we believe that these principles are not immutable. There should be continuous discussion about defining the "WSIS principles", which can change or be enlarged throughout the years, by a more comprehensive reading of the guiding WSIS Documents, and by a careful examination of the dynamics of the IGF. Principles that may have emerged during the last five years need to be captured, summarized and publicized in a concise document, such as a chart of principles.

---

[21] This was the approach followed during the session "Internet Governance in the light of the WSIS principles", which took place in IGF Egypt, in 17 November 2009. The transcripts are available in <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/2009/sharm_el_Sheikh/Transcripts/Sharm%20El%20Sheikh%20 17%20November%202009%20IG%20in%20Light%20of%20WSIS.pdf>

Bottom-up initiatives such as the attempt to develop a "code of good practice on information, participation, and transparency in Internet governance"[22] and national models, such as the Brazilian "principles for the governance and use of the Internet"[23] should be carefully examined, as they may help to shed some light on how to make the WSIS principles more concretely embodied in the IG processes. The development of a chart of principles was also supported in the IGF 2010 in Vilnius.

To sum up, we believe the measures taken to improve the IGF should be based on three fundamental goals:

1)   To allow the IGF to be an important and integral part of the process of public policy making regarding Internet issues, since "the main function of the Forum is to discuss publicly policy issues relating to key elements of Internet Governance"[24]
2)   The urgent need to increase the participation of developing countries and key-players Who have not been involved in the IGF process so far and to mainstream development concems in the agenda
3)   The need to see the IGF as a process, that should take place constantly throughout thin year, in face-to-face meetings or online

Nominet:
Through the WSIS process, it was clear that there were different approaches to, and understanding of, Internet governance issues. This was recognised in the Tunis Agenda with the recommendation for the creation of the Internet Governance Forum, unanimously agreed by all governments, as a way of helping improve our shared awareness of different approaches to shared issues.

The mandate for the IGF, which built on experience in the WSIS discussions, was important to finalising the Internet governance section of the Tunis Agenda. This was recognised in the UN General Assembly resolution which renewed the mandate of the IGF:

"17. Decides to extend the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum for a further five years, and in this regard, invites the Secretary-General to continue with the convening of the Internet Governance Forum for a multi-stakeholder policy dialogue on Internet governance issues according to its mandate as set out in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, while recognizing at the same time the need to improve it with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global internet governance;"

We believe that this confirms that the mandate identified in the Tunis Agenda for the IGF is fundamental to the success of the IGF. In particular the mandate ensures that the IGF provides a unique forum in bringing together governments and other stakeholders to improve the shared understanding of Internet governance issues.

As we noted in our earlier contribution to this review, the IGF has, over the last five years:

a. Built a community actively engaged in sharing good practice and developing an understanding of the opportunities and challenges of the Internet. As an example of an initiative, we have developed the Nominet Internet Awards to identify examples of stakeholder-led work that that contribute to a safe and accessible internet, used to improve lives and communities. We are aware of other initiatives from other countries that also focus on solution-led good-practice sharing.

---

[22] The code states, among other things, that; "all information Which is relevant to Internet governance and decision-making should be open and publicly available; that Internet governance entities should broadly publicize opportunities participation in the Work and policy-making of their organizations, and that the development and administration of Internet policy and standards generally be open, transparent, and inclusive". http://WWW.ape.org/pt-br/projects/code-good-practice-information-participation-and-t
[23] Available at < http://WWW.cgi.br/english/regulations/resolution2009-003.htm>
[24] Note by the Secretary-general on the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. A/65/78-E/2010/68, paragraph 4

b. Developed national and regional outreach and cooperation between different partners.
We are involved in the UK-IGF, just one example globally of developing engagement in the IGF process.

c. Embedded the IGF multi-stakeholder cooperation model in many different (and diverse) regions and countries. The UK-IGF is a national example. Nominet and the UK more generally are also involved in initiatives in Europe (EuroDIG) and the Commonwealth, and we have worked in partnership with the East Africa-IGF.

d. Promoted shared understanding of issues and an appreciation of different partners' viewpoints. In particular, we welcome therespectful and informed dialogue that now characterises most discussions.

These are significant achievements, but they are also work in progress: we welcome that the IGF has continued to evolve over its short life and we believe that this responsiveness will continue to be important.

The WSIS recommendation placed a responsibility for implementation on all stakeholders, including governments. Many governments have taken this responsibility seriously and have committed significant effort and resources to ensuring the success of the IGF. Together with other stakeholders, they have helped shape the IGF and, over the five years, it has been encouraging to see the development of active engagement.

This engagement is important: we believe that participants benefit most when they getinvolved in the discussion and share preparation and results with their own communities. This can be seen as a major stimulus for the development of national and regional IGFs, which greatly expand the outreach of the IGF.

With in the mandate of the IGF, the IGF has evolved in response to the interests of the stakeholders engaged in the process. We would expect that, as the IGF outreach develops, the nature and focus of the IGF will move in response to specific interests. The IGF has shown itself to be responsive to "new" issues, by which we mean, to enable discussions in response to interests of stakeholders. We would hope that developing engagement will lead to broadening the agenda.

Norway:
Norway is of the opinion that the IGF in general has proved to meet its mandate as laid down in the Tunis Agenda in a satisfactory way. The basic principles including IGF's primary function as a discussion arena for all stakeholders should be maintained. We also believe that the question of accountability of the different stake-holder groups should be more focused as the IGF continues.

We welcome the increasing number of regional and national IGF initiatives which is a good way to facilitate new ideas and new issues which could later be brought up to the yearly IGF.

The IGF as a non-negotiating body without binding outcomes must be maintained.

Portugal:
The mandate of IGF, as established in paragraph 72, was completely fulfilled. In fact:
a)   Public policy issues of the Internet sustainability, robustness, security and stability have been thoroughly discussed;

b)   In IGF meetings, bodies dealing with international public policy issues regarding the Internet have extensively participated in the sessions and frequently as organizers of workshops;

c)   The same happened with inter-governmental organisations on matter pertaining to IG;

d) Information and best practices have been fully exchanged with intense contributions of the academic, scientific and technical communities;

e) The questions of how to improve the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world have been extensively addressed;

f) The engagement of stakeholders, including those from developing countries, progressed positively, and IGF triggered a wide movement of creation of regional and national fora in all continents, including in developing countries;

g) Emerging issues have been identified and brought to public attention, e.g., including, among many others, social networks, cloud computing, mobile e-commerce, Internet of Things;

h) By fostering the exchange of best-practices and knowledge IGF has contributed to capacity-building for Internet Governance in developed and developing countries; of particular relevance to this point is also the wide movement of creation of regional and national IGFs mentioned above;

i) The WSIS principles in IG have been a constant presence;
j) Critical Internet resources have been discussed in all IGF meetings;

k) The problems and possible solutions to issues arising from the use or misuse of the Internet have been extensively addressed, such as, among many others, questions of access, privacy, data protection, security, ciber-crime, freedom of expression, digital literacy, access to public sector information;

l) The proceedings have been published.

All requirements mentioned in paragraphs 73 and 77 have been met, in particular the IGF has been a neutral, nonduplicative and non-binding process, without any involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet. All stakeholders and relevant parties have been invited to participate at the inaugural meeting of the IGF, taking into consideration balanced geographical representation. As called for in paragraph 80, multi-stakeholder processes developed at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet as a means to support development efforts to achieve internationally-agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals.

Social Aid of Hellas:
Tunis Agenda has put the foundations and the bases of a globally shared IGF.
But we have to add that from the time of the Agreed Tunis Agenda ,our global society has changed and for that reason it is necessary that an up-to-date new Discussion has to be organized in order new priorities for a global IGF be promoted and established.

South Africa:
Paragraph 72 of the Tunis agenda highlights discussion, interface, facilitation, advice, assessment as key elements of the multi- stakeholder dialogue. Although the IGF has to a large extent attempted to cover these, there are still some limitations in evidence. These limitations are very closely linked to the debates and discussions that occurred during the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS).

During the WSIS process a lot of compromises were arrived at and this included the establishment of the IGF. What, however, became clear both during the course of the debate and after the adoption of the Tunis Agenda and Plan of Action, was the fact that many parties interpreted the definition and scope of Internet governance in different ways.

Firstly there were those parties who were of the view that Internet governance should be limited to three areas: that is management of the address and domain name systems, technical standardization and some service related issues. Those espousing this view felt that

the current or existing methods of Internet self-regulation are sufficient and should not be tampered with.

The second view expressed the need for global governance and favoured a new international governance mechanism in relation to financing the deployment of and access to the Internet and in relation to its international framework.

The third view expressed the need for transformation, but wanted a more specific focus on issues of migration from circuit switched to IP based networks, and the progressive convergence of traditional telecommunications, broadcasting and Internet services in areas such as broadband, entertainment and mobile services of the future.

Why is this relevant? The above divergences lie at the heart of some of the perceived and real weaknesses in the functioning of the IGF today. Because diverse actors still hold certain views about what constitutes Internet governance, this has subtly crept into the debates around IGF and has largely influenced its agenda and processes. In order to effect a change of mindset, the various stakeholders need to move from the mindset of utilizing IGF as a platform for entrenching their beliefs to addressing some of the critical issues outlined in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda. Although, to a certain extent, some of the actions outlined in this paragraph have been addressed the efficiency in doing so has been largely hampered by the ideological starting point held by the diversity of stakeholders.

What all stakeholders agree on does deserve highlighting. All stakeholders do and did agree with the WSIS assessment that a vacuum exists in the Internet landscape and that there was and still is a need to encourage a space for dialogue on issues related to the Internet. Furthermore, most stakeholders were in agreement that the creation of this space for dialogue could open the way for addressing current and emerging issues which are cross–cutting and affect a cross section of institutions. For this dialogue to be effective, however, it is important that certain factors be recognized and although some of these have been highlighted at the level of the IGF they remain a challenge. Innovative means of addressing these challenges are therefore required.

South Africa is of the view that the mandate of the IGF should remain as it is presented in paragraph 72 and suggest the following improvements:

a)   Recommendation: The Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) should solicit public views on the issues that should be tackled in the agenda of the IGF. Some issues need not be discussed in consecutive meetings of the IGF. The themes of the IGF should be guided by main public policy issues.

b)   Recommendation: Consideration must be given to online discussion on various cross-cutting issues as a means of facilitating discussions amongst various bodies. Another way of doing this is through national and regional IGFs to keep the momentum as the IGF is only held annually. Inter-regional IGF interaction must be encouraged.

c)   Recommendation: The standard practice of involving intergovernmental organisations must continue.

d)   Recommendation: Publish all research work and distribute to governments, libraries, research institutions and other institutions of higher learning.

e)   Recommendation: Development issues have yet to receive the priority they deserve. All development issues should be clustered under a sub-theme that would seek to address them. This would make it easier to compile a complete record of all interventions made on this subject.

f)   Recommendation: Financial constraints have been cited as one of the obstacles preventing developing countries from participating in the IGF. The UN should also contribute towards funding developing countries. Modalities for the establishment of such a funding mechanism need to be elaborated. Awareness/Outreach activities and programmes could also be another way of dealing with sensitising developing countries

about Internet governance and its contribution to development as it has been reported that many developing countries are not exposed to Internet governance issues.

g) Recommendation: In line with paragraph c above, IGF should continue interfacing with relevant intergovernmental organisations. IGF should make the recommendations/advice/message forwarded to any intergovernmental body public on their website. Matured issues that have been subject to exhaustive discussions such as standards, accessibility, and human rights may necessitate the establishment of regularised processes or structures.

h) Recommendation: The focus of capacity building activities will depend very much on the gaps identified by developing countries. The African continent for instance has identified issues of accessibility, affordability, multilingualism, infrastructure development, amongst others. These should then inform the nature of capacity building needed by developing countries

i) Recommendation: None (Achieved)

j) Recommendation: These issues will only be discussed substantially if we have representatives from all stakeholders providing in depth analysis. At present, only few views have been heard about this particular issues and it is quite a sensitive topic that requires fair discussion and allocation of time.

k) Recommendation: None (Achieved)

Sri Lanka:
The IGF has been very successful through its innovative concept of dynamic coalitions in discussing a host of issues related to internet usage and has to some extent met the requirements of Mandate 72g and 72k. Some dynamic coalitions have however not been as effective as one would have expected. Although the dynamic coalition on open standards came up with a series of recommendations, there seems to have been little progress in disseminating these recommendations and persuading national governments to adopt them.
Mandate 72a is to discuss public policy issues related to key elements of internet Governance, but the IGF has regretfully not been proactive in discussing the issues of global internet governance and its democratization. This mandate is strengthened by further mandates 72b, 72f, 72i and 72j. However there has been very little discussion within IGF on this issue and particularly on the effect of the Joint Project Agreement between ICANN and the US Government on global internet governance. While some progress has been made on mandates 72d, 72e, 72h and 80 which are important for the developing countries, much more has to be done to ensure that the benefits of the internet are available to marginalized sections of the developing world and that a meaningful contribution is made by the Internet to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals.

Sweden:
In line with the UN adoptions in point 1-3 above we have found as follows.

The Internet Governance Forum has during the years showed that things have evolved considerably since its start.
The numbers of participants from government, private sector, civil society and technical community has increased and this will, for sure, continue to evolve.
The IGF has also played a role as a focal platform and encouraged regional and national IGF meetings and processes, which increases international inclusiveness as well as local and regional multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity building.
The remote participation has increased and the Forum has promoted a dialogue and mutual understanding and helped to clarify issues that seemed very complex and confusing at the outset.
New and future issues have been regularly identified and discussed from several perspectives: political, technical and societal.

Things are discussed in an informal manner and experiences are shared in a truly multi-stakeholder environment.

Sweden also believes we must maintain the bottom up, multi-stakeholder preparatory process which has demonstrated capabilities for self-improvement. This power of "self development" pushing evolvement and capacity building is something remarkable and gives energy for engagement for stakeholders in future improvement processes within the IGF process itself!
We want the CSTD working group to follow and take this into consideration in their discussions and work with the development of the IGF.

SWITCH:
72. We ask the UN Secretary-General, in an open and inclusive process, to convene, by the second quarter of 2006, a meeting of the new forum for multistakeholder policy dialogue—called the Internet Governance Forum (IGF). The mandate of the Forum is to:

a. Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet.
Partially met. What we are missing is an open and transparent discourse between those parties opposed to the currently established bodies concerned with planning, organization and management of key Internet resources, structures and issues and those bodies currently in charge. This discourse should in addition take place with the participation of all concerned stakeholders.

b. Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body.
Partially met, could be improved. Examples: Better inclusion of social media, stronger outreach to bodies like WMO, WHO, etc.

c. Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.
Most intergovernmental organizations are now aware of the IGF and participate where appropriate.

d. Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities.
The IGF is a superb institution for such exchanges – much has already been achieved.

e. Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.
We think the general awareness for the needs of developing countries has been enhanced by the introduction of the IGF. ISOC is doing a remarkable job in this area too, with strong local groups in the developing countries which ensures the sustainability of the efforts.

f. Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries.
Difficult to answer: On one hand the IGF, due to its limited mandate and power can only issue recommendations and raise awareness to certain issues. An example would be accessibility and connectivity issues brought to the attention of Internet service providers. On the other hand, most of the current pending issues, like cybercrime, privacy and security are in their impact not limited to developing countries. The IGF is still in the progress of addressing these topics.

g. Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.
The IGF is a superb institution for such exchanges – much has already been achieved.

h. Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.
Should be answered by developing countries.

i. Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.
The IGF has been primarily created for this purpose and it is fulfilling its objectives.

j. Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.
Ongoing. Still not fully understood by most stakeholders.

k. Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.
The IGF is a superb institution for such exchanges – much has already been achieved, more can be done.

l. Publish its proceedings.
Done.

73. The Internet Governance Forum, in its working and function, will be multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent. To that end, the proposed IGF could:
a. Build on the existing structures of Internet governance, with special emphasis on the complementarity between all stakeholders involved in this process – governments, business entities, civil society and intergovernmental organizations.
b. Have a lightweight and decentralized structure that would be subject to periodic review.
c. Meet periodically, as required. IGF meetings, in principle, may be held in parallel with major relevant UN conferences, inter alia, to use logistical support.
All (a, b, c) achieved. The lightweight and decentralized structure has proven a great asset and should be kept for the future.

74. We encourage the UN Secretary-General to examine a range of options for the convening of the Forum, taking into consideration the proven competencies of all stakeholders in Internet governance and the need to ensure their full involvement.
Achieved. Remote participation is possible as well as fellowship programs available.

75. The UN Secretary-General would report to UN Member States periodically on the operation of the Forum.
76. We ask the UN Secretary-General to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in formal consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and to make recommendations to the UN Membership in this regard.
77. The IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, nonduplicative and non-binding process. It would have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet.
Achieved.
78. The UN Secretary-General should extend invitations to all stakeholders and relevant parties to participate at the inaugural meeting of the IGF, taking into consideration balanced geographical representation. The UN Secretary-General should also:
a. draw upon any appropriate resources from all interested stakeholders, including the proven expertise of ITU, as demonstrated during the WSIS process; and
b. establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau to support the IGF, ensuring multistakeholder participation.
The proven expertise of the ITU has in our opinion already been incorporated and could possibly be continued; the secretariat is already lean and cost-efficient and should remain so; multi-stakeholder participation is established, both in the MAG and in the fora.

79. Diverse matters relating to Internet governance would continue to be addressed in other relevant fora.
They do. Examples are ISOC, ITU, WIPO, ICANN, RIR's, ccTLD's, gTLD's, registrar communities, access and service providers to name just a few.

80. We encourage the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the

Internet as a means to support development efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals.
Achieved. Since its creation many national IGF's and several regional bodies have merged. This trend seems to continue. The incorporation of the national and regional bodies in the global IGF is a challenge and solutions should be found. We doubt that the IGF is the best forum to reach the Millennium Development Goals, except for goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development, where the IGF could contribute within its limited mandate and power.

United Kingdom:
The UK Government believes that the IGF has both fully met the criteria laid down by the Tunis Agenda for a multi-stakeholder forum and, moreover, exceeded the original expectations of Tunis. This is demonstrated by the emergence of so many complementary national and regional multi-stakeholder fora since the Athens IGF.

The IGF has been consistently supported by representatives from all stakeholder communities and governments including developing countries, with diverse participation. The IGF has successfully achieved its mandate in identifying and advancing key global public interests issues pertaining to the Internet by bringing together in a non-negotiating forum - often for the first time - the key actors and policy experts in a way that has in some cases very usefully reduced contention and promoted better understanding of respective positions.

The value of the bottom up process of setting the agenda has been demonstrated by the consistently high number of workshops. We strongly believe that the wealth of information about solutions and best practice collated and showcased in these workshops has proved to be extremely valuable for the participants in informing policy decisions and promoting cooperation and collaboration at the national and regional levels.

UNESCO
UNESCO acknowledges that the current IGF format meets all the important points of the Tunis Agenda paragraphs 72-80. We are satisfied of the way the IGF "interface(s) with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview" (paragraph 72 c)) and consider UNESCO has the opportunity to input in its areas of competence to the IGF. We are also reporting back to our constituents on developments at the IGF.

With regards to the IGF's capacity building function (paragraph 72 h)), we would, however, question whether the approach of mainstreaming the capacity building function into every session will actually lead to the expected results. As often, the mainstreaming approach might well lead to overseeing this important IGF aspect. One idea would be to require from the organizers of any session, to provide participants in advance with introductory summary paper, to inform less experienced participants about the topic, give leads to more sources of more information and lay a common foundation for the session. These introductory papers could well be put together in an IGF publication after the event.

More generally, we believe the IGF needs to continue catering with special introductory and capacity building sessions to newcomers. Educational resources for awareness raising and capacity building initiatives need to be developed, systematically promoted and used. Another idea would be to set-up an IGF e-learning environment, in which interested participants can acquire knowledge at distance and in an interactive way.

United States of America:
The United States believes that the UN Secretary-General, the IGF Secretariat, and the Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group have fully executed the responsibilities laid out in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda and should be commended for their work.

a. The multi-stakeholder IGF model has delivered progress on challenging policy issues, such as critical Internet resources and the internationalization of the Internet, and it is now driving a greater focus on the development goals of access and affordability.

b. These issues have been undertaken by a diverse mix of bodies with distinct responsibilities that migrate to the IGF to meet with other groups whose interests overlap or intersect with their own. This was exemplified at the 5th IGF in Vilnius, Lithuania, when UNESCO and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers agreed to work together to further strengthen multilingualism in cyberspace and facilitate the successful implementation of internationalized country code top-level domains.

c. The IGF has consistently served as a gathering point for relevant intergovernmental agencies including, among others, the ITU and OECD.

d. The exchange of information and sharing of best practices are the functions the IGF does best. The list of workshops from any of the past IGFs reveals an impressive array of speakers from the technical, scientific, and academic communities sharing their expertise on matters ranging from cybersecurity to green technology to IPv6 migration. It is this exchange of ideas that has secured the IGF's reputation as the premier forum for fostering the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet.

e. The issues of access, affordability, and diversity of the Internet in the developing world have been hallmarks of main sessions and scores of individual workshops every since the IGFs inception. The main session from Vilnius focused on access to infrastructure and access to content and considered a range of issues from geo-location, the global reach of social networks and the linkages between access to knowledge and security solutions, both in terms of hardware and software. It was pointed out on several occasions that emerging economies will soon have more Internet users than Europe and the United States, and addressing the needs and priorities of these new users was of utmost importance.

f. The stakeholders for Internet governance mechanisms including ICANN, the RIRs, and other members of the technical community, have long been participants in, and advocates for, the IGF. This will not change as long as the IGF remains true to its core principles. Moreover, Internet governance in developing countries has long had a primary role in the IGF. As the Chairman's Summary from the Vilnius IGF states, "Internet Governance for Development has been a crosscutting priority of the IGF since the first meeting in Athens in 2006. For the 2010 meeting it was introduced as a new theme for a main session.

The session explored the possible effects of global Internet governance arrangements on the development of the Internet in developing countries. The discussion considered the institutional processes and substantive policy outputs of governance arrangements and whether these may raise developmental concerns that have not received sufficient attention to date.

The session looked at the meaning of Internet governance for development (IG4D).
Among others, the following points were made:
- Internet governance for development
- Needs to be understood from the perspective of a sustainable development that meets three needs: social equity, preserving the environment, and economic efficiency;
- Is governance that adequately and proportionally represents developing countries in its mechanisms and processes;
- Must enable innovation in developing countries;
- Advances the development of the Internet in developing and transitional countries and promotes Internet enabled development;
- Takes a global view and is governance for both the developing and developed worlds.

g. The flexible and adaptive nature of the IGF agenda ensures that this forum stays on the very forefront of emerging Internet policy issues. In Vilnius, for instance, the emerging issues main session was devoted to technical and policy issues related to cloud computing. Past "emerging issues" include the digital divide, Web 2.0, environmental

sustainability, and the impact of social networks. Discussion of all of these issues have deepened as the IGF has progressed.

i. The IGF, more than any other institution, promotes the the embodiment of WSIS principles of an information society for all.

j. Discussion of Critical Internet Resources has been a prominent part of the IGF from its inception. In Vilnius the discussion centered on the status of IPv6 availability around the world, the internationalization of critical Internet resources management and enhanced cooperation, the importance of new TLDs and IDNs for development, and maintaining Internet services in situations of disaster and crisis. The United States believes that the IGF is the appropriate forum for sharing views of CIR and will remain fully engaged in these discussions.

k. Through a variety of workshops and main sessions, the IGF has made considerable progress towards creating a safe online environment for Internet users across the world and building capacity among government and private sector leaders to establish cybersecurity policies in their respective domains.

l. The IGF has done an exemplary job of publishing its proceedings and just as importantly, making them universally available. The Chairman's Report, transcripts of workshops, and webcast archives are all available online and without charge for participants and non-participants alike.

73. The Internet Governance Forum, in its working and function, will be multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent. To that end, the proposed IGF could:

a) Build on the existing structures of Internet governance, with special emphasis on the complementarities between all stakeholders involved in this process – governments, business entities, civil society, and intergovernmental organizations.

The IGF has been quite successful in this regard. The event continues to attract a wide array of stakeholders from a well-balanced array of countries who are able to discuss pertinent cross-cutting Internet policy issues.

b) Have a lightweight and decentralized structure that would be subject to periodic review.

The United States is supportive of the existing "light touch" arrangement between the IGF Secretariat and the United Nations. We support the continued presence of the Secretariat in Geneva and its absence from the United Nations budget. We would view any changes to this arrangement as unwise.

c) Meet periodically, as required. IGF meetings, in principle, may be held in parallel with major relevant UN conferences, inter alia, to use logistical support.

The IGF has met at the global level once a year, which we believe is appropriate. As discussed further in paragraph 80, the emergence of regional and national IGFs have proved a helpful complement to the existing global schedule.

74. We encourage the UN Secretary-General to examine a range of options for the convening of the Forum, taking into consideration the proven competencies of all stakeholders in Internet governance and the need to ensure their full involvement.

The IGF has been convened in an appropriate manner given the proven competencies of all Internet governance stakeholders. Moreover, these stakeholders have been given ample opportunity to provide input into the forum and to construct the agenda and nature of workshops as they desire.

75. The UN Secretary-General would report to UN Member States periodically on the operation of the Forum.

The IGF has operated in a thoroughly open and transparent manner. UN Member States have been fully informed on the operations of the forum.

76. We ask the UN Secretary-General to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in formal consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and to make recommendations to the UN Membership in this regard.

The UN Secretary-General was extremely thorough in soliciting feedback and opinions from all interested parties on the extension of the IGF. A questionnaire was circulated at the 2009 IGF and subsequent surveys and live consultations were held within ECOSOC and the UN Second Assembly. Based upon the overwhelming support of the IGF, the UN General Assembly adopted a Resolution on "Information and communications technologies for development" on 24 November 2010, which called for the unqualified renewal of the IGF for an additional five years.

77. The IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative and nonbinding process. It would have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet.

The IGF has appropriately avoided any involvement in the day-to-day technical operations of the Internet or oversight of the many unique organizations that are charged with the Internet's core functions. However, what the IGF has done is provide a forum for these groups to meet and discuss important cross-cutting issues and to strengthen the arrangements and mechanisms that exist between them. The IGF is in fact the only place where the international business, government, civil society, and technical communities can gather in a multi-stakeholder fashion to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet. This key aspect of the forum must be preserved.

78. The UN Secretary-General should extend invitations to all stakeholders and relevant parties to participate at the inaugural meeting of the IGF, taking into consideration balanced geographical representation. The UN Secretary-General should also:
a) draw upon any appropriate resources from all interested stakeholders, including the proven expertise of ITU, as demonstrated during the WSIS process; and
b) establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau to support the IGF, ensuring multistakeholder participation.

Official statistics from the fourth IGF in Sharm el-Sheik indicate that the Secretary-General continues to be extremely successful in attracting a wide array of stakeholders from a well-balanced array of countries. To wit, of the 1400 participants, governments represented 28%, civil society 19%, followed by the technical and academic communities with 18% and the private sector with 17%, and intergovernmental organizations accounting for approximately 10%. The International Telecommunication Union has been one of many expert stakeholders which have made the IGFs successful. As for geography, 32% of the participants at the fourth IGF came from Africa, 27% came from Western Europe, 19% came from Asia and Oceania, 12% from North America, 5% from Eastern Europe and 5% from Latin America and the Caribbean.

79. Diverse matters relating to Internet governance would continue to be addressed in other relevant fora.

There are several other relevant fora that continue to address matters relating to Internet governance, including but not limited to: UNESCO, OECD, APEC, ITU, the RIRs, IETF, W3C, and the Government Advisory Committee of ICANN. We believe that the variety of fora is appropriate given the decentralized nature of Internet governance and the vast number of issues that it includes.

80. We encourage the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet as a means to support development efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals.

One of the true successes of the IGF over the past five years has been the proliferation of national and regional IGFs which have taken root in all corners of the globe. These fora are tangible proof that the Tunis Agenda's call for the development of multi-stakeholder processes has been answered. The multi-stakeholder process of Internet governance has resonated in countries and regions with varying levels of development and Internet penetration. As a result, national and regional IGFs encourage strengthen dialogue between governments, civil society, business, and the technical community that can be specifically tailored to address their most pressing development goals and objectives.

2. Improving the IGF with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance as directed by the UN General Assembly Resolution on "Information and communications technologies for development" (adopted on 24 November 2010)

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
As the internet increasingly impacts all facets of our lives, our discussions must increasingly include a broader set of stakeholders. As such, the IGF should have a clear liaison role with regard to international processes and institutions that deal with internet governance, AND with ICTs for development. Examples would be regional UN economic commissions, international organisations such as the ITU, WIPO, and the WTO (to mention a few).

Norbert Bollow:
This is very important. The IGF needs to create "outcome" documents which document consensus where it exists, and which document the spectrum of differing reasonable viewpoints where reasonable disagreements exist. These "outcome" documents need to be actively promoted for consideration in the various national and international decisionmaking processes. Otherwise many stakeholders in particular from developing countries who really should be participating in the IGF will not do so, because as long as the IGF has so little obvious influence on visible policy-making processes, the IGF does not appear important enough to justify the necessary effort for overcoming the significant difficulties (in terms of scarcity of resources) of participation in an international conference.

In addition, information should also be collected and made readily available to the IGF community on where in the various policy-shaping processes, use is made of IGF outcome documents. Here policy-shaping processes include not only activities of national and international government entities, but also other stakeholders and groups of stakeholders who may choose to take the IGF outcomes in consideration in directing some of their activities.

Brazil:
2.1   Brazil understands that the mentioned UNGA resolution reflects the will of the community of states that IGF meets its mandate specified in paragraph 72, itens "b", "c", "e", and "g". Such items are all related to the establishment of an effective communication from IGF to other fora, organizations or relevant stakeholders whose actions or discussions clearly impacts issues on global policy aspects of Internet governance.

2.2   The absence of a clear and concise outcome from IGF undermines the engagement of stakeholders and can jeopardize IGF itsef inasmuch as, in the long run, stakeholders tend to direct their funds and human resources to the participation in dialogue processes or organizations from which a clear outcome can be expected. This perception is even more clear to developing countries. For example, since the IGF preparatory process takes place in Geneva, the participation of developing countries is much more expensive and time consuming than the participation of developed countries.

2.3   "Shaping the outcome of IGF meetings" is crucial to IGF fulfill its mandate. There is a clear need to develop an inclusive, transparent, "neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding" process (paragraph 77) aiming at the elaboration of a clear and concise IGF meeting outcome, that could reflect the convergence and diversity of opinions on global policy issues of Internet governance.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
A side-effect of the IGF's reluctance to develop output documents, and to evolve processes suited to developing these, has been its relative insularity in the Internet governance regime. Other institutions of Internet governance are unable to consider any concise outcomes of the IGF discussions as inputs into their own deliberations. As such, the IGF, whilst not irrelevant to those who participate in it, has proved less relevant and significant to outsiders than it deserves.

This points to the need to create mechanisms so that IGF outcomes are appropriately connected to the processes of other IG institutions. For example, just as at the Vilnius IGF meeting online moderators helped to bridge between online and offline discussions, so too there could be rapporteurs whose job it would be to summarise relevant discussions at the IGF and to forward them to external institutions, and to receive feedback from those institutions.

Ideally these summaries would include both main sessions and workshops, since much of the valuable discussion at the IGF takes place in the latter. Alternatively, they could be limited to the main sessions provided that a better mechanism for feeding the output of workshops back into main sessions is realised (this is explored in section 8 below).

A emerging model for this process (though other possible models may also be explored) is found in the "messages" or "recommendations" produced by national IGFs such IGF-D (Deutschland), and regional IGFs such as the East African IGF and EURODIG. Ideally this would become a two-way process in which the institutions addressed could also turn to the IGF with issues they wished the IGF to address through multi-stakeholder dialogue.

More detail of possible mechanisms for recording outcomes from the IGF process are considered in section 4 below, and more specific means of linking with other organisations dealing with Internet governance are considered in section 5 below.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
In ETNO's view, the most important objective of the IGF is to create a true forum for dialogue and exchange of information on internet governance, public policy issues and furthermore to establish a reliable global basis for a cooperative, pluralistic dialogue that embraces all stakeholders. Much of the success of the IGF stems from its open and inclusive character and its multi-stakeholder nature. This success also relies on the non-decisive, non-binding character (of the IGF), which allows all parties to explore difficult issues without political tensions and to speak freely. Such an approach is essential in dealing with the challenges the Internet faces, and will assist in taking advantage of the opportunities it presents for further economic and social development. It can be stated that so far IGF has lived up to these expectations and has actually created a platform for this open exchange of opinions and possible solutions for existing tasks.

The evolving IGF agenda clearly shows how the process of the annual IGF, and the national and regional IGF initiatives, serve as a forum for linking all stakeholders and respective organizations into a network of dialogue around Internet governance.

In our view, no other mechanism, or individual organisation, or body, besides the IGF, can achieve all these, or is more appropriate. ETNO believes that the IGF has broadly met its mandate, although there is of course room for improvement in certain fields.

For example: IGF should increase the production of outcomes in the form of written documentation and enhance its website and contents to ensure an easy access to the consolidated information and an efficient distribution to all involved or interested parties. Also an Annual Report of the content and actions of the IGF would produce more transparency. Nevertheless, the forum should not produce negotiated outcomes or formal agreements, since this would hinder the free and open transfer of opinions. A pre-condition for a broader dialogue is of course, to make sure, that the IGF process is easy to participate in and simple to contribute to. One action to improve this point would be to strengthen the possibilities for remote participation and enable the participation in non-real time (e.g. transcription and archiving of audio and video files).

Finland:
The IGF can and should be developed further as the broadest existing global dialogue on internet governance issues. As to the broadness of its scope, the IGF can progress only through an organizational structure which allows the introduction of new ideas and innovations in a bottom up manner. The regular open consultation meetings and the MAG provide such an environment. As to the broadness of the participation in the meetings, the

IGF should remain as open and inclusive as possible to assure wide participation from different stakeholder groups and world corners. Efforts should be made to reach out to new people, to target particular audiences and to use efficiently new technologies for remote participation.

As to IGF´s capacity to link with other, more focused dialogues on internet governance, the IGF´s preparatory process should continue to explore ways to bring the essence of other discussions to the realm of its meetings. Feeding into the IGF meetings can be further encouraged through background material and special sessions such as this year´s innovation on regional meetings in the context of "Setting the scene". As to sharing information from the IGF meetings, the participants themselves are the best advocates in their own constituencies. However, the IGF can improve in sharing for example through its web page, information material and liaisons of the secretariat with other entities. The IGF could be also better linked to the WSIS follow-up through closer ties with the CSTD and its meetings.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):
The GIIC feels that the steps which the IGF have taken each year to incorporate new elements and issues into its agenda are a reflection of an organization that is growing and meeting the challenges in the area of Internet Governance. The rapid growth of regional and national IGF meetings is also a reflection of this. We encourage the IGF secretariat to continue working to ensure these regional and national IGFs can play a meaning role in achieving the overall objectives of the IGF.

Hungary:
For the IGF process, close cooperation with other organisations – e.g. ICANN, OECD, UNESCO, ITU – is of high importance. Certain linkages should be strengthened: like those between national, regional IGFs and the global IGF; or the linkages between the CSTD and the IGFs. IGF has a rather valuable experience of multistakeholderism, neutralism, open discussions, mutual understanding of such complex issues as the Internet governance and its socio-economic impact.

ICC BASIS:
The IGF has to date played an important role improving collaboration, cooperation and coordination among a wide range of stakeholders. By involving existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, it automatically links to all dialogues on global Internet governance, and provides a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process for the participation of all. The evolving agenda is a demonstration how the process of the annual IGF, and the national and regional IGF initiatives in of themselves serve as a forum to linking all stakeholders and respective organizations into a network of networks of dialogues around Internet governance.[25] These efforts should continue to be built upon.

India:
An assessment of the IGF in its first phase of 5 years makes it clear that its areas of under-performance, and thus areas for improvement, are in terms of its specific contributions to global Internet policy processes. This is also endorsed by the UN Secretary-General's Report and explicitly stated in the UN General Assembly resolution of 22 November 2010 that mandated the setting up of the CSTD Working Group on improvements to the IGF, by "recognizing ....the need to improve it, with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance".

Recommendation: This reinforces the point that the Working Group's recommendations should focus on substantive improvements to the IGF with regard to its linkages and contributions to global policy dialogue, spaces and institutions, as proposed in the annexure.

Internet technical and academic community:
2.1 The IGF is already having a positive impact on Internet governance globally
The IGF has succeeded in providing a space for all stakeholders to address a broad range of topics related to Internet governance. Discussions at the IGF have become more mature over time, and those who have been involved in the process since the beginning would recognize

---

[25] Tunis agenda para 80

such development. The IGF has led to greater understanding and consensus on challenging Internet governance policy issues. Without the IGF, there is no such open space for discussion of the full range of current and emerging Internet issues among all relevant stakeholders.

IGF participants have embraced the approach of "think globally, act locally" to address issues of development and human, economic, and social growth, which are essential to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. For example, the rise of national and regional IGFs shows the commitment of all stakeholders to integrate the outputs of the IGF into localized policy processes that are most immediate and effective for them.

The IGF has also succeeded in expanding the participation of government representatives and other stakeholders from all regions.[26] This expanding participation is also exemplified by the interest in national and regional IGFs, which are continuing to be added to the annual broader Internet governance calendar of meetings.[27]

The IGF has succeeded in building linkages with other Internet related bodies. As noted in the Tunis Agenda section above, a number of organizations involved in Internet governance hold "Open Forums" at the IGF. In addition a number of these same organizations, and many others, hold Internet Governance sessions as part of their own meetings. For example, the "Internet Governance workshop", a standard agenda item at ICANN meetings in the past few years, is used to inform the ICANN community of developments taking place at IGF meetings, and to allow participants to exchange views on the various issues under discussion.

2.2 Proposals for improvements
The Tunis Agenda clearly specified the IGF to be a forum for multistakeholder policy[28] dialogue, not a policy-making forum. As such, one of its primary aims is to facilitate information sharing among all stakeholders. The following concrete proposals could improve this information sharing:
1. The outcomes of the IGF should be packaged in a useful way for all stakeholders to take home (see response to section 4.)
2. During the year, funding permitting, more efforts should be made to reach out to governments, international organizations, and other stakeholders who would benefit from briefings on the outcomes of the IGF.
3. The national and regional IGFs, while not part of the formal mandate of the Tunis Agenda, could more consciously build in opportunities to share information and best practices from the IGF into their programs.

Iran:
3.   As the UNGA Resolution "Information and communications technologies for development" in December 2010 is seeking improvements to the IGF 'with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance', discussions of IGF meetings should contribute, in particular, to shaping global Internet governance along with the principles mentioned in paragraph 29 of the Tunis agenda.

4.   Preserving the role of IGF as regards to the Internet governance dialogue at global level is vital to its well-functioning and cannot be substituted by discussions at regional or national levels.

5.   The UNGA resolution recognizes the IGF and the process of "enhanced cooperation" as two distinct processes. In this context and due to urgency of the process for enhanced cooperation, IGF should be linked to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance by providing its contribution to the process towards "enhanced cooperation" on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

---

[26] See:"Attendance Breakdown by Region and Stakeholder Group of the IGF Rio de Janeiro Meeting", 2007http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/rio_stats.htm "Vilnius Meeting Participation Figures", 2010, http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/2010/Stats.2010.pdf
[27] See "IGF Regional and National Links", http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/regional-and-national-igfs
[28] Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 67

6.   The role of IGF as regards to broader dialogue on global Internet governance could be improved by contributing to the work of governments in the process towards enhanced cooperation.

7.   According to paragraph 35 of Tunis Agenda, policy authority for internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states. As mentioned in paragraphs 69 & 70 of the Tunis Agenda, the governments should cooperate in development of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. To this end, the discussions in IGF should be linked to the global dialogue on global Internet governance by contributing to the process toward "enhanced cooperation".

IT for Change:
The mentioned UN General Assembly resolution specifically requires the WG on improvements to the IGF to seek improvements to 'the IGF with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance'. It reasserts that the Tunis Agenda's principal mandate for the IGF is in the area of 'global' Internet governance. It also connotes concern that meaningful linkages between the IGF and other global bodies dealing with Internet governance is an area of lack, requiring significant improvements. Thus, the WG should focus on developing concrete processes and mechanisms for such linkages. However, creating any meaningful concrete linkages with other global IG bodies first of all requires that there are specific outcomes from the IGF on important global IG issues. Without such specific outcomes, it is difficult to imagine how the IGF can be linked to the 'broader dialogue on global Internet governance'.

It is for the above reasons that we think that the main substantial recommendations of the WG should concern itself with laying out appropriate processes to ensure that the IGF is able to produce concrete outcomes in the area of global Internet policies. It should also recommend how these outcomes can be channelled into the proceedings of other global Internet governance related bodies.

Marilia Maciel:
The IGF and the debates carried out therein remain considerably insulated from the context of WSIS implementation. If the main role of the IGF is to discuss public policy and regulation concerning the Internet[29], it is fundamental that its participants have access to comprehensive information about the broad picture of the policy and regulation that are being developed on the global and regional levels.

Linking the IGF to the broader dialogue on global Internet Governance requires a two-pronged approach: the IGF should receive inputs from other fora and should provide them more concrete outputs that embody the discussions that take place in the Forum.

Regarding the inputs to the IGF, the Forum should acknowledge, summarize and publicize information received from other global bodies that have a role in WSIS follow-up, as well as from fora on the regional and national levels, with emphasis on:

a)   Reports from relevant organizations in the UN system, with special attention to the annual report of the Secretary-general on the progress made on the implementation and follow-up of to the outcomes of WSIS. The report identifies key trends to the development of the Information Society and provides valuable information that the IGF community should take into account when planning the meeting and identifying topics of interest.

b)   Information about regional action plans, such as the African Information Society Initiative (AISI), eLAC in Latin America and the Caribbean, and the initiatives by UNECE in Europe. The action plans are fundamental to the process of "translation" of general public policy guidelines into public action. The links between the IGF and these regional action

---

[29] Note by the Secretary-general on the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. A/65/78-E/2010/68, paragraph 4.

plans, as well as between the regional and national IGFs and these initiatives have been very weak so far.

c) Information about the debates that take place in regional and national IGFs. Regional and national meeting organizers should be encouraged to contribute to the agenda-setting of the IGF in a timely manner.

d) Remote participation should be improved and the Secretariat and the MAG should use online tools throughout the year to remain in close consultation with the community.

Regarding the outputs of the IGF, important changes should be introduced.

a) The IGF is a forum for policy dialogue that should produce outcomes that express consensus as well as divergent policy options. One of the main goals of the IGF process is to contribute with policy development, specially on the global level. For that, it is important that the IGF produces more concrete and objective outcomes that could serve as input for the development of policies by other bodies. Some of the changes that could help achieve this goal are suggested under question 4.

b) Strengthen the link between the IGF and the work carried out by CSTD. The communication between the two bodies should be enhanced. The discussions that take place in the CSTD should find a way into the IGF and vice-versa. The outcomes of the IGF should be forwarded to CSTD, so they can be included in the Commission's report.

Both organizations could also exchange good practices. As CSTD is in charge of assisting ECOSOC with the system-wide follow-up of WSIS, including the IGF, the CSTD and its Secretariat could adopt some of the effective practices of the IGF and its Secretariat, such as reinforcing multistakeholder participation, remote participation and real time transcripts.

Nominet:
As noted above, we believe that it is important for the review called for in paragraph 17 to be based on the WSIS mandate.

Paragraph 21 of the UN General Assembly Resolution stressed "the need for enhancing participation of developing countries, in particular from least developed countries." We believe that this is important and there was additional outreach and focus on this at the 2010 meeting of the IGF. We would note that there are excellent examples of developing country participation, including financial support for participation channelled through the ITU or the IGF Secretariat.

There are a number of developing country governments and stakeholders from developing countries involved in the IGF, some of which are playing strong leadership roles in shaping the agenda. We believe that it is important that developing countries do get involved to ensure that their issues are addressed.

There is nothing preventing this and we also believe that the Kenyan hosts of the 2011 IGF are planning to focus on some issues of specific interest to East Africa. The Kenyan engagement with a national IGF and active regional cooperation with the East Africa-IGF is an example of a process that many countries have also used to get the best from the IGF process.

We noted in our earlier contribution that the IGF is "work in progress". In the environment of the Internet and the speed of innovation and change, a mechanism or process that did not continually evolve would rapidly become useless. The nature of the IGF has evolved from one meeting to another, responding to input developed in an open and transparent process, and we welcome this responsiveness of the IGF.

Norway:
In our view, the IGF should explore ways to secure that the existing global dialogue on internet governance is better linked to the IGF, possibly by better use of the preparatory

process including the open consultations and the MAG-meetings. Efforts should be made to increase outreach to new groups, especially directed towards developing countries.

Portugal:
It is very clear for us that there are no other global organizations or fora other than the IGF dealing with all aspects of Internet Governance, so the question here is how to broaden the dialogue with other instances considering particular aspects of Internet Governance and/or with those that do not have a global reach.

Governance in the knowledge society of now-a-days requires a much wider engagement of governments with other multistakeholders in the public sphere for which the traditional strictly intergovernmental organizations settings are inappropriate. Moreover, IGF-like settings proved to be most valuable and capable of triggering wide social involvement at regional and national levels worldwide.

As the Internet increasingly impacts all facets of our lives, IGF engages with a broad stakeholder community, particularly those (governmental and nongovernmental) involved in development policy, environmental policy, science & technology policy, trade, access to knowledge, and governance. As such, the IGF should outreach to liaise with relevant international processes and institutions for transmitting IGF outcomes and suggestions for discussion at those fora that deal with Internet related policies, which could have a real impact, as can be the case with affordable Internet access.

The cooperation with ICANN, RIRs, ISOC-IETF, OECD, UNESCO, ITU, the Council of Europe, regional/national IGFs, among others, is important as it boosts the dialogue in a truly multistakeholder manner and allows discussing a broader scope of Internet issues. The present IGF format has allowed very well for the participation of these organizations and for interactions with them. However, there is room for improvement by developing systematic procedures of outreach and joint work intersessionaly through the IGF Secretariat and the MAG. It would be desirable that the IGF Secretariat and the MAG would systematically engage intersessionally with entities such as those mentioned here in order to feed into their own processes and also obtain their contribution to shape the agenda of future IGFs.

The links between IGF and CSTD should be strengthened for a better understanding within the UN system of multistakeholderism as an essential component of the current knowledge society public policy ecosystem, not only to answer to the society increasing demands for more participation in the political dialogue but also to unleash the creative potential of nongovernmental stakeholders for social, political and economic growth, actually directly answering to the text adopted by the Heads of State at the WSIS and to their expectations.

Finally, the connection of the global IGF with regional and national IGFs should be strengthened through explicit systematic procedures:
- By having them to contribute to the open consultations, format and content of the IGF global meetings;
- By organizing intersessional meetings, with a remote participation component, between organizers of regional/national IGFs, and the IGF Secretariat and MAG;
- By organizing schemes for issues raised at regional and national fora to be tabled at IGF sessions or workshops.

Social Aid of Hellas:
We totally agree with this priority, but it would be useful to be organized a broad environment which will answer to new challenges of our rapidly evolving global society and the Tunis Agenda be able to meet the new requirements of our globalized communities.

Sri Lanka:
Since the IGF has failed in its mandate to discuss key elements of global internet governance and make recommendations towards its democratization, it is important that IGF be encouraged to formulate a timeline for it to make such progress in this area during the period of its new mandate. IGF meetings should include a report on achievements made during the

previous year followed by a session to discuss challenges faced and measures which could be adopted to ensure progress. Any further extension of the IGF mandate should be dependent on the achievement of real progress in this important area of its mandate.

Sweden:
See 1

SWITCH:
In order to bridge the Digital Divide, global partnerships with all relevant stakeholders, knowledge and development are, inter alia, key aspects and the IGF is able to provide a forum to build on.

United Kingdom:
The IGF does not convene in a vacuum. As a truly global forum these linkages are created through the cooperation it fosters between all actors in global ICT including the UN agencies, relevant IGOs, multi-stakeholder international bodies such as ICANN, and multilateral fora in which developing countries participate. The UK Government believes that the IGF play an important role as a unique, non-duplicative platform for these bodies to come together and share perspectives that in turn inform more coherent and consistent approaches to development.

UNESCO:
A stronger link to the WSIS process needs to be established, particularly in the lead up towards the 2015 review. An IGF session at the last WSIS Forum was a good start and the important participation showed also a strong interest for the IGF topics by the traditional WSIS stakeholders and WSIS Forum participants. UNESCO would welcome consultations of the IGF Secretariat with the lead agencies for the WSIS implementation, and consecutive consultations with the different stakeholder groups on possible avenues for improving links and interactions in the future.

United States of America:
The United States recognizes that global dialogue on Internet governance is appropriately modelled after the Internet itself: distributed, decentralized, and multi-stakeholder. That is to say, there is not one "broader dialogue" that the IGF is absent from. However, there might be ways with which to link the IGF to other dialogues. For instance, the IGF Secretariat and members of the MAG could be empowered and encouraged to attend meetings of fora such as the OECD and ITU to share relevant lessons learned or perspectives shared at the IGF.

The Secretariat could also work to distribute the chairman's report and transcript of sessions to a broader audience. The IGF website could be upgraded and efforts to use social media to spread the IGF message could be enhanced.

As discussed in the previous question, the IGF has done a remarkable job in attracting a large and diverse audience of participants from government, the private sector, civil society, and academia. All of these people are leaders in the Internet governance dialogue in multiple fora. Links to broader global dialogue on Internet governance are made when these people come together within the IGF. Prior to the IGF, a venue did not exist in which governments, the private sector, the technical community, and civil society could gather. Rather than focusing on building links away from the IGF, we should continue to strengthen the impact of the conversation within.

3. How to enhance the contribution of IGF to socio-economic development and towards Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs) including enhancing participation of developing countries

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
APC has consistently argued that it is essential to include development in IGF discussions.

Broadening participation

Developing countries
Introducing a plenary session on Internet Governance for Development in the 2010 IGF provided an increased incentive for participants from developing countries to attend and participate in the IGF. So did identifying speakers and facilitators from developing countries for main sessions.

But APC believes that the IGF community - which includes current participants - still needs to make more concerted efforts to include the participation of developing country stakeholders and include development issues and developing country concerns in the agenda. Internet governance for development is more than 'development of internet governance' or even 'internet governance in developing countries'.

Development community
Other policy communities, particularly those involved in development policy, environmental policy, trade, access to knowledge, human rights, democratisation and governance should be invited into the IGF process.

Exploring the relation between internet governance and development is to think about how internet policy impacts on, and responds to, social, economic and human development. These impacts can be positive or negative. To explore them will involve the IGF facilitating dialogue between the internet community and development policy-makers and practitioners, many of whom are not currently engaged with internet governance and policy.

A sustainable development perspective
To consolidate a development agenda in the IGF effectively, APC believes that an IGF development agenda should embrace the concept of sustainable development. Sustainable development involves consideration of human, economic, and social development, and the impact of development on the natural environment. Growth is not always sustainable. Economic growth alone can entrench existing inequalities in access to power and resources, and create new ones, or it can challenge those inequalities: neither is inevitable.

APC understands that the IGF is still evolving in how to treat development, and learning how to do it effectively, and believes that it requires more substantive consideration of how internet policy and regulation can either enable or disable development.

Documenting IGF discussion, and messages, the relate to development is one way of profiling this issue, and discussing it in a way that can have greater impact. E.g., a document at the end of each IGF with a topic such as: Reflections and suggestions from the XXX IGF relevant to meeting internationally agreed development goals.

Brazil:
3.1   The desired contribution IGF can offer to socio-economic development and towards IADGs is to become an example itself and a supporter of enhancing the participation of developing countries in the discussions and decision making process regarding Internet Governance.

3.2   Among the Internationally-agreed Development Goals outlined in the Millennium Declaration the goal that better applies to IGF role is to "Develop a global partnership for development" which highlighs the importance of assuming the perspective of development as a priority in the reform of international regimes.

3.3   Brazil also supports the comments presented by India under this topic.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
To enhance the contribution of the IGF to socio-economic development and towards the IADGs, the IGF should identify the linkages between Internet governance mechanisms and development, and consider options for mainstreaming development considerations into IGF discussions and Internet governance processes, as appropriate.

To enhance the participation of developing countries, it will be necessary to establish a special funding mechanism to help actors from developing countries to continuously engage in the IGF and related organisations and meetings. Fellowship works carried out by DiploFoundation, DotAsia Organisation, the Internet Society and other institutions offer a good reference for this, but they should be expanded to a larger scale. Targeting youth groups or the younger generation of professionals will have, in the long run, an effective impact.

Funding mechanisms for developing country participants must take into account clear criteria (for instance, age, gender and whether a particular group works with the marginalised people we want to bring to the IGF process). There should be an open opportunity to apply for funding, and opportunities should be published and disseminated widely. Transparency and timely decisions on funding decisions are also important.

Another way to enhance participation is by providing technical training to policy makers and policy training to engineers to help close the gaps between and within the under-represented and also even the well-represented. To differentiate between this capacity building role of the IGF and its policy discussion role, they should be clearly differentiated at IGF meetings, and perhaps the capacity building workshops held on a day before the main sessions and the more policy-oriented workshops begin.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
Over the last years the participation of developing countries has already greatly improved. Measures designed to enhance a broader dialogue, such as the easy access to the forum, are also contributing to the involvement of these parties. Indeed, without the IGF, there may not be a platform for these countries to participate.

Aside from this, the IGF is contributing to social-economic developments in many ways, for example, activities concerning the internationalized domain names (IDNs), in which the IGF was not only enabling the dialogues and discussions around the topic, but also created the necessary awareness of all relevant bodies to ensure implementation.

By using modern technical means to ensure remote participation, developing countries can today participate in the debates at the global IGF meetings. These possibilities should be improved to secure wider inclusion.

Finland:
The IGF should continue to carry out development as a strong cross-cutting theme in all its deliberations. As the stakeholders from developing countries are best placed to identify the most essential topics and the most efficient methods for their discussion, their active participation in the open consultations and in the MAG meeting is a key to ascertain the relevance of the IGF meetings from the development perspective. One option to link the IGF better to the IADGs could be to choose a particular development goal or a set of goals as a starting point for discussion.

Participation from the developing countries should be further encouraged through different methods. The establishment of national and regional IGF processes with a strong link to the global IGF drives for better overall engagement. Resources should be devoted to the continued development of remote participation, including through the establishment of remote hubs in developing countries. Possibilities should be explored to increase voluntary contributions for financing the participants from developing countries in the IGF meetings.

Holding the annual IGF meetings in developing countries also facilitates the participation from the developing world.

ICC BASIS:
The IGF has evolved to contribute to important social-economic developments and the IADGs, including enhancing participation of developing countries. And more can be done in this direction.

An example of existing contributions includes the dialogue around internationalized domain names (IDNs), and the eventual evolution of their implementation. The awareness created at the IGF events, the partnerships for workshops with UNESCO and other entities enabled a dialogue around the issue, which in turn was worked on by ICANN to ensure implementation. The implementation of IDNs is an important and critical contribution to social-economic development and the creation of content.

The participation of developing countries has improved over the years, with more work ahead. Through the generous contribution of several entities, fellowship programmes have been put into place, enabling participation from respective stakeholder groups. Additionally, remote participation, remote hubs, transcription, and the archives of information, enable both real-time participation and non-real time review of information. The national and regional IGF initiatives are additional important contributions to enhancing the participation of all stakeholders from anywhere on the globe. The input and dialogue around IGF issues is an added contribution to this evolving process.

Additional improvements can of course be made – including improved consolidation of materials from IGF events for better research and use; additional funds for developing country participation and improvements to the remote participation capabilities and archiving of information.

India:
To answer this key question, we must first thoroughly examine the impact of the Internet on the social and economic landscape of our societies. Too much of the Internet governance discourse currently is centred on technical issues, with not enough economic, social, cultural and political analysis. One of the main functions of the IGF should be to bring such analyses, and the policy questions that they raise, to the fore. In fact, many of the technical governance issues will then need to be revisited from the standpoint of these more fundamental considerations.

The Internet globalizes economic, social, cultural and, even, political flows, setting up new forms of comparative advantages as also new forms of exclusions. In this, there are immense opportunities as there are challenges for the developing countries. It is generally appreciated that the Internet can contribute to connecting everyone, or most, to the global economic and social systems, and thus probably enhance the overall opportunity availability for everyone. What is, however, much less examined is the question: what kind of an Internet, and what kind of social phenomenon shaping around the Internet, would provide a level playing field for all in the emerging Internet-enabled global systems, especially for developing countries, and more so, for the marginalised sections in the developing countries? Global Internet-related policies have an important role in this regard. They should not only ensure that everyone is connected, but also that the Internet is developed in a manner that provides a level-playing field for all.

While the manner of development of the Internet at present poses challenges to the possibility of a level-playing field (increasing violation of the network neutrality principle, for instance, can be a major disadvantage for late entrants from developing countries to global Internet businesses), what is needed is to go even further and provide protective discrimination to the structurally disadvantaged countries and groups. What looks equal and participative from a mature market/ Northern point of view may not be so equal and participative from a developing country's point of view. These kinds of structural inequalities obtaining among countries, and among different groups within each country, require a well-considered and nuanced approach to Internet policies which alone can ensure that the future

shaping/development of the Internet contributes to sustainable and equitable socio-economic development. Addressing such structural issues underpin most developmental discussion in global forums like the WIPO, WTO, UNESCO (for instance, the recent cultural goods treaty) etc. However, the global discourse on Internet governance remains peculiarly 'technicalized' and individual user-centric – a standpoint which tends to ignore larger structural issues of exclusion and marginalisation.

Recommendation: There is no global forum which provides space for shaping such a developmental perspective of Internet governance. The IGF is well-suited as it is expressly mandated to take up this task, and has the benefit of a diversity of views from a multi-stakeholder format. The IGF should, therefore, focus more specifically on addressing structural issues of exclusion and marginalisation and the inequalities among different regions, countries and marginalised communities of various kinds, to usher in a more level-playing field.

Internet technical and academic community:
3.1 Millennium Development Goals
In September 2010, the UN Summit on the Millennium Development Goals concluded with the adoption of a global action plan to achieve the eight anti-poverty goals by their 2015 target date and the announcement of major new commitments for women's and children's health and other initiatives against poverty, hunger, and disease.[30] Paragraph 20 of the Millennium Declaration[31] (referred to by Paragraph 10 of the Tunis Agenda) explicitly recognizes the importance of information and communication technologies and public private partnerships to reach the Millennium Developments Goals. In this regard, participation in the Internet Governance Forum, which has made Access and Openness key topics of discussion in its meetings, becomes critical, especially for developing countries.

3.2 Participation of developing countries
We would like to emphasize the importance of expanding the participation of developing countries in the IGF preparatory process and in the Forum itself. Through the Trust Fund, the donors have financed the participation of many MAG members in the preparatory meeting and the annual IGF meeting.[32] In addition, many organizations and governments have continuously sponsored the participation of individuals from all continents in the IGF. For example:
- Canada has demonstrated a remarkable commitment in this regard.[33]
- The DiploFoundation, through its own efforts and in collaboration with governmental and intergovernmental agencies, and the Internet Society (ISOC IGF Ambassadors program)[34] have helped several dozens of individuals to participate in the IGF, year after year.
- Similarly, dotAsia and Nominet have sponsored the participation of young people.[35]

To further expand the participation of developing countries in the IGF process, more organizations and governments should be encouraged to contribute funding through a fellowship programme managed by the Secretariat.

Encouraging participation does not need to be limited to physical attendance at the IGF. For example, in Latin America there is a Regional Preparatory Meeting for the IGF where local and regional concerns are addressed in the three main languages of the region growing from

---

[30] "UN Summit on the Millennium Development Goals", 2010, http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010
[31] "55/2. United Nations Millennium Declaration", 2000, http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm
[32] "Funding", http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/funding
[33] See page 2 of "Government of Canada Submission to the Open Consultation on Enhanced Cooperation and International Public Policy Issues Pertaining to the Internet", 2010, http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan043211.pdf
[34] "IGF Ambassadors Program", http://www.isoc.org/pubpolpillar/igfambassadors
[35] See: · "NetMission.Asia 2.0", http://www.netmission.asia/2010 · "Childnet International", http://www.ntkc.org.uk/ntkc-search/grant/481

40 in its first meeting to almost 200 participants from a variety of stakeholder groups in its latest meeting.

Statistics[36] regarding participation in the IGF are encouraging and show that these efforts have paid off:
- The overall attendance during IGF meetings, 2007 to 2009, has been, on average, 1300 participants.
- The number of countries that have participated in the IGF meetings increased during the years 2007 to 2009.[37]
- Since 2007, there has been a positive trend concerning participation of stakeholders from developing and less developed regions, as well as a growing balance between different categories of stakeholders (civil society, business, governments, parliamentary, Internet technical and academic communities, media and intergovernmental organizations).

It needs to be noted, however, that some stakeholders may attend the local or regional IGFs rather than the global IGF, not only because the lack of economical resources, but in some cases because they are at an early stage of Internet governance discussions and their priority is first to consolidate their understanding within a local context. This is another reason, in fact, why regional and local IGFs are such an important part of the larger IGF process.

3.3 Improving all mechanisms for IGF participation by all stakeholders
We believe that participation mechanisms for all stakeholders, not only those from developing countries, can still be greatly improved. This includes mechanisms to facilitate both on-site (for example, via fellowships) and remote (for example, remote hubs, webcasts, etc) participation. Participation to the IGF is a collective responsibility and all stakeholders should commit to providing resources to assist improve participation mechanisms. As noted in section 3.2 above, one way this could be achieved is a fellowship program funded by multiple stakeholders and managed by the IGF Secretariat. It is important to not only get a greater balance between participants from developed and developing countries, but also continuously work towards improving gender balance, geographical diversity, and full participation from all stakeholder groups.

3.4 Ensuring the IGF continues to be held in a different region each year
Convening the IGF meetings in various locations around the world, in particular, developing countries, makes it more accessible to local IGF participants who are not able to travel far for the IGF meetings.

Iran:
8.   The idea of maintaining 'development' as a strong cross-cutting theme should be central in work of IGF. The discussions in IGF should ensure that the development of Internet along with global Internet governance will contribute to sustainable social and economic development of developing countries and their increased access to related knowledge.

9.   Discussing the key elements of global Internet governance by IGF can contribute to social and economic development of developing countries by addressing some major impediments that developing countries face such as interconnectivity charges and issues related to technology transfer, technology ownership, intellectual property and standards to bridge the existing gap between developed and developing countries.

---

[36] See page 2 and 3 of "The Importance of the Internet Governance Forum
(IGF)", http://www.isoc.org/isoc/conferences/wsis/docs/igf_20101021_en.pdf
[37] See: "Attendance Breakdown by Region and Stakeholder Group of the IGF Rio de Janeiro Meeting",
2007 http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/rio_stats.htm; "Attendance Breakdown of the Hyderabad Meeting",
2008, http://igf.wgig.org/cms/index.php/component/content/article/42-igf-meetings/414-attendance-
breakdown-of-thehyderabad-meeting; "IGF Sharm El Sheikh Attendance Statistics", 2009,
http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/content/article /87-programme/484-igf-sharm-el-
sheikhattendance- statistics

IT for Change:
IGF is most of all about participation. That is the principal objective of its open and multistakeholder platform. The central tenet of participatory development is that those people and groups with whom development is directly concerned know best what is needed for and as development. Internet governance for development should thus, before all, seek to get these groups, and those who work closely with them, into decision-shaping and decision-making processes about global IG. The 'choice' spoken of here however refers to 'informed choice' that requires adequate enabling conditions of information and organising for these groups. It is therefore often required to work through groups and organisations that 'demonstrably' represent the perspectives and interests of these groups. IG would start contributing meaningfully to socio-economic development only when the different 'development constituencies' are strongly represented in the IGF debates, which, regretfully, is not the case at present.

Another important issue is that global IG has not to just focus on 'directly evident' individual issues vis a vis the Internet among marginalised groups but also the more structural issues, which requires an informed articulation and representation. Development agendas at various global policy spaces like those concerning intellectual property, trade, climate change, cultural diversity etc largely consists of such structural issues, and not so much of 'direct' individuals-related issues. Such an articulation of structural development related issues is largely absent in the IG, and the IGF should pro-actively provide a space for, and enable the shaping of, such a comprehensive development agenda for IG.

Enhancing participation of 'development actors' (various people and groups systematically dealing with development issues) in the IGF, and providing enabling conditions for developing a concrete development agenda in the area of IG, are the two principal ways through which the IGF can begin to meaningfully contributing to socio-economic development.

Lithuania:
Best practise site on the IGF website could be useful.
Encourage formation of dynamic coalitions which pursue socio-economic development goals.

Marilia Maciel:
The UN General Assembly Resolution on Information and communication technologies for development clearly expresses in paragraph 19 (a) that the CSTD IGF working group should introduce improvements to the Forum so that "the representation and voices of developing countries should be increased and the development issues should be placed as the first priority".

To achieve the mainstreaming of development issues and to enhance the participation of developing countries, some changes need to be introduced:

a) Development should be mainstreamed as a theme in the IGF. Special support should be given to the discussion about the interplay between Internet Governance and development. Workshops and main sessions were organized about this theme in the IGF 2010, but IG4D should become one of the permanent main sessions in the schedule. It is also fundamental that funding is available to bring speakers from developing countries to these sessions, and the Secretariat and other bodies should be actively involved in the preparation of this discussion, together with the session organizers.

b) More clear outcomes of IGF debates should be produced and forwarded to pertinent organizations, as discussed in question 4.

c) Funding to increase the participation of developing countries in the IGF should be provided, as recommended on the note by the Secretary-General on the continuation of the IGF. Additional funding should be employed in capacity building, remote participation and on increasing physical attendance, as discussed under question 6.

Nominet:

As noted above, the IGF has reached out to developing countries to ensure their issues are addressed and a number of developing countries have been actively engaged in the process.

The most relevant Internationally-agreed Development Goal is to "Develop a global partnership for development."

Underpinning target 8F is the importance of promoting investment in ICT infrastructure in developing countries. A number of countries now have good stories to tell about how they have developed an environment to promote infrastructure investment. Over the years the IGF has included a significant "good practice" sharing in access to, and use of, information and communications technologies. We have been pleased to contribute to this dialogue with the Nominet Internet Awards. The Manthan Awards look across the countries of South Asia to identify how people are making a real difference in improving access and use of the Internet and communications technologies.

The Kenyan host of the 2011 IGF has flagged its interest in strategies for ICT-based opportunities for employment. Kenya is an excellent example of how a developing country can engage with, and lead, the IGF to help it address its priorities.

We believe that the IGF needs to continue to reach out to developing countries and to encourage them to identify issues which they would like to see addressed. In addition, the IGF should continue to encourage best-practice sessions – in particular with examples of work in developing countries – to help decision makers identify good strategies for national priorities.

The multi-stakeholder community has been generous in its contributions to support involvement by stakeholders in developing countries. We believe that, as the IGF continues to work in a true multi-stakeholder environment, addressing issues of interest and relevance to participants from developing countries in a cooperative way, we will see a continued growth in support for the IGF to enable engagement in the process.

Norway:

We see the question of increased participation from developing countries as one of the most important tasks in the next mandate period of the IGF. The IGF must explore how this important issue can be moved forward, and the stakeholders from the developing countries in our view have in this regard an important role as these stakeholders are in the best position to understand and put forward relevant topics from a development perspective.

Portugal:

The IGF has naturally evolved into an inclusive event where any individual, organization or country can have a voice, contributing in that way to a dialogue and action towards social, political and economic growth and therefore to the IADGs. It also has influenced certain developments within ICANN, in particular the launching of IDN ccTLDs and the need to analyse carefully how to increase the opportunities of stakeholders from developing countries regarding the new gTLDs, which are important for socio, political and economic development. Discussion of new Internet trends with socio-economic impact at the IGF, such as social networks, cloud computing sensor-based networks and the Internet of Things, mobile-commerce also have provided important opportunities as outcomes of the IGF.

A larger involvement of stakeholders from developing countries in the IGF agenda setting process, in particular through a new role to be played by remote participation hubs proposed elsewhere in this contribution, will bring new opportunities for both developed and developing countries to influence on the identification of topics and themes relevant for socio-economic development and the IADGs.

Social Aid of Hellas:

Developing countries need an Agenda of Education and Training in order to be developed equal Partners.

South Africa:

In terms of developing countries in particular, when the issue of participation in current debates is raised, the issue of finance, whilst a significant barrier, is not the only one. Most developing countries also face technical, institutional, and information barriers amongst others. In order to ensure inclusion and full participation into the debate on Internet governance these have to be tackled in a cohesive manner as they are largely interrelated.

The IGF, if structured correctly, could go a long way in addressing this issue. Most developing countries particularly in Africa have already identified what barriers are being faced when it comes to development. The next step now is to determine how these should be addressed. The agenda of the Forum should be geared towards issues such as Internet inter-connection, intellectual property specifically copyright, and allocation policies which have significant socio-economic development nuances. The dialogue should therefore have tangible economic and social benefits. If one looks at Africa for instance when issues of Internet governance are raised and the debate is turned towards the priorities that require consideration, the recurring response leans towards

- Affordability and Access
- Cultural and linguistic diversity
- Inclusion
- Education and human capacity building
- Accessibility of content
- Infrastructure development
- Cost of leased Internet lines
- Issues relating to inequitable access to global Internet backbones

These are issues that should be dominating the global IGF agenda as some countries have tackled these successfully, thus the sharing of best practices is vital. What is also vital is a more open approach towards opening up the debate on how to tackle issues that are a consequence of the very fact that countries are at different levels of development yet those who are behind want progress without necessarily stemming innovation and progress. Such debates are important as developing countries strive not only to be recipients but also innovators and creators of technologies.

Sri Lanka:

The main problem developing countries face regarding internet is the lack of internet penetration and access. While market conditions encourage service providers to cater to demands from the urban sector in developing countries, there is little incentive to develop rural networks. Although much publicity has been given to the rapid expansion of mobile telephony in rural areas of developing countries, it must be understood that the demand for mobiles in these areas is largely as alternatives to fixed lines. The scarcity of fixed line connections and the need for mobile service providers to cater to their urban clients moving through rural areas have been the factors that have led to a large expansion in mobile telephony. However most of the mobiles are not used to connect to the internet either because they are cheap phones which cannot access the internet or because signals are poor and/or access is expensive. The factors that helped expand mobile telephony should contribute to an expansion of mobile internet access in rural areas with the availability of cheaper internet ready phones in the market. However the problems of cost, the much harder mastering of the technology and local language issues will make this process slow. The availability of fixed line internet broadband access would accelerate penetration into rural areas but this would require state intervention to support the building of a well spread rural broadband network and also telecentres or other common internet access centres where cheap access would be available. State intervention is also necessary to ensure that with improved access, training programmes would be made available to ensure the rural use of the internet in applications particularly by women and marginalised sections of the community to further their economic and social status.

Sweden:

See 1

SWITCH:
On the issue of IADG see our answer to question 1, Tunis Agenda para. 80 above. In general, the creation of national IGF-like fora should be encouraged and supported. Many issues can and should be addressed nationwide first to be brought up to wider audiences, e. g. in regional and international IGF's (among others).

United Kingdom:
The UK Government believes that the IGF has succeeded in bringing together government and industry including investors to create new dialogue on addressing the digital divide. Internet governance for development will rightly continue to be a key main IGF theme consistent with achieving the Millennium Development Goals.
A key objective for all actors in the IGF, the Secretariat and the MAG, is therefore to continue to address the need to bring into the IGF preparations and events those developing country policymakers and stakeholders that are not yet engaged. A strong message needs to go out to them ahead of the Nairobi IGF that the IGF has wide-ranging potential yet to be realised in the area of socio-economic development. Their participation either in person or remotely through the regional hubs will help to realise this to their benefit in better informed policy and opening up new avenues of cooperation and development for them.

UNESCO:
Equitable participation of developing and developed countries from all the regions of the world could be enhanced by strengthening remote participation based on existing infrastructure of remote hubs in 32 locations established for the Vilnius IGF, which enhanced the participation of those who could not physically attend. Continued seeking of extra-budgetary by the IGF Secretariat for this purpose as well as for ensuring physical participation and representativeness of all stakeholders is also crucially important.

In addition, national and regional IGF discussions, particularly in developing countries, should be supported and improved. General guidelines could help ensure that basic WSIS and IGF principles, such as the multistakeholder approach, are also applied to regional and national IGFs.

United States of America:
We (the US) were glad to see the issue of development elevated to a main session at 2010's IGF and believe that development should continue to play a priority role in IGF discussions in the future.

The evolution and continued growth of regional IGFs in developing countries is essential to increasing their participation. Particularly, local and regional IGFs strengthen dialog between local and regional governments, civil society, business, and the technical community that would not have taken place otherwise. Successful national and regional IGFs will ultimately support the IGF at the global level and broaden the influence and participation of developing countries.

Increased efforts can be made to improve the quality and availability of remote participation. Civil society groups, businesses, development organizations, and other stakeholders can offer scholarships to attend the IGF, as Human Rights Watch did this year for a group of participants from Southeast Asia. Each country must be ready to explain to these stakeholders how the IGF adds benefit to their country's economic and social development goals. Likewise, future IGFs should be held in developing countries or regions of the world to maximize convenience and minimize travel expenditures. Finally, efforts should be made to reach out to more economic sectors that are influenced by the Internet such as healthcare and education.

4. Shaping the outcome of IGF meetings

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
A more 'outcome' oriented approach
The IGF should be allowed to evolve as a forum that can produce outputs and outcomes beyond those of a space purely of policy dialogue and deliberation. APC would like to see the outcomes of the dialogue extracted succinctly and made more visible in a format that can facilitate uptake by actors involved in internet governance and development. We believe this can be done without compromising the non-binding, non decision-making nature of deliberations as it does not imply negotiated agreements which we do not believe is the role of the IGF. We would like to see the IGF evolve away from its annual event format into a year-round process that allows multi-stakeholder dialogue to inform policy-makers and that effectively facilitates interaction between this dialogue and the forums and institutions where internet governance and policy decisions are made.

IGF messages
A change in the format of the IGF that leans strongly towards documenting the outcomes and conclusions of workshops and main sessions in the form of "IGF messages" can be of benefit to participants who are not physically present and could lead to more straight forward collaborative action of stakeholders that attend the event. If the IGF can distil messages, or suggestions for further discussion, or even concrete advice, it will facilitate follow up interaction between stakeholders and it could consolidate and elevate its impact.

Capacity building
This is one of the key outcomes of the event. Finding ways to report on the capacity building outcomes in a consolidated way could be of value in maximising this outcome in future IGFs.

Norbert Bollow:
This needs to be a transparent process in which all stakeholders are reasonably able to participate, and where it is ensured that any omission of reasonable viewpoints (that were stated during the IGF meeting) can be corrected before finalization of the output document.

Brazil:
4.1 The preparatory process for IGF 2011 meeting in Nairobi should include the development of an inclusive, transparent, "neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding" process (paragraph 77) aiming at the elaboration of a clear and concise IGF meeting outcome, that could reflect the convergence and diversity of opinions on global policy issues of Internet governance.

4.2 Brazil fully agrees and supports the detailed suggestions provided by India ("annexure") and Internet Governance Caucus on this topic.

Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA):
The current format attempts to have increased dialogue as an outcome of IGF meetings, and does not require changing.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
The IGF should consider how to improve its orientation towards the development of tangible outputs. These may amount to "messages" rather than to recommendations, declarations or statements. The difference is that messages would take into account diverging opinions, and capture the range of policy options — however this should not preclude the IGF from developing processes that are better at facilitating a convergence of opinion through reasoned deliberation. Whilst consensus will not be achievable in every area, an important objective for a policy forum such as the IGF is to produce a high-quality reasoned consensus on policy issues where possible.

A first step towards the production of such messages or recommendations from the IGF is to create the necessary structures and processes for improved reporting from the IGF. This could include the use of a reporting template by workshops and main sessions.

Messages or recommendations could be based on:

- An overall chairman's report (though this alone may not be a sufficiently inclusive process).
- Discussions in each session, compiled at the end of the IGF (though experience has shown that some session organisers can be lax in preparing such summaries).
- A repository of best practices discussed at the IGF (though in emerging policy areas, best practices may not exist yet, so the IGF's outputs should not be limited to recording these).
- Discussions of thematic working groups (which would need to be created), to continue following the annual IGF meeting and be largely conducted online through open and inclusive processes.

Whatever form its outputs take, efforts should be taken to ensure that they are transmitted to relevant external institutions through appropriate mechanisms. Processes for efficient distribution of outputs to all relevant bodies and missions must be established. One method for such distribution would be the establishment of a rapporteur role such as that discussed in section 2 above, perhaps under the auspices of the MAG.

Finally, to ensure the effectiveness of the evolving mechanisms used for developing and disseminating outputs, the IGF should define ways to better capture the impact of the IGF, such as through an annual report.

EUROLINC:
See above comments under 1.l).

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
The IGF is a non binding process, as established by the Tunis Agenda.

Each IGF should result in a flexible number of consistent and easily accessible outputs, such as the Chairman's reports and workshop summaries. In addition to these reports, the actual IGF discussions held during plenary sessions and in workshops must be made available.

A further enhancement opportunity for the IGF is to provide a compilation of the different experiences and practices in different regions as a reference tool for best practices in national and regional IGF events. This will enable and support discussions at the local, national and regional level, without dictating outcomes.

Finland:
Finland strongly supports maintaining the IGF as a non-binding process without negotiated outcomes or decisions. The main outcome should be the one which each participant brings home and feeds into discussion, decision making and action in other fora. However, different methods could be explored to improve the deliveries of the IGF meetings (chair´s summary, workshop reports). Named entities such as the dynamic coalitions could summarize their own take-out from the discussions in the IGF web page. A collection of views expressed as to the main delivery of a particular IGF meeting could also be published. We would also support creating a repository for best practices on the IGF web page.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):
The GIIC feels that the Tunis Agenda has created a unique and valuable model with the IGF. Utilizing a non-binding format as the core of its operating process, the IGF has been successful at promoting an honest exchange of views, ideas, recommendations and criticisms without regard for how this frank exchange will be captured in a final communiqué. The GIIC has found tremendous value in this approach for all participating stakeholders.

The GIIC would find it valuable to have a more robust set of "takeaways" from the annual IGF meetings to share back with membership that were not able to participate. This could foster greater interest and engagement for future meetings.

ICC BASIS:

The IGF is a non-binding, and non-duplicative process, as established by the Tunis Agenda.

- The Chairman's summary of each IGF has been comprehensive. This should be built upon along with the reports from workshops and other sessions to capture the substantive discussions
- Consideration should be given to developing a 'glossy' takeaway that is published after the IGF that captures the key issues discussed, highlights information about policy choices and options on the range of issues
- Better use of the website to ensure it serves as an ongoing outcome of the IGF would be a useful improvement.

India:

One of the major challenges of the IGF is the question of how to maintain its open and inclusive character, while enabling it to make strong and specific contributions to global Internet-related public policy. Since the IGF is not a policy- making body, its contributions must come in the form of policy advice and recommendations. Shaping outcomes from the IGF in form of policy advice/ recommendations is, therefore, the key task that this Working Group should address itself to. It is also the impression gathered by the UN Secretary-General's report on consultations with IGF participants during the fourth IGF in Egypt in 2009 that this areas is considered by many stakeholders as the one which requires most attention vis a vis improvements to the IGF.

When IGF outcomes are discussed, often two kinds of impacts of the IGF are mentioned – (i) the capacity-building role of the IGF, and (ii) its impact in terms of certain regional and national IGF's. While IGF's outcomes in terms of its capacity- building role are significant, a more important and primary mandate of the IGF where it has under-delivered, is in the area of global policy-making. As for the development of regional and national IGFs, while it is indeed a welcome development, it relates to para 80 of the Tunis Agenda which encourages regional and national multi-stakeholder initiatives, and not so much to the basic mandate of the IGF contained in para 72. In any case, the 'global' role of the IGF remains primary and that cannot be substituted by its regional and national level impacts.

Recommendation: We, therefore, suggest that while this Working Group's report should mention the positive aspects of the IGF in terms of its capacity-building impact and the emergence of regional and national IGFs, its substantive parts should focus on what is both the primary mandate of the IGF, and the area of its most significant under-performance - the global Internet policy-related role of the IGF.

Structuring an open and inclusive process towards outcomes will require considerable innovation as well as some additional resources. The outlines of such a process that can provide clear outcomes in the form of policy-related recommendations from the IGF, while adhering to its open, participatory and inclusive nature, are elaborated in the Annexure.

Internet technical and academic community:

4.1 Shaping outcomes within the mandate of the Tunis Agenda

Any discussions about the IGF outcomes need to be considered within the context of the Tunis Agenda. It is important to note that Paragraph 77 states that:

"The IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process. It would have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet."

This characteristic has been key in encouraging participants to engage willingly in discussions, and exchange views with others without having to negotiate positions, as would be the case if resolutions were to be adopted. The IGF is successful precisely because the focus is on sharing knowledge and perspectives, the free flow of ideas, debate, listening, and learning from one another's experiences. Moving away from these principles and turning the IGF into a decisionmaking body would not only disregard the consensus reached in the Tunis Agenda by creating duplication of efforts and existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions

or organizations, but it would shift the focus to a more closed state (for example, the pedantic creation of documents), instead of open exchange and discussion.

The bottom-up development of national and regional IGFs is a direct result of not only the successful multistakeholder model exemplified by the IGF, but also the non-binding nature of the discussions at the IGF. Had the IGF been a decision-making body, national and regional IGFs may not have had the opportunity to be created so easily.

4.2 Proposals for improvements
As noted in section 1 above, the IGF already publishes a wide variety of its outcomes as mandated by the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72.l. However, it is fundamental for the continued success of the IGF to maintain continuous improvement on the shape of its outcomes to ensure that it adapts to the changing needs of all participants as the Internet governance dialogue progresses. And it seems that one of the critical underlying issues in this case, is to integrate further the regional and national threads in the working process, and therefore in the outcomes. We would like to propose practical solutions to make progress on this front:

1. It is vital to make the resources of the IGF available as widely as possible. Where resources permit, the website should be improved to transform the extensive material produced by those within the IGF community into a valuable resource available to anyone interested in the issues discussed within the IGF. Any efforts to synthesize messages coming out of the IGF need to respect the full diversity of views within the IGF community.
2. Improve the structure of the outcomes of the international IGF itself. For example: fed by local input, the workshops could be structured in a way that would emphasize their linkages, producing usefully packaged information. This information could cover, for each issue, a summary of the state of the debate, the principles used by all stakeholders facing these issues, and include, where possible, an identification of possible new approaches to these issues. This coordinated and informational outcome would provide each participant with a set of valuable tools to take home.
3. The IGF website should utilize web tools that make its information searchable and easy to be reached. Such web tools can also provide an interactive environment for the public to provide input and comments, and engage in discussions online.
4. The IGF could find ways to define and document how the IGF is progressing in the fulfillment of its mandate, as defined in the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72.
5. The IGF website currently publishes the national and regional IGF reports, but they could be given a higher visibility on the IGF website. In addition, these valuable resources should be archived, and be widely used to feed the international process.
6. There have also been very positive individual initiatives in the past to capture some of the key messages and different views at the IGF in an accessible way, such as the video project "Imagining the Internet".[38] The Secretariat could not only encourage such initiatives, but also link to them in an effective way through the IGF website.

Iran:
10.   Tunis Agenda established IGF as a non-binding and non-negotiation process. Open discussions and dialogue at the IGF meetings and whatever participants take from these discussions could be considered as report of such a forum. However, reports of the meetings can be enhanced to benefit others involved in global Internet governance, particularly those not present at the meeting. In this context, due to role of CSTD as a follow-up mechanism for WSIS outcomes, reports of IGF could be submitted to CSTD informing the member states of the work of IGF.

11.   Though the IGF is not a decision-making body but rather a forum for capacity building and policy dialogue, its deliberation and reporting mechanism could be more educational and attractive to decision-makers by contributing to the dialogue on the key elements of global Internet governance.

---

[38] "Imagining the Internet", http://www.imaginingtheinternet.org

IT for Change:

Tunis Agenda mentions global policy dialogue as the key objective of the IGF. Obviously, the outcomes of a global policy dialogue need to be oriented to global Internet policy making. The measure of effectiveness of a global policy dialogue is in its impact on global Internet policies. This requirement is further confirmed by the recent UN GA resolution seeking IGF improvements 'with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance ' and asserting the complementarity of the IGF to the process of enhanced cooperation (which, as per the Tunis Agenda, is clearly a process devoted to global Internet policies). Efforts at obtaining clear, tangible and useful global Internet policy related outcomes therefore need to drive the whole exercise of seeking IGF improvements.

Speaking of IGF outcomes only in terms of the impressions and ideas that participants individually take home is hardly enough. IGF is supposed to be a part of an important global political process of Internet Governance, and like all political processes – which concern taking collective decisions in public interest – must strive towards convergences through feeding into appropriate policy making forums.

The following are some suggestions on how the IGF can begin to fulfil its mandate by coming up with useful outcomes.

1. Identifying the most important and urgent global Internet policy issues to be taken up by every IGF. The selected issues should be rather specific and clear, and such that directly concern the public interest. It is not difficult to identify such issues if a focus on global public interest can indeed be maintained by and in the preparatory process. Correspondingly, while IGF agenda setting should remain a multi-stakeholder process, conscious and visible effort needs to be made to ensure against undue influence of special interests trying to block or drag their feet on uptake of key public interest issues. Too often, special interests manage to build an indomitable presence in policy forums through a misuse of the multi-stakeholder platforms. A distinction between upholding public interest and serving special interests needs to be a conscious, constantly alive and visible element throughout the IGF process. This imperative needs to be strongly expressed in the IGF, its preparatory processes and the facilitative processes provided by the secretariat.

2. Once the key policy issues to be taken up are identified, dedicated issue-wise MAG subcommittees, incorporating some outside participation, need to develop background material on the concerned issues. Outside expertise may be sought in this matter, but due attention needs to be paid to the fact that sourcing expertise itself is a very political activity, and it must be ensured that background material is unbiased and informed only by the highest public interest, and not by special interests. Efforts should be made to obtain a good diversity of views and facts.

3. Inter-sessional thematic meetings may be held on the concerned policy issues that are in focus for the plenaries in order to to advance the possibility of coming up with concrete outcomes.

4. The same key policy issue wise MAG sub-committee, under the supervision of the MAG, should develop the format of the plenary discussions at the annual IGF in a manner which is best suited to ensure a focussed discussion on the concerned issue.
5. As mentioned in the preceding section, these MAG-plus sub committees will need to work further after the annual IGF meeting on the basis of the plenary discussions with a view to explore the possibility of coming out with recommendations on the involved policy issues. The outcomes could also be in the form of a set of different options. However, the details have to be sufficiently worked out for the outcomes to be useful to the relevant policy making forums, which is the whole rationale for the existence of the IGF.

Lithuania:

Lithuania supports current practice when no negotiated outcomes or decisions are produced.
A special report might be produced to present accomplishments of dynamic coalitions.

Marilia Maciel:

The IGF should be regarded as a process that lasts throughout the year. All the steps in the preparation of the IGF are important to generate meaningful outcomes, such as: an open and early discussion of key-themes, the definition of clear questions that will structure IGF sessions, and an inclusive process of agenda-setting. Thematic groups coordinated by MAG members can be created to plan the sessions, identify speakers, contact organizers of feeder workshops and summarize discussions.

During the IGF, some changes could help in the process of producing more clear outcomes, such :

a) IGF workshops need to be better documented with main positions (specially policy positions) being identified by a rapporteur and forwarded to main sessions for further and wider debate.

b) The MAG or some multistakeholder thematic commissions could analyze the summaries of IGF discussions - both what has been pointed out by workshops rapporteurs and discussed in main sessions - and translate this valuable but rough material into messages about policy proposals to be shared with relevant decision-making bodies.

c) IGF messages could be fed into relevant fora dealing with Internet governance issues, especially CSTD

d) A dynamic online repository of Best Practices discussed at the IGF (regarding public policy and regulation) should be created and constantly updated. Best practices can serve as model for local policy development.

Nominet:

The IGF has adopted a very open process in developing its processes and the meetings. This has been one of the strengths o f the IGF. We are sure that, as more stakeholders get involved in the IGF, we will see the IGF continue to evolve.

The best achievement from the IGF is that participants learn from their involvement, and that, on returning home, they do something different: actions speak louder than words! We believe that, both from developing and developed countries, those engaging in the process continue to engage becausethey are learning from their involvement.

As noted above, participants in the IGF benefit from the effort that they put in to shape the dialogue to the challenges that they face. Concerted preparation and wider dissemination of results have been achieved through national and regional initiatives. (East Africa, which has become a thought-leader in the use of the IGF-model, with more recent initiatives of West and Southern Africa IGF, are excellent examples of this.)

We would not support changing the emphasis of the IGF into producing formal outputs as this would move the focus away from developing and improving cooperation, knowledge and shared understanding in favour of the preparing written texts.

That said, we do recognise that, while the output of the IGF meetings is easily accessible in a relatively high-level format (the chair's summary) or in more detail through session transcripts or workshop reports, more could be done to extract targeted messages. We would be interested to see more done to develop "messages from the IGF", something we do in the UK-IGF to help spread the messages.

However, we are highly conscious that Internet governance issues do not have clear "right and wrong" answers. The IGF has been successful precisely because it has looked at different approaches and focussed on opportunities, options and strategies suitable for the individual circumstances. As an example, we would note the way the IGF has dealt with security, openness and privacy as three inter-related concepts.

Any future development of the IGF should recognise this complex relationship between different fundamental concepts, something that is not too different from the relationships between different rights in the off-line world.

Norway:
Norway strongly believes that the IGF should be maintained as a non-negotiating body without binding outcome or decisions. However, different ways should be explored in order to make the outcomes more concrete without changing the IGF into a negotiating or decision-making body. One way might be to establish a system with chair's summary and reports from the different workshops. Furthermore, we believe that the IGF could benefit from a more structured framework. We therefore support the idea of setting specific questions and anticipated outcomes for each IGF which in our view could lead to a more focused approch to the different issues.

Portugal:
IGF meetings should continue to be a non-binding fora free from constraints and the limitation to minimal outcomes that obtain consensus or general support which are associated with attempts to reach consensual or negotiated documents. The dialogues between different stakeholders should be free from these constraints so that they can fully benefit from open multistakeholder dialogue, well informed and seeking the development of contributions to social, political and economic growth, along with more shared knowledge and meaning among different stakeholders.

The outcomes of IGF meetings are already excellent through numerous and varied participation, full written transcripts of plenary sessions, video recordings and full written proceedings. These are already most and better organized outcomes than other large communication fora in any area and anywhere.

A Chair's report is a very valuable outcome to get a real sense of what level of consensus exists on some of the topics, or identify more clearly areas of disagreement, to clarify different points of view and to signal progress.

Dialogue and debate in a constructive way towards social, political and economic growth, alongside with the perception of what is new, unique and convergent or not in Internet policy issues around the world, should be the key words to shape the outcome of IGF meetings.
It might be useful to have an additional outcome in the form of clear-cut messages, as "bullet-point statements" synthesizing the main points addressed in sessions and workshops. These could function as outcome highlights that could raise the attention of different organizations/fora to ubsjects of their interest. They could just be a compilation of up to three messages from each session/workshop contributed by rapporteurs designated for each one of them, and not a negotiated document that would take a lot of time and result in "least denominator" instead of a highest-value pool of ideas/contributions. This approach would have the further advantage of allowing for different uses/interpretations by different parties/organizations according to their varied interests and points of view.

Social Aid of Hellas:
IGF Meetings have to become our first priority but they have to be planned step by step with eminent specialists and experienced stakeholders and then we have to reach a broad participation.

South Africa:
What the Tunis Agenda is clear about is that the IGF is not a decision making body but rather a forum for capacity building and policy dialogue. This is important to keep in mind when one talks about shaping the outcome. Having said that this does not mean that its outcomes should not be structured in such a way that they serve some educational purpose. What has paralysed this aspect in terms of the Forum has been the ambition, in some quarters, to have "politically influential" rather than capacity oriented outcomes. Capacity oriented outcomes such as outlines of best practices, opinions and so forth should be encouraged as they provide the developed and developing countries with the requisite information. The structure and mandate of the IGF is such that if this body is to remain relevant capacity building has to

remain key. This is an area which is not only vital but also fluid enough not to require extensive restructuring that would be necessitated in outcomes geared at policy making for example. The problem that arises when outcomes are geared at influencing policies and debates stemming from other global policy institutions is credibility and what might be termed "delegated authority to represent". In other words, the question of representativity and legitimacy arises. The IGF does not have a specific governance structure, thus outcomes that are geared to transfer to other bodies would have to address the question of what constituency the forum is speaking on behalf of and who has given it the mandate to do so.

Sri Lanka:
The two concerns which arise when one looks at the past performance of the IGF have been the failure of IGF discussions to concentrate on the really important issues of interest to the world at large at its annual meetings and its relative lack of success in ensuring that its recommendations are implemented. In order to ensure that IGF agenda is more relevant, reports of IGF annual meetings must be presented as part of the agenda to the General Assembly and any concerns expressed on the direction being taken by IGF should be conveyed to the IGF and used to shape the procedures/agenda of the next meeting. As far as implementation is concerned, better mechanisms must be available to ensure that recommendations made at the IGF are conveyed to national governments and that where necessary, technical support is made available particularly to developing countries for the implementation of such recommendations.

Sweden:
Sweden thinks it is very important to maintain the IGF as a non-binding process without negotiated outcomes or decisions. The main outcome should constitute a good basis for each participant in their decision processes.

However, summaries and headlines from sessions made by the moderator for sessions for example as being done at the European IGF, called EuroDIG, is a useful practise. A best practise site on the IGF web page is also a good idea.

SWITCH:
Currently IGF's outcomes only have advisory character. This should remain so. We neither need a global police nor any other Internet superpower above those already established. Formally there should be accurate reports from the meetings and the outcome should be in the form of specific recommendations on certain topics and best practice documents.

United Kingdom:
Consistent with the Tunis Agenda, we do not believe the IGF should be a negotiating forum producing binding outcomes. This would change its essential character as a coming together of experts and policymakers for dialogue from which ideas, new solutions cooperation and shared initiatives flow.

However, we also believe that this process does need a more structured framework including setting objectives and anticipated outcomes of all the various sessions.

The UK Government supports therefore the setting of questions and objectives for each IGF in order to provide the necessary focus. This would enable the forum participants to assess progress on issues at the end of each IGF: the forum can ask to what extent have these questions been answered or need further elaboration and interaction amongst the participants between sessions or at the next IGF event so that the dialogue maintains a coherent momentum with sight of some end-results and even in some cases closure so that the IGF can turn to other themes in its place. This should be possible and would provide vital clarity for all participants of the takeaways and agendas for inter-sessional activities at the regional, national and local levels.

UNESCO:
For UNESCO, the IGF has been successful, inter alia because of its non-negotiation approach and open format, which does not require any accreditation procedure to participate in the Forum. UNESCO welcomes the idea of innovation and change, while maintaining these

two elements. Granting to the IGF authority for producing negotiated outcomes could lead to reduce the current level of freedom of expression and exchange of ideas to simple, strategic statements for negotiation purposes.

United States of America:

The United States strongly feels that the IGF should avoid producing negotiated texts. This would undermine the important exchange and dialogue among all stakeholders which is a unique feature of the IGF. Better alternatives might be to publish a Chairman's Report, summarizing the discussions held at meeting events, or to publish a compendium of views expressed by stakeholders at an IGF meeting.

5. Outreach to and cooperation with other organisations and fora dealing with IG issues

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
Outreach and cooperation with other organisations and institutions in the internet governance ecosystem will be more effective if the IGF generates messages, or outcomes that are easier to communicate than the current chair's summary, or IGF proceedings.

Another way to increase outreach could be to pilot thematic IGFs. Thematic IGFs can provide fora for individuals with the appropriate expertise from different stakeholder groups to engage specific issues in greater depth and then communicate the outcomes their discussions to the global IGF and to relevant other IG bodies.

As with pre-events, thematic events can help to deepen the understanding of complex issues.

Regional and national IGFs can also provide fora for stakeholders from developing countries to engage with the IGF processes and issues. There is a general consensus that regional and national processes should be strengthened and that their link with the global space should be flexible rather than formal, allowing these processes to follow their own dynamics and respond to their regional or national priorities. The MAG should, however, encourage national and regional IGF related processes to contribute to the open consultations to ensure that the priorities identified at those levels are taken into account when building the global IGF agenda. We propose that the Secretariat facilitates periodic meetings between conveners of national and regional IGFs and provide avenues for the exchange of information. We urge national and regional IGFs to be as inclusive as possible and to respect the WSIS principles at all times. We also suggest that conveners of national and regional IGFs produce reports which feed the main session on regional perspectives and be tabled in pre-events, workshops and other sessions.

Brazil:
5.1   Brazil believes that IGF should, in cooperation with other organizations, play an important role in "strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries" and "promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes". (itens "f" and "i" of paragraph 72).

Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA):
CIRA believes that a lot of progress has been made with existing outreach and cooperation efforts, and that continuing to mature these efforts will benefit the IGF.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
As already noted in section 2 above, the IGF lacks a strong cooperative relationship with other Internet governance institutions. They do not yet recognise the value of the IGF's contribution, in bringing multi-stakeholder deliberation to bear on pressing Internet governance questions. In particular, it is necessary to increase the influence of the IGF over decision-making bodies.

One concrete strategy to this end that could be immediately implemented could be to strengthen the link between the IGF and the CSTD, being the body with main responsibility for WSIS follow-up. Specifically, the CSTD should take into account inputs from the IGF when drafting its annual resolution. The IGF should then concentrate on developing similar links with other global decision-making bodies both public and private.

The IGF also has a watchdog role to play, pursuant to its mandate in paragraph 72(i) of the Tunis Agenda, wherein it can review and ensure the accountability of all fora involved in Internet governance. This could also be the specific responsibility of a new multi-stakeholder working group within the IGF, reporting to the MAG.

EUROLINC:

In matter of cooperation, the outcomes are limited. Some cooperation may be observed with ITU. Indirectly, regional or national IGF meetings cooperate with local organisations. There is no formal arrangement with ICANN (legally a private US corporation), but through its dense patronage this organisation is able to permeate the IGF scene indirectly, situation which can not be seen as very transparent.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):

In addition to the important global IGF, national and regional IGFs have evolved in all regions, each distinct to their own locality, but building on dialogues of the global IGF and providing new input back into the global discussions. As national and regional IGF initiatives, these events allow for an evolution of the dialogue and reflect the implementation of the Tunis Agenda goals.

The IGF is not designed to "take over" issues from other processes. It might however, help stakeholders and processes that are independent of each other to exchange experiences in a way that makes their dialogues more informed, including by having the opportunity to build on experiences of success and failure.

The IGF has been very effective in outreach and cooperation with other organizations and forums with Internet governance issues. This has been achieved through open consultations, national or regional IGF initiative meetings, and the specific role of organisations in the process of coordinating workshops. The continued success of this is demonstrated by the engagement of Internet governance topics in other organizations that then, in turn, participate in the global IGF. The partnerships and cooperation that have emerged out of the IGFs are another example of the effectiveness of the outreach.

Finland:

The IGF is naturally linked to other entities dealing with internet related issues by bringing together all stakeholder groups. Depending on available resources, the outreach made by the secretariat could be further increased by targeted information material and participation in relevant meetings dealing with internet governance.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):

The GIIC feels greater outreach and cooperation on IG issues is an ongoing process as the IGF has established itself as a valuable venue for the discussion and debate of critical Internet Governance issues. We would encourage the IGF to continue its outreach efforts to draw more organizations into the IGF process.

ICC BASIS:

The participation of representatives from various international and inter-governmental organizations and processes in the IGF and the regional initiatives has been a useful way to create links, raise awareness about work programmes and activities, and has facilitated the exchange of information. It would be useful to build on this start by encouraging other organizations who have not participated in the IGF to do so, and creating a regular update to relevant organizations and processes by sending them the Chairman's summary of the IGF event, for instance. It would also be helpful to build on the work of other organizations addressing topics within the purview of their mandates to share information with the IGF to enable awareness of respective organizational processes and work programmes.

India:

The Tunis agenda mandated the IGF as a policy dialogue forum and mandated it to link with other global fora dealing with Internet Governance issues. Many parts of the mandate of the IGF, as discussed above, directly speak to this issue and seek various kinds of linkages with such fora. The UN General Assembly resolution of December 2010 specifically seeks IGF improvements with a view to link it to the broader dialogue on internet governance. Section 72 (i) mandated the IGF to 'promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes'. This provision clearly establishes 'a watchdog function for the IGF' vis a vis all other global Internet Governance processes. It is,

therefore, important that specific improvements are proposed in the IGF for it to meet its responsibilities in this regard.

As an open and participative public forum on Internet-related issues, the IGF should be seen to have the legitimacy and 'power' of the common people of the world to have their views listened and responded to, and to be able to seek any information or clarification as required. On the other hand, their considered views should be routed into policy-making process. At present, the IGF is the primary institution of global deliberative democracy in the area of global Internet policies. Its formal linkages with institutions of policy-making, therefore, need to be ensured.

Recommendation: All the relevant policy-making organisations should be invited to IGF meetings where they should submit their work to public scrutiny and duly respond to all issues and questions that are raised. As mentioned above, para 72 (i) of the Tunis Agenda mandates and authorises the IGF to undertake such a watch dog role. A clear and effective protocol should be established for outcomes from the IGF, and other kinds of communications like specific clarification or information that may be sought, to be conveyed to all concerned Internet-related bodies in a relatively formal manner, with an expectation not only of due acknowledgement, but of full response and sustained engagement. The MAG and the Secretariat will have an important role in maintaining such liaison on a continued basis. These bodies will have to appropriately structure themselves for this purpose. The format and outcome of the IGF meetings as also the preparatory process will also have to be modified accordingly, as outlined in the Annexure.

Internet technical and academic community:
We believe the IGF should continue to be a unique venue for the open dialogue, exchange of ideas and sharing of information on Internet public policy issues.

As the Tunis Agenda instructs, the IGF should continue to strive to "(f)acilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body" while also imposing "no oversight function" and not "replac(ing) existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise".

In addition to the arrangements, mechanisms, institutions and organizations that were in place at the time the IGF was originally constituted, additional activities such as regional and national IGF events have been created directly as a result of the IGF's last five global meetings.

We see the creation of regional and national IGFs as a very positive outcome of the global IGF. It has allowed for more in-depth discussions among stakeholders in a particular region to discuss problems and potential solutions relevant to that region. Regional and national IGFs provide a good opportunity to enable regional/national stakeholders to conduct a dialogue with their local regional and national Internet governance organizations. In this way, there is a continual cycle of stakeholder outreach both at the global and more local levels. In addition, bringing together actors at the local level encourages stakeholders to work together to improve Internet governance in their own environments. It is encouraging to see that many regional and national governance processes in various parts of the world have been inspired by the multistakeholder model of the IGF, adopting the same open and inclusive nature in their respective processes.

The IGF should continue to be a facilitating arena that both accepts input from such organizations and events as well as distributes outcomes of discussions back to these organizations.

As noted in our responses in section 1—how the IGF has met its mandate, in particular, according to the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72f—and section 2—how the IGF links into the broader dialogue on global Internet governance—it is clear that the IGF has succeeded in building linkages with other Internet bodies. Internet governance sessions have become a

standard agenda item in other Internet meetings, such as ICANN and RIR meetings, and many of the participants in those meetings are also active participants in the IGF.

Iran:
12.   IGF may be informed about discussions in organizations dealing with global Internet governance.

13.   IGF may explore ways and means for enhanced interface with other relevant organizations that are facilitators of WSIS action lines in order to promote the embodiment of WSIS principles in global Internet governance.

14.   In conformity with the provisions of Tunis Agenda, IGF should not duplicate the work and mandate of other organizations.

IT for Change:
A clear and effective protocol should be established for outcomes from the IGF, and other kinds of communications like specific clarification or information that may be sought, to be conveyed to all concerned Internet related bodies in a relatively formal manner, with an expectation not only of due acknowledgement but of full response. As a public fora on Internet related issues, the IGF should be seen to have the legitimacy and 'power' of the general people of the world to have their views listened and responded to, and to be able to seek any information or clarification as required. And their considered views should be routed into policy making process. IGF is thus the prime institution of global deliberative democracy in the Internet policies space. Its formal linkages with institutions of policy making therefore need to be ensured.

All the relevant policy making organisations should also be invited to IGF meetings where they should humbly submit to public scrutiny their work and duly respond to all questions that are raised.

Lithuania:
Stronger links between IGF and CSTD.
Other UN agencies and other International organisations may organise follow-up discussions on the outcomes of IGF related to the field or their activities.

Marilia Maciel:
Enhanced cooperation
It is fundamental to stress that if enhanced cooperation is indeed implemented, the relation between the IGF and enhanced cooperation needs to be better defined. Multistakeholder participation on shaping policy issues should be preserved not only as a principle, but as a necessity in the field of Internet governance. On very simple terms, better policies can be developed if the diversity of views is taken into account.

One possible Way to understand this "complementary" between the IGF and enhanced cooperation is that the initial demand for policy development should emerge from bottom-up and be put forth in the IGF. The IGF is a Forum in Which ideas can be examined by a multistakeholder group of participants and submitted to qualified debate and scrutiny. The outcome of the debates in the IGF should identify the need for policy making in a particular field and point out the range of policy options available. Then they could trigger the actual policy-making in an "enhanced cooperation institutional framework".

Outreach with organizations and fora currently dealing with IG issues
In order to cooperate With other organizations in substantial policy matters, the IGF needs to produce clear outcomes from its discussions, as suggested in the comments made to question 4. In parallel to this exercise:

a) The MAG should map the constellation of organizations and fora that have an impact on IG, map the current issues they are discussing and infonn the IGF community about it.

b) The MAG should make sure that the policy messages from the IGF reach the organizations mentioned above. It should follow-up the actions that are taken by these organizations in response to IGF input.

c) Opportunity should be given for other organizations to present contributions to the open consultations, including on the discussion about priorities for the next IGF.

Nominet:
The IGF has been open to the engagement of other organisations and with other Internet governance fora and we would want it to remain so: the involvement of the Council of Europe, ICANN, ISOC and other international and inter-governmental organisations is important for the success of the IGF.

We would note in particular the development of the engagement of the UN through the ITU and UNESCO. Some regional and other organisations have recognised the importance of this engagement.

We would certainly welcome the engagement of other organisations and fora in the IGF discussions. We recognise that, as the IGF – the new boy on the block – develops visibility, it will be easier to reach out to other organisations. We would welcome any additional visibility that the CSTD can give to the IGF.

As we suggested in our earlier submission to the CSTD, the IGF could benefit from higher visibility with decision makers around the globe. One way of achieving this could be through a "World Economic Forum" (Davos) model: as the importance of the Internet continues to grow, we need to raise the profile of the IGF among the decision-makers in the world – heads of state and governments, senior business people, leading researchers and thought-leaders in civil society.

There have been examples of senior-level involvement in the IGF, but we could usefully develop this engagement, perhaps for one day of each IGF meeting. This will be hard to achieve, but an invitation from (and the involvement of) the Secretary-General would be a good signal that these issues are important.

Regional and national IGFs have also been able to engage a wider participation in the IGF process: EuroDIG has had involvement with the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) and the European Commission, as well as the Council of Europe. A number of national IGFs (including the UK-IGF) and regional IGFs (East Africa-IGF, EuroDIG) have engaged with parliamentarians. This is vital outreach.

Norway:
Within available resources, outreach to other entities dealing with internet related issues should be a priority in the next mandate period.

Portugal:
The cooperation with other organisations and fora dealing with Internet is essential, but it is very clear for us that there are no other global organizations or fora dealing with Internet Governance.

It is desirable to undertake some targeted outreach by enhancing the active participation and engagement of governmental and parliaments actors from both the developed and developing countries. Public sector engagement in debates has been somewhat lower than that of other multistakeholders, such as business, technical and academic community and civil society.

The Internet is decentralized but cooperative, and the dialogue with other instances dealing with Internet issues is rewarding and very positive for all the stakeholders, because it does not only enable mutual learning as it builds on a crossfertilization opportunity that opens new doors for understanding, creativity and innovation, enabling social, political and economic growth worldwide.

Social Aid of Hellas:
We totally agree

South Africa:
The IGF has so far conducted good outreach to other organizations and this should continue in the future

Sri Lanka:
While most intergovernmental agencies are represented at IGF meetings, their does not appear to be a viable mechanism to involve them in implementation of IGF recommendations. However it is regrettable that the IGF has not been able to make a greater impact on ICANN and its governance structure

Sweden:
In order to link the IGF as discussion forum to the decision making at international level, Sweden would like to strengthen the link between the IGF and the CSTD. This will lead to better understanding within the UN system of the multi-stakeholderism in IGF and its importance for social, political and economic growth.

We also think that the cooperation with ICANN, RIRs, ISOC, IETF, OECD, UNESCO, ITU, the Council of Europe, among others, is important for dialogue in a truly multi-stakeholder manner.

SWITCH:
We see a great value gained from a bottom-up structure. Outreach and cooperation should start at the national and regional levels. This ensures that all relevant stakeholders in a certain area can be addressed, that people speak the same language and that traditions and special forms of cooperation are implicit. The general language may still be English, but there should be translations in at least all official UN languages in the plenums. Work in dynamic coalitions and caucuses may not be in English, if all people concerned agree on a different language and if the output can and will be translated to English. Moderators should be chosen who are aware of the intricacies of different countries and people and who are able to ensure an integrative and inclusive climate for all participants.

United Kingdom:
The IGF has successfully attracted the participation of multilateral organisations whose own agendas are informed and even shaped by the unique multi-stakeholder discussions at the IGF.

The complementarily and necessary understanding of respective areas of expertise and policy initiatives have become more easily achieved by their coming together in the unique place of the IGF. In this way the IGF should continue to promote awareness and synergies, and help to avoid conflicts and duplication amongst organisations with differing expertise but similar goals.

There is of course always room to improve in terms of identifying relevant fora not yet engaged

UNESCO:
The IGF Secretariat could launch a systematic outreach process. At the outset, an outreach could be developed including an analysis of which international processes and institutions Internet governance inputs and outputs will make a substantial difference to. This could relate to the MDGs and, or to EFA, or the application of HR and principles. For example, an IGF association with the World Press Freedom day activities and processes would be a fruitful undertaking.

United States of America:
The United States stands firm in our conviction that when the international community meets to discuss the range of Internet governance issues, these conversations must take place in a

truly multi-stakeholder manner. The very architecture of the Internet itself embodies a mode of social and technical organization that is decentralized, cooperative, and layered. Each of these characteristics is fundamental to the benefits the Internet has brought. A multi-stakeholder approach fuels the freedom of innovation that enables economic growth. It fuels the freedom of expression that enables social and political growth.   The United States encourages the IGF to explore ways and means for greater collaboration with other relevant organizations that have WSIS action lines in order to increase the role of the IGF in Internet governance and ensure maximum benefits to the global community. Those organizations include, but are not limited to, ICANN, the RIRs, IETF, ITU, ISOC, UNESCO, and W3C. The participation of development organizations should also be encouraged.

USG Supplemental Language for para 5: To improve the IGF's interface with other intergovernmental organizations, the United States recommends, consistent with Tunis paragraph 120, that all WSIS stakeholders, including the IGF, contribute information on their activities to the public WSIS stocktaking database maintained by the ITU. We further recommend that this database continue to be distributed widely and to all multi-stakeholder communities. We understand that the IGF report is non-negotiated and reflects the contributions of all those participating in the IGF forum.

6. Inclusiveness of the IGF process and of participation at the IGF meetings (in particular with regard to stakeholders from developing countries)

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
We have already addressed participation from developing countries earlier in this document. It remains one of the two most critical challenges that need to be faced to make the IGF more inclusive.

It must involve participation of stakeholders dealing with internet governance, AND stakeholders dealing with development if we want to achieve a creative intersection between development and internet governance.

The other key issue is the participation of non-governmental stakeholders.

We propose increasing the number members in the MAG that are drawn from civil society. Civil society stakeholders are diverse and come from networks and/or institutions or associations that are very different in how they are constituted. We believe that the Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus (IGC) has effective and transparent mechanisms for nominating civil society candidates from within its ranks. This process makes an important contribution to the nomination process.

However, there are important civil society stakeholders who are not present or active in the IGF space, or, who have their own representative structures through which they could also nominate non-governmental members for the MAG. This will be particularly important if we want to include stakeholders who should be involved in the IGF but who do not yet participate actively. Such as human rights organisations, groups working for the interests of people living with disabilities, linguistic and cultural diversity advocates, organisations working on economic development and trade justice, women's rights and development groups, and groups working on climate change and renewable energy. We recommend that the IGF actively reaches out to such groups and include them in the MAG.

We propose that the current number of civil society spaces in the MAG is doubled, with half of these seats being allocated to civil society organisations working specifically in internet policy and governance, and the other half drawn from a wider range of civil society organisation that have an interest in the internet, but who do not focus only on internet policy.

Remote participation
We encourage the Secretariat and workshop organisers to make greater use of speakers and presenters who participate virtually. We recommend that at least one of the two annual open consultations held to prepare for the IGF be held as online consultations. We suggest thinking of remote participation as "enhanced participation" as a means of achieving a more participative IGF process as a whole.

We believe that somewhat more structured formats can assist with this, e.g. the use of rapporteurs in workshops and main sessions, and the consolidation by the rapporteur of any messages that the workshop or main session would like to convey to other internet governance fora and institutions.

Norbert Bollow:
See above under 2. In addition, it would be important for travel funding to be made available to a significant number of civil society participants from developing countries.

Brazil:
6.1 Brazil believes that it should be developed affirmative actions aiming at increasing the participation of stakeholders from developing countries in the preparatory process and IGF meetings, respected the diversity of ideas. This includes the development of criterias for equal participation of representatives from developing and developed countries in the IGF meetins and its preparatory process. Additional funds, managed by the MAG plenary with clear rules,

should support not only travel costs, but also local process of preparation to IGF and on line tools for remote participation and coordination along the year.

6.2   Brazil also supports the main three strategies proposed by Internet Governance Caucus regarding capacity building, outreach and remote participation. In relation to capacity building in developing countries , it should be considered too the item "h" of Paragraph 72 that stresses that such initiatives shall draw fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
Improving the inclusiveness of the IGF requires three main strategies to be addressed:

- Capacity building.
- Outreach.
- Remote participation.

Capacity building should focus on institutional capacity (eg. governments, civil society organizations), rather than on individual capacity. Some suggestions in this regard have been given above in section 3 above.

The IGF should develop an outreach strategy to include in the IGF processes groups that have not yet been included, from civil society, small and medium sized companies, decision-makers, parliamentarians and youth. This should involve the production of a roadmap to identify key-players in each region that need to be included. Such an exercise could also assist the IGF to understand the real barriers for participation.

Integral to this is the issue of funding for developing country participants (especially to developing country policy makers), which has also been addressed already in section 3 above.

Remote participation is a vital feature of an inclusive IGF, and should be formally recognised as an integral part of the IGF. Basic features to be supported are that all IGF meetings, MAG meetings and open consultations should be webcast, recorded and captioned, and options for remote participation put in place. This must include not only participation that is simultaneous with the annual meeting itself, but also asynchronous participation that is not dependent on the timezone of the participant.

The tools and techniques used to enhance remote participation should give participants the opportunity to effectively influence agenda-setting and IGF debates. Too often, the undue emphasis on real-time discussion at the IGF means that remote participation comes too late to be relevant to the IGF's proceedings. This can be avoided by re-conceptualising the IGF as an ongoing global process that takes full advantage of online networking. By the same token, the participation of remote speakers should also be encouraged.

To achieve the necessary level of remote participation, resources must be provided. To date, the resources that have been poured into the annual meeting have been disproportionate compared to those devoted to remote participation – which has a much greater inclusive potential. There has been an over-reliance placed on volunteer effort, which the IGF has been very fortunate to receive. Neither has there been any effective outreach or support to the administrators of other Web sites and popular online fora that comment on IGF or broader Internet governance issues, and could supplement the IGF's own efforts to include the community in its work.

EUROLINC:
Stakeholders from LDCs cannot afford the amount of money needed to attend all IGF meetings. In addition they are often hampered by restrictive visa procedures. Remote participation is presently getting more organised and more efficient. Nonetheless real time interaction remains contingent upon the capabilities of the remote local infrastructure.

The next roadblock is translation. English is rarely LDC stakeholders native language. If they can understand when it is clearly spoken, they may not be fluent enough to participate in quick exchanges of a discussion.

This is the case of workshops, which are the dominant and more productive session category, while being devoid of translation. Deficiencies in audio equipment are an additional source of aural impairment. Thus, translation is all the more essential for LDC stakeholders that they are usually a small minority in IGF meetings. Except when volunteers are available, translation means money. As mentioned later in paragraph 8, we suggest to limit translation in main sessions and allocate interpreters to workshops
In an attached companion document we suggest an approach for a stable financing of LDCs participation in the WSIS process.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
Inclusiveness should be achieved, primarily, with a balanced representation of governments and other stakeholders.

The IGF process should be easy to participate in, simple to contribute to – e.g. to bring data and share experiences,. There should be increasingly effective mechanisms to bring information back to reflect upon in a localized, national, or regional context.

The ability for all stakeholders to engage in the IGF process is important, including for new participants. This is achieved through a variety of means, including remote participation, national or regional IGF initiative meetings, participation and help by other organisations. The IGF itself delivers remote participation opportunities, as well as transcripts and video/audio archives which provide for participation.

Finland:
Finland would like to see further efforts made to mainstream the participation of the youth in the IGF meetings and their organization. This can be done only through special trust funds and other systematic efforts. The MAG could include members from the youth. The substance of the meetings should be planned in such manner to facilitate the participation of the youth in the discussion.

Finland would also like to see increased participation of the parliaments from both the developing and developed countries. To attract them special meetings should be organized for the parliamentarians in the margins of the IGF. Government officials, especially the ones dealing with development issues, as well as the marginalized groups could also be better represented. Increasing the inclusiveness of the IGF can be achieved through targeted efforts made by all stakeholders.

The participation of stakeholders from developing counties is discussed under the point three.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):
The GIIC feels that the consultation format, established by the IGF Secretariat (early debrief/planning meeting in February, a mid-year session in April or May, and a final session in early fall, with the IGF soon after is a process that works well so that all interested stakeholders can now plan contributions to and participation in IGF meetings.

The introduction and growth of the remote participation has been welcomed additional to the IGF process. The GIIC would encourage the continued focus on the value of this tool and support additional steps to reach a broader audience and encourage participation for the IGF.

Lastly, the growth of the regional and national IGFs has been an effective way of reaching a larger group of interested parties as well and the GIIC would encourage the continued work of the IGF secretariat to find ways to engage with these new organizations.

ICC BASIS:
- Continue to increase remote participation opportunities at the IGF and at all of the preparatory meetings
- Ensure transcription and the well-organized archiving of IGF proceedings, in an easily accessible manner.
- Continue to build the website as a comprehensive resource to raise awareness and provide relevant information for all
- Build on IGF national and regional initiatives to raise awareness and create more inclusive and active participation in the global level IGF
- Seek feedback from stakeholders on what the obstacles or challenges are to participation

India:
Openness, as admirably achieved by the IGF, is just the first condition of inclusiveness. It requires further specific measures to ensure that openness does indeed lead to equitable participation. In this regard, we find that the IGF still has much to achieve. It is obvious that any process where anyone can come and be part of, will get crowded by those with most resources to attend. This skews the very identity and thus legitimacy of the concerned forum, because it is perhaps more important for those people and groups who are least likely to have resources to attend policy forums, to do so. Any open process thus requires countervailing measures of 'protective discrimination', whereby those sections that are identified to be under-represented are provided special enabling measures as well as incentives to participate.

Recommendation: (i) Adequate funds and other forms of support should, therefore, be made available for participants from developing countries. It must also be recognised that even within developing countries there are various socio-economic divides and other kinds of marginalisations. Special proactive funding and other support for developing country participants should expressly target these groups that represent marginalised interests. While providing support within all categories of stakeholders from developing countries, it is important to recognise the claims of groups that are more marginalised like those associated with women's rights and those working with various kinds of disadvantaged communities. Making linkages with groups that actually work with, and represent, marginalised sections of the society in the developing world, is an important requirement that the IGF process should address itself to. Multi-stakeholderism is not fulfilled by getting one representative each from governments, civil society, private sector and the technical community. This is only a nominal and insufficient representation of the diversity of views and interests related to internet policies. It is important to have representatives from various under-represented groups from the developing countries. An active attention to these imperatives throughout the IGF process is required to ensure inclusiveness.

(ii) Inclusion, however, does not stop at ensuring attendance. It means much more - from consciously taking up issues on the agenda that relate to the interests of the marginalised groups; getting representatives of these groups on the MAG and other committees; getting them on panels of the Plenary as well as workshop sessions; and ensuring that policy-related outcomes specifically focus on the interests of these groups. It should be ensured that for every plenary session and every workshop, there is at least one person on the panel specifically representing the interests of marginalised groups.

Internet technical and academic community:
Please see response to section 3.

Iran:
12.   15.   To optimize the expertise and richness of dialogue in the IGF and in order to address the issue of limited participation from the governments and other stakeholders from developing countries in its deliberations, it is imperative to manage IGF discussions towards key elements of global Internet governance in line with paragraph 29 of the Tunis Agenda to persuade more stakeholders from developing countries to attend.

16.   Adequate funds should be made available to support the participation of representatives of Internet governance organizations from developing countries. However,

funding of IGF participants should be properly managed not to threaten their independence.

17.   Inclusiveness of the IGF to allow all stakeholders to participate at discussions on global Internet governance issues is important. To increase the productivity of discussions at this multistakeholder forum, priority should be given to the participation of experts from developing countries, interested in global Internet governance issues, by providing financial support to them.

IT for Change:
One problem with completely open forums like the IGF is that they get populated by those with resources to attend. This skews the very identity and thus legitimacy of the concerned forum, because it is perhaps more important for those people and groups to attend policy forums who are least likely to have resources to do so. Adequate funds and other forms of support should therefore be made available for participants from developing countries.

It must also be recognised that even within developing countries, and perhaps increasingly more so, there are deep socio-economic divides and other kinds of marginalisations. Special proactive funding and other support for developing country participants should expressly target these groups that represent the marginalised interests.

Inclusion, however, does not stop at ensuring attendance. It means much more; from consciously taking up issues on agenda that relate to the interests of the marginalised groups, getting representatives of these groups on the MAG and other committees, getting them on panels of plenary as well as workshop sessions, and ensuring that policy related outcomes specifically focus on the interests of these groups. Public policies, apart from ensuring 'general' public interest have an important role in correcting power imbalances in the society. The IGF also needs to address itself to this task vis-à-vis the global Internet space in the entire spectrum of its working.

It should be ensured that for every plenary session and every workshop there is at least one person on the panel specifically representing the interests of marginalised groups.

Lithuania:
Further elaborate opportunities of remote participation.
To encourage and support participation of delegates from developing countries, especially from LDCs, as well as representatives from civil society and the youth.

Marilia Maciel:
Capacity building

a) Focus should be placed on institutional capacity building (governments - With emphasis on policy makers - and civil society organizations), rather than on individual capacity. There are capacity building organizations that focus on individuals.

b) The secretary-general recommended that IGF produces and offers to member states useful capacity building outputs, such as offline and online training and toolkits aiming at greater awareness and better understanding of issues related to Internet Governance.[39] It also recommended members states and relevant UN system organizations to make a concerted effort to promote capacity building.[40] For instance, the IGF could take advantage of the expertise of the Division for Public Administration and development (DESA) for capacity building, both online and offline

Increasing physical participation

---

[39] Note by the Secretary-general on the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. A/65/78-E/2010/68, paragraph, 35.
[40] Paragraph 49.

a) An outreach strategy should be developed by the MAG and the secretariat to bring to the IGF process key-groups that have not yet been included. In parallel, communication should be established with outsiders to understand the real barriers for participation in the IGF process.

b) Travel funding should be available to people from developing countries (with special emphasis on developing country policy makers), taking into account clear criteria, such as, for instance, age, gender and whether a particular group works with the marginalized key-groups that need to be included in the IGF process.

c) Open opportunity to apply for funding, widely announced among interested people, specially the ones from developing countries. Transparent and timely decisions regarding the funding is important

Remote attendance

Remote participation has been a very important way to increase the involvement of people that otherwise could not follow the IGF meetings, due to several reasons, such as lack of financial and human resources, time constraints or mobility issues.

During IGF interested people are able to take part in discussions individually, from home or office, or they can gather in IGF hubs. The hubs are local meetings where the participants are able not only to watch the webcast of the IGF but also to interact with those physically present in the IGF. Also, and more importantly, participants are able to discuss the themes covered by the IGF from a local perspective with others from their own region. The Forum serves as a stimulus or a starting point for the debate of local issues and implications and for the development of a network of interested people in every region. According to statistics about the IGF Vilnius, made available by the IGF secretariat, 1299 people participated remotely and 81% among them were from developing countries.[41]

Due to its importance, remote participation should be regarded as an integral part of the IGF. In addition to that, it should be made available in the IGF process as a whole, not only in the meetings per se.

a) In all IGF meetings, MAG meetings and open consultations, webcast, recording and captioning should continue to be available, as well as options for remote participation

b) Remote participation should be fonnally recognized as an integral part of the IGF. Due to the importance that remote participation has gained in IGF meetings, the secretariat should not rely only on volunteers to provide remote participation. Technical, financial and human resources to put in place remote participation should be provided.

c) Tools and techniques should be used to enhance remote participation, giving participants the opportunity to effectively inf`luence agenda-setting and IGF debates. Some innovative ideas are been putting in place in EuroDIG this year, with the support of fellows from DiploFoundation.

d) The participation of remote speakers should be encouraged. In IGF Vilnius, representatives from civil society as well as parliamentarians were able to deliver their presentations online. This contributes to the diversity of stakeholder and regional views on the panels.

Nominet:
The IGF process has throughout been an open process and in recent years has developed regional hubs and remote participation to improve engagement in the process and at IGF meetings. We would welcome ideas to further develop this engagement.

---

[41] IGF Secretariat. Vilnius meeting participation figures, 2010. Available at
http;//www.intgovforumorggcms/2010/Stats.2010.pdf

In particular, we believe that stronger engagement from developing country government departments leading in the introduction of ICTs and from governments directly involved in CSTD would help drive the priority of the development agenda.

Norway:
See remarks under point three

Portugal:
The UN should create a transparent administered fellowship program to promote the participation of stakeholders from developing countries and LDC, as well as needed civil society organizations, avoiding a dependency on the availability of voluntary contributions administered through a trust fund.

IGF should take place in both developed and developing countries, as in the past.

Remote participation in IGFs has also been a very successful learning process throughout time. The organization of remote participation hubs in developing countries and remote areas could be enhanced and advance to be more interactive and engaging settings, by allowing for remote direct participation of individuals in real-time debate without having to go through intermediaries and by organizing remote hubs workshops to debate specific themes but considered as part of the workshops of the IGF participating in the IGF reporting schemes in equal footing to in site workshops.

Social Aid of Hellas:
We have the opinion that in order the Meetings have the possibility to reach to serious results ,we strongly believe that the first Meetings must be planned by stakeholders who have knowledge and experiences

South Africa:
The Secretariat of the IGF has in the past attempted to promote as much open participation as possible, but there are some challenges. As with most annual meetings and specific sector meetings, the tendency of participation of 'regulars' does tend to stagnate fully inclusive participation. There has been to date a relative tendency of not safeguarding the need to include other groups through the inadvertent encouragement of certain stakeholders to continue to dominate. Stakeholders who have a vested interest in Internet issues receive prominence to the extent that stakeholders from developing countries have limited influence in the debate. In the case of the IGF, these have been businesses who are market stakeholders and are geared towards influencing market trends more than capacity building.

It is important to keep in mind in promoting inclusiveness and participation that participation is not equal to effectiveness and falls into different categories, that is, fully effective; partially effective or not effective at all. The type of participation level derived by participants is critical in ensuring their continued desire to participate in the proceedings of the IGF. As alluded to earlier a higher level of interest and participation has to be measured against the possible benefits that the process can give a participant, be it on an individual, national or regional level. Tangible benefits are very important in enhancing participation.

 The MAG needs to be more active in this area by specifically giving priority and targeting small civil society entities from developing countries to participate. Special funding mechanisms to ensure that this happens might have to be devised. Preparatory meetings at a national level would facilitate more diverse interest.

Sri Lanka:
More than 60% of the Civil Society and Business representation at IGF meetings are from the developed world largely because of the inability of developing country civil society and business to fund their own participation. Financial support for such participation will have to come from extra-budgetary funds available with intergovernmental institutions. Bilateral support for developing country civil society and business participation from developed country sources will not ensure inclusiveness unless the funding is made through intergovernmental agencies and a transparent process for choosing the recipients of such funding is established.

Inclusiveness could also be improved by the use of internet-based discussions to a larger extent in the preparatory process before Annual meetings of the IGF and meetings of its dynamic coalitions.

Sweden:
The principle of inclusiveness should be maintained and further enhanced by maintaining the trust fund to support participation from developing countries. Other funding options could be explored further.

It is also important to stimulate remote participation and encourage participation from national parliaments and from the youth.

SWITCH:
See answer to question 5 above. In case of great interest from large countries like China, Russia, Japan etc. it may be necessary to find ways to better incorporate non English speaking and reading persons.

United Kingdom:
IGF has a strong track record on inclusiveness that can be further built on. We agree with Markus Kummer that the record of involvement of developing country stakeholders in the IGF to date has been good though it does still need improvement
The revolving hosting of the IGF in diverse regions serves to attract greater stakeholder participation from developing countries and promote regional, national and local multi-stakeholder initiatives.

The Vilnius IGF was a successful turning point in facilitating greater enhanced and meaningful remote participation that should be developed further through greater awareness of these participation hubs in all regions throughout the stakeholder communities, the business, trade and consumer associations, the local Internet bodies and the relevant government ministries and departments, regulators and other public sector agencies with an active policy interest in Internet governance issues, innovation and best practice

The provision of multilingual materials and interpretation is a key component of truly diverse dialogue: no-one should feel left out of the opportunity to contribute to the dialogue from all perspectives. This needs to be truly global forum for dialogue to match the global pervasiveness of the Internet and its contribution to the global economy.

There is a need for a much better IGF website that serves as a portal and an online forum and a focal point between the physical meetings.

The proliferation of national and regional IGFs stimulated by the global IGF in recent years has great unrealised potential for promoting greater inclusiveness. It was agreed in Vilnius that there was no need for formal linkages with these fora but they should be mutually supportive nonetheless. This would in this way result in greater levels of engagement and reach to all types of stakeholders and users of the Internet.

In this way the IGF Secretariat and the MAG can also receive the full range of feedback from national and regional fora to ensure the IGF remains effectively a self-evolutionary model that does not need top down control or external oversight to take key decisions on changes to the IGF.

UNESCO:
Women's participation from developing countries should be enhanced. Internet creates enormous opportunities to increase the participation and access of women to expression and decision-making and applications. The IGF debates should therefore include their voices to efficiently reflect their real needs. The IGF Secretariat could consider calling for special extra budgetary funds to support women from developing countries realizing projects related to Internet governance.

United States of America:

The evolution and continued growth of regional IGFs in developing countries is essential to increasing their participation. Particularly, local and regional IGFs strengthen dialog between local and regional governments, civil society, business, and the technical community that would not have taken place otherwise. Successful national and regional IGFs will ultimately support the IGF at the global level and broaden the influence and participation of developing countries.

Increased efforts can be made to improve the quality and availability of remote participation. Civil society groups, businesses, development organizations, and other stakeholders can offer scholarships to attend the IGF. Each country must be ready to explain to these stakeholders how the IGF adds benefit to their country's economic and social development goals. Likewise, future IGFs should be held in developing countries or regions of the world to maximize convenience and minimize travel expenditures. Finally, efforts should be made to reach out to more economic sectors that are influenced by the Internet such as healthcare and education.

7. Working methods of the IGF, in particular improving the preparation process modalities

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
Much has been said about the need for the IGF to interface in a useful way with external policy makers, but the IGF's working methods were not originally developed in a way that readily advances this aim. Focused reform to the IGF's institutional machinery will be required to improve its capacity to contribute to Internet governance policy making processes.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
The working methods of the IGF should be open, transparent, and must be even more effective and inclusive for remote participants.

ETNO wants to stress the importance of the rounds of preparatory meetings and consultations for each IGF cycle, open to all interested stakeholders.

Regarding the main sessions, a few focused topics and two moderators who are experts, is still the most successful format. Almost all main sessions should follow this format.

As for the new Internet Governance for Development session, or IG4D, we regret it should have been a workshop (as it was in the previous years) instead of a main session. We strongly believe that development is the most important element of Internet governance and it should remain as a cross-cutting theme in all IGF sessions. For this reason, IG4D session should be a workshop.

As a suggestion, perhaps it will be more useful to have two "emerging issues" sessions in future IGFs. In this way there can be enough flexibility to adjust to
Internet government developments, instead of trying to label new main sessions, or identifying new themes that are not really new vertical themes (such as Internet governance in light of WSIS principles, or IG4D).

The Setting the Scene and Regional Perspectives sessions are very useful and we think that in the first case a separate orientation session for newcomers and in the second bringing together the various regional perspectives on each of the main IGF topics should be their format. We also would like to have a shorter opening ceremony and opening session. We still think that besides a formal opening part, the rest of the opening session should be short, with a few key addresses, instead of a questionable line-up of speakers.

Given the opportunity, we would like to request more transparency regarding the selection of speakers for the opening or closing session and a clarification as to the criteria used for selection. For future IGFs we suggest that the opening session and the 'setting the scene' is combined in one 3 hour slot, while the Regional Perspectives session takes a separate 3 hour slot. We believe that a separate 3 hour Regional Perspectives session is well justified, given the rise of the regional and national IGFs.

A true effort should be made to better link the main sessions with workshops, to push for workshops to merge, to keep workshops at a reasonable number – as they are still high in our view - and to have more discussions. This should continue and improve in the future.

The IGF should not be a meeting only for those who can afford to attend meetings. All meetings must benefit from the true possibility of remote participation. Webcasts, remote moderators as a prerequisite, training for remote moderators, remote hubs, all these are greatly appreciated. However, despite the availability of extensive remote facilities, in some cases remote interaction hasn't been enough.

Live transcription is also very much appreciated. This should be extended to all meetings and not just in the main room. If possible, we recommend a brief training session for transcribers before the IGF, as it was the case for remote moderators, so that they get acquainted with the IGF terminology and names.

ETNO wants to stress for future meetings that proper attention is given to the venue, that it is clear what is expected from the host country, and that participants know in advance what the costs of participating in an IGF are.

We strongly believe that for any future IGF, all logistical requests regarding the convening of an IGF meeting should be described in a "requirements" or "specifications" document to be produced by the IGF Secretariat. That document should clearly describe what is expected from the host country, with chapters such as venue (meeting rooms, facilities, infrastructure, etc.), accommodation, travel and visa, local transportation, safety and security, other local host responsibilities (i.e. host country reception, food options, coffee breaks, etc.). In addition, future host countries should fill a candidacy file which will provide answers to the "requirements" document or will commit to provide what is required. This way, planning will be separated into two things: logistics and substance.

Hungary:
The IGF should continue its work on the basis of annual meetings. The open, transparent and non-binding consultation of the IGF should be maintained.

The IGF Secretariat should be kept small and cost effective. Its operation should be accountable to all stakeholders. There is a high value in the independence of the secretariat; that is why its funding on a voluntary basis should be maintained as much as possible.

ICC BASIS:
- Continue to build opportunities for remote hubs and remote participants to contribute throughout the preparations
- Use community projects such as Rural Information Centres equipped with Internet service to promote remote and active participation in IGF at all levels
- Devote resources to the website to develop it further as a 'one stop' educational and training resource of substantive information and also information about the regional and national IGF initiatives
- Continue to build on and encourage local, national and regional IGF dialogues to also contribute to the preparation process and to deepen awareness and inclusivity

United Kingdom:
The UK Government strongly supports the current framework for preparations: i.e. a lightweight secretariat in Geneva (home of WSIS and many key IGOs), assisted and guided by a fully inclusive geographically diverse multi-stakeholder advisory group which is informed by open consultation meetings and written contributions from stakeholders all over the world.

The open meetings in Geneva should be improved by interpretation and enhanced interactive remote participation through regional hubs; especially in the developing world.

The scope for providing greater financial support for physical participation in these preparatory processes must also be investigated.

The bottom up process of applications for workshops has proved to be the most effective means in bringing key current and emerging issues to the IGF. We consider that the management of that process still needs perfecting in order to make navigation at the event itself easier. However, the current efficiencies of this management process should be preserved at all costs.

We also believe that the Secretariat and MAG must also allow a role for the IGF host to help shape specific overarching theme for each event, e.g. we support the young entrepreneurship theme of development at the Nairobi IGF - a key policy objective for Africa and its opportunity focus for the Internet.

7.1. Current modalities: open consultation and MAG

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
Open consultations
We believe that at least one of the annual open consultations should be held virtually to enable all stakeholders to participate equally, irrespective of whether they are in Geneva or not. It should include both synchronous and asynchronous discussions. We also believe that instead of one day of open consultation and two days of semi-open consultations there should be, at the Geneva meetings, two open days and one day of the MAG meeting on its own.

Facilitation roles within the MAG
We recommend that the Secretariat assigns a coordinator to work with the MAG, that the MAG develop a work-plan which includes distributing its work more evenly throughout the year, and that the MAG elects a small coordinating group from among its own members to help facilitate its work. This group could assist the chair and the executive coordinator in facilitating the work of the MAG. The positions in this group could be pre-defined e.g. a liaison for fundraising, for regional meetings, remote participation, for evaluation and feedback to stakeholders. The IGF Secretariat should direct more resources towards facilitating the work of the MAG so that it realises its full potential.

More on-site support from MAG members during the annual fora would contribute for more effective sessions and workshops. We would like the MAG to be more proactive in identifying emerging issues. The MAG should find a way of making recommendations for follow up on some of those emerging issues.

Increased use of ICTs by MAG members
We recommend that the MAG makes use of online platforms for meetings in between face-to-face meetings in addition to their existing use of a mailing list.

Rotation and renewal of mandate
Clear annual or bi-annual rotation and mandate renewal process should be in place to ensure greater representational parity between different stakeholders.

Nomination of MAG chair
Terms of reference and criteria should be developed for this position and a non-com process instituted to propose names for the SG to appoint a chair. One idea could be to have co-chairs (or a chair and a vice-chair) with one position chosen by the UN and the other by the MAG itself. This would be consistent with the IGF leading the way in terms of process at the UN, and it would also support continual communication between MAG members, the Secretariat and the chairs.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
The open consultation meetings could be improved by:

- Seeking the inputs of national and regional IGFs regarding the issues to be discussed in open consultations, especially the agenda. The MAG could take responsibility for this.
- Organisations that are part of the Internet governance ecosystem could be invited to share a one-page document regarding their suggestions on specific thematic issues. This will improve the inputs that go into the IGF and this is important if the IGF is expected to serve as a clearinghouse.
- At least one of the open consultations should take place as an online meeting.

The MAG also requires reform, both in its composition and its working methods. On the former count, the MAG needs to become more accountable to its constituents. This may involve moving on from the existing "black box" approach whereby the United Nations Secretary General selects MAG members from a range of nominees put forward by various parties, pursuant to selection criteria that are not published.

An alternative approach is the selection of MAG representatives through a bottom-up process driven by the stakeholder groups, subject to appropriate criteria to ensure regional and gender balance and a diversity of viewpoints.

In particular, civil society has been under represented in the MAG to date. This anomaly should be corrected in this round of rotation and a fair balance of members among all stakeholders assured. Fair civil society representation is necessary to ensure legitimacy for this new experiment in global governance. We agree that the organisations having an important role in Internet administration and the development of Internet-related technical standards should continue to be represented in the MAG. However, their representation should not be at the expense of civil society participation.

Another reform that might be considered is to rescind the special privileges that representatives of intergovernmental organisations, and special advisors to the chair, currently possess. If the MAG's processes are opened to broader oversight by the community, such special privileges would soon become redundant.

It is also very important that the established process by which one-third of the MAG members are rotated each year is executed methodically, so that the composition of the MAG is completely refreshed every three years. Without this, it is too easy for the MAG to be captured by particular interest groups and for under-performing members to hold the MAG back.

As to the working methods of the MAG, more significant reform of should be considered to assist the IGF to fulfill its mandates in "interfacing," "advising," "identifying issues," "giving recommendations" etc. Specifically, the MAG could be more effective if it worked through thematic and functional working groups (some of which have already been identified above). These working groups should prepare for each main session and the set of workshops connected to this main session. Working groups can also be used for managing internal tasks of the MAG more effectively. It could thus be strengthened and enabled to take on a more effective role in reporting, and in facilitating substantial discussions throughout the year.

EUROLINC:
Open consultations typically occurred during two (sometimes three) one-day meetings in Geneva.
Attendance to these meetings has been dwindling over the years. Live polling of stakeholders opinions is certainly useful, but the cost/efficiency ratio is not perceived as particularly valuable. A continuous process by remote participation, possibly complemented by a two-day meeting, could be a better option.

The MAG and its 50+ more or less perpetual members, do not seem to have a well defined mandate. As a body of advisors representing a diversity of viewpoints, if not powers, it is a classical fixture of democratic processes. So be it. But this instrument is inadequate when it has to deal with organisational tasks, in particular the IGF yearly meeting programme (see later paragraph 8). The IGF yearly meeting is a conference, which needs ad hoc teams for preparation and outreach, like many other conferences. A programme committee should be set up each year, with enough referees for evaluating submitted contributions and proposals. Some MAG members could participate as long as they are personally committed to put in the necessary resources.

The host country is normally in charge of the local organisation. This should be an opportunity for host government and institutions to boost local awareness to internet related issues. In other words touristic fallout should not be the major incentive for hosting IGF meetings.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
The process of the IGF is multifaceted, and one important element is the regular and open consultations – they provide a transparent mechanism for all stakeholders to assess, review, and provide input into the next multistakeholder annual meeting and to help define what needs to be achieved.

ETNO recommends that the Advisory Group always publishes its agenda and produces reports (minutes) of its meetings, as it has initiated already. We also suggest that the Advisory Group increases its efforts to disseminate information regarding the IGF preparatory process, by producing regular reports of its activities. It should also work towards being a fully transparent, democratic, and accountable to all body, debugging the impression of a closed structure. In order to increase transparency, ETNO supports the idea of having a limited number of observers for each Advisory Group meeting.

ETNO insists that certain criteria on the rotation of members of the Advisory Group are established from now on. By all means the Advisory Group must continue to be multi-stakeholder in nature and the balance of the multistakeholder groups within the Advisory Group must be kept.

The MAG should present proposals on substance issues – not host country issues – which should be confirmed by the open consultations or planning meetings. Mainly post acting, or choosing to go independently of the consultation meetings is not the proper way forward for the MAG.

We do not need something in the form of a UN style bureau. This has been discussed and resolved. What we need is a few members who have a genuine interest in the evolution of Internet governance, who have a general knowledge and experience, who represent all groups and who can dedicate time and work.

Finland:
Finland values the IGF´s bottom up, multi-stakeholder preparatory process which has made possible that the meetings evolve from year to year. Open consultations should be maintained with the possibility for remote comments. We also would support creating Terms of Reference for the MAG in line with its own reflections made in the report of its last meeting. The report touches a number of issues, incl. the selection of the MAG members. The meetings of the MAG should be maintained open for observers.

ICC BASIS:
- The open consultations with real-time high quality transcription provide transparency, and an excellent record of proceedings
- Remote participation facilities are essential at open consultations
- The recent opening of the MAG meetings is critical for transparency and inclusivity, this must remain
- The use of real-time transcription and remote participation facilities at the MAG meetings is key
- Ensuring that MAG meetings are always open to observers and that their quality opinions when expressed count

India:
A large part of our response to this question is already covered in the earlier sections. The MAG clearly needs to be much more than just a program committee: it should be focussed on the outcomes of the upcoming annual IGF. As explained earlier, this can be done through meaningful contribution on key Internet policy issues to relevant policy-making forums. It has been 5 years now and the IGF needs to urgently address itself to the number of very pressing global Internet policy issues that await resolution, and regarding which the IGF has not yet been able to achieve much in terms of direct and concrete contributions.

Recommendation: (i) The MAG has to get functionally more differentiated, with different sub-groups taking the responsibility of IGF preparations around each key plenary theme; liaising with different Internet policy institutions; and perhaps also for key internal/administrative functions.

(ii) The selection of non-government representatives to the MAG has to be made more transparent and democratic/representative to better represent different sections of the society, more so the marginalised. Efforts have to be made to obtain as globally representative a group as possible. At present, there are no specific processes to ensure these imperatives,

and the selection process is largely ad hoc and mediated by some key global stakeholder bodies, without due transparency about the process followed to ensure that the diversity of interests and views in that particular stakeholder group are duly represented.

We recommend an accountable, transparent and diversified stakeholder selection process for stakeholder representatives. Such a process should demonstrate its connectedness to the full range of diversity within each stakeholder group, especially those from developing countries, and otherwise less represented groups. Each stakeholder group while selecting its representatives should describe the process used in making the selection, and also specifically mention what steps were taken to include a full diversity of views and interests, and less represented groups, including those from developing counties. To get the selection process right is very important for the success of the unique multi-stakeholder experiment in global governance that the IGF represents.

(iii) One way of ensuring that specific interests are kept out of MAG is by stipulating that the business sector members should not be representatives of specific private companies, but represent different trade associations like in the areas of telecom, software companies, etc. The technical community members could similarly include representatives from key technical and academic institutions. The selection process for civil society members could be made similarly democratic, with representatives selected by a network of NGOs working in areas associated with Internet policies, thus representing a really broad spectrum of civil society.

Internet technical and academic community:
We believe that the working methods of the IGF have been successful due to its unique, multistakeholder approach. The components established to support the working methods of the IGF include: the Secretariat; the MAG; open consultations; and the IGF event itself.
We believe that:
1. The Secretariat should be an independent body, based in Geneva to ensure the continued trust by all stakeholders in the IGF. The Secretariat should continue as a lightweight administrative body that supports the implementation of the IGF program of activities developed through both open consultations and MAG consultations, consistent with their recommendations and taking into account the mandate of the Tunis Agenda[42] and the particular interests of the host countries, where applicable.

2. The MAG's current working methods are effective due to the MAG's composition, comprising representatives from all stakeholder groups, including the technical community, which ensures full representation of all parties in the process. We welcome the recent change by the MAG to make their meetings open to observers, thereby increasing transparency in the process. We believe this shows that there is increased trust among participants in the IGF, a welcoming sign of the maturity of the process.

We support the continuation of the MAG and its multistakeholder composition. We also support the continuous efforts made to further increase gender balance, geographical diversity and balanced representation from both developed and developing countries in the MAG. We believe the selection process of the MAG members should continue to allow each stakeholder group to define its appropriate nomination method, leaving the Secretariat to ensure wider representation based on the stakeholder nominations. In its summary report of 23 November 2010[43], the MAG discussed the selection process of its members and made recommendations to enhance this process. We support the recommendations put forward by the MAG, specifically:

a) A third of the MAG members be rotated every year.
b) A de facto three-year limit to each member's term.
c) Maintaining the private sector, civil society and the technical community as separate stakeholder groups.

---

[42] In particular, Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 73b, "Have a lightweight and decentralized structure that would be subject to periodic review".
[43] "Multistakeholder Advisory Group Meeting: Summary Report", 2010, http://intgovforum.org/cms/2010/MAG.Summary.23.11.2010.pdf

d) Recognition that all of the stakeholder groups are organized differently and based on different cultures and should therefore be allowed to develop their own specific selection procedures.

e) A form of 'triage' carried out by the Secretariat to ensure appropriate diversity and geographical balance among MAG members.

3. Open consultations should continue to be held as a way of further enabling a wide cross section of stakeholders to contribute to the IGF program development.
We strongly believe that the IGF event should continue to be completely open to all participants. No accreditation or restriction should be imposed on participation in the IGF meetings, and no special labels should be used by any specific group. Anyone participating in the meeting should not only be permitted, but be encouraged, to make their voices heard.

4. It is essential for the IGF to continue to provide remote participation mechanisms, allowing those unable to travel to consultations or the yearly global IGF (such as stakeholders from developing countries, marginalized groups, or individuals without the financial backing to attend) to continue to participate in the IGF process. In its first five years, the IGF has evolved the approach to remote participation, becoming gradually more effective; this evolution must continue, building on best practices developed in other forums as well as lessons learned. To date, remote participation has been made possible through generous donations by various stakeholders and through a plethora of committed volunteers. This model has proven to be successful in the past, and should be further built on in the future.

5. Interpretation and translation into UN languages should continue to be supported to enable as wide a range of input as possible.

Iran:
18.   The functioning of the multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) could be improved as regards to its competences, legitimacy and efficiency.

19.   In IGF preparatory process, MAG should uphold IGF contribution to key issues related to global Internet governance.

20.   The meaningful participation of stakeholders from developing countries in the preparatory meetings of IGF should be supported.

IT for Change:
A good amount of what we may have to say here is already covered in the earlier sections. The MAG clearly needs to be much more than just a program committee, and it should be focussed on looking at what can that particular year of IGF activity concretely contribute to upholding public interest in the global Internet space. This can be done through meaningful contribution on key Internet policy issues to relevant policy making forums. It is required that such exhortations are made early in the annual cycle of the IGF to inform the whole process around the IGF. It has been 5 years now and we need to get out of an experimental – things are yet young and fragile – mode, and get on with grappling with the huge number of very pressing global Internet policy issues that await resolution, and regarding which the IGFs have done little if anything in the first phase.

The MAG has to get functionally more differentiated internally, with different sub-groups taking the responsibility of IGF preparations around every key plenary theme, liaison with different Internet policy institutions and perhaps also for key internal/administrative functions.

The selection of non-government representatives to the MAG has to be made more transparent and democratic/representative, as representing different sections of the society, more so the marginalised. The basic objective of such representation has expressly to be to get a complete picture of the public interest involved, and not of placating special interests. The effort has to be to obtain as globally representative a group as possible, while ensuring that multistakeholderism does not become a route to get special interests into positions of undue influence on policy processes. At present there are no specific processes to ensure these imperatives, and the selection process is largely ad hoc.

We greatly recommend trying out the stakeholder selection process of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee. The business sector members of this committee are representatives of different trade associations like in the areas of telecom, software companies etc. There are no direct company representatives on the committee, which makes perfect sense for keeping out special interests. The selection process for civil society members is similarly democratic. The members are selected by a network of hundreds of NGOs working in areas associated with Internet policies, and thus represent a really broad spectrum of civil society. To get the selection process right is very important for the success of the unique multi-stakeholder experiment in global governance that the IGF represents.

Lithuania:
Lithuania supports opening MAG meetings to observers.

Marilia Maciel:
The IGF should be a process, not a yearly event. The bottom-up creation of regional and national IGFs was an important step to give more continuity to the debate throughout the year, but IGF working methods and communication mechanisms could be enhanced to allow more openness, diversity and participation.

Open consultations
Planning meetings, such as the open consultations, are very important, as they decisively shape the agenda on the next IGF. Several documents that present an evaluation of the IGF, such as the note by the Secretary-general, mention that the agenda of the meeting needs to be more socially and development oriented. It is easy to understand why developmental issues are not so mainstreamed, if one takes a look at the participants of open consultations. There is a great majority of people from developed countries, who put forward their own legitimate concerns, which may not coincide with the issues faced in developing countries. The fact that all the meetings take place in Geneva and that developing country representatives have to deal with scarce resources are also obstacles.

a) At least one of the open consultations should take place as an online meeting. Online meetings are not only eco-friendly, but can also foster more equal participation among regions. One example of the inclusive potential of remote participation may be illustrative. Last IGF, only 5% of the people who physically attended were from South America. But 25%of the remote participants were from the same region, showing that lack of resources is more significant than lack of interest when it comes to participation in IGF process.

b) The actual dynamics of remote participation should continue to be improved, so remote participants will have more impact on discussions and equal chance to intervene and make their voices heard.

c) Early each year, in Open Consultations, participants should identify key global policy areas that require attention. Thematic commissions coordinated by MAG members could be created around these areas. They could share background material and discuss them in thematic sessions that could be carried out online throughout the year, with the aim to prepare for more in depth discussion at the IGF.
d) Organizations that are part of the IG ecosystem could be invited to share their suggestions on specific thematic issues. This Will improve the inputs that go into the IGF

The MAG
The MAG needs to be more than a committee to discuss the program and the infra-structure for the next IGF. The competences of the MAG should be enlarged, its legitimacy should be strengthened and its internal dynamics should be rendered more efficient.

a)   The election of non-governmental members for the MAG needs to be more transparent to guarantee that a Wide range of interests are indeed represented. It is Worth to analyze and drive lessons from successful methods for electing non-governmental members of Multistakeholder bodies, such as the one put forth by the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee.

b) The periodicity of the rotation of MAG members needs to be further discussed. Good suggestions have been advanced about it in the MAG questionnaire and need to be reviewed.

c) The members of the MAG should approve an annual Working plan and implementation strategy on the beginning of every year, right after the first round of open consultations.

d) Sub-committees could be created in the MAG. These committees could have an administrative nature, such as a coordinating committee, or deal with more substantive themes that are agreed to be priority in the beginning of the year, integrating the thematic committees mentioned above

e) MAG should have an important role in the process of helping to identify policy messages from the IGF. The valuable but rough summaries of Workshops discussions and main sessions need to be translated into a language and format that could serve as input for policy development in other fora. Thematic groups coordinated by MAG members could perform this role

Regional and national IGFs
a) Seek the inputs from national and regional IGFs especially on agenda-setting, to make sure that issues that were regarded as important on the regional and local level are included in the agenda of the meeting. The MAG could establish a close dialogue with regional and national IGF organizers, to make sure that a feedback relation is created and that information flows on both Ways - from regional to the global level and from the IGF to regional meetings.

b) Foster periodical meetings (that can be carried out online) with the participation of the organizers of national and regional IGFs.

Communication
It is important to notice that very positive actions were taken by at the secretariat in order to improve communication With the IGF community, such as reforming the Website and using social media, such as Facebook and YouTube. Nevertheless, a more coherent strategy for communication should be put in place, if outreach is an important goal to be achieved on the next years.

Particularly, there should be improvement of IGF Website. Three points to be taken into account on this regard are: i) A section could be created for the national and regional IGFs, Where they Would be able to share news and reports; ii) an easy online Way to seek input from stakeholders regarding specific matters, such as the agenda of the meeting; iii) The Website could encompass a section in which people from different constituencies could talk among themselves and reach a more round understanding of issues in-between the open consultation meetings. These discussions could take place throughout the year, with the possibility of meaningful participation of people Who cannot make it to the Open Consultations in Geneva

Nominet:
The current process – directly focussed on outreach and open engagement – has been successful in bringing in new participants. We would welcome additional ideas for outreach that widen engagement in the process.

The Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group has been important in the process of preparing IGF meetings. It has brought together a good mix of different stakeholders but, most importantly, it has provided a useful resource of people prepared to do the programme committee and animator roles.

We would be pleased to see the development of MAG membership, as long as criteria for involvement includes a commitment to maintain the neutral (independent) nature of the MAG with a focus on making the annual IGF meeting work. We would be concerned if the MAG

ceased to provide both the leadership and operational drive that we have seen over the last five years.

Norway:
Norway supports that the MAG-meetings should be maintained open for observers. The value of the open consultations is dependent on more or less equal participation from all stakeholder groups on a relevant level. It should be avoided that one stakeholder group has the possibility to dominate the open consultations. In this respect, Norway is of the opinion that more governments should participate in the open consultations and as observers in the MAG meetings.

Portugal:
The open consultations and the MAG should continue. The transparency on the MAG composition should be improved in order to be better understood by the community. A transparent open process should be put in place to assure an annual turnover of at least 1/3 of its members and to avoid excessive inbreeding. The multistakeholder nature of the MAG should continue with a balance of representatives, on equal footing, who would ensure that people with different experiences and interests, from different communities, continents and countries could have a seat at MAG.

After the discussions held at the open consultations and the MAG to prepare the annual IGF, it should be set-up a team to organize each session (either plenary or breakout session), on a voluntary basis, to better structure dialogues. They should provide background to contextualize the themes, lay out different positions pertaining to each of the topics, and prepare the debate and the sharing of good and best practices. Each team should include whenever possible different stakeholders from different parts of the world.

The preparatory discussions should encourage putting on the table each year new and emerging issues.

Remote participation and real time reporting and transcripts are of course core elements that should continue and be enhanced whenever technically possible.

The IGF should be annually organised, in different countries, both developed and developing, as it has been the case so far.

South Africa:
The MAG must be transparent in discharging its mandate. More information of the work of the MAG must be posted on the IGF website. The MAG should work closely with the national and regional IGFs and other stakeholders to solicit their views on the preparation of the IGF.

Sri Lanka:
Open consultation and the Multistakeholder advisory group are innovative processes which have helped IGF grow into a formidable organization. The IGF Secretariat is of minimal strength and has to rely on the MAG to successfully carry out the IGF programme. There may be a case for strengthening the Secretariat to give more technical support to IGF deliberations and to ensure better dissemination of IGF recommendations. The preparation process may be improved by the use of internet-based discussions before Annual meetings of the IGF and its dynamic coalitions. A greater role may be given to regional meetings in the preparation process and more regional meetings may be organized back to back or during regional IT conferences with the support of regional powers.

Sweden:
The open consultations and the MAG (Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group) should continue. The MAG composition could be improved and be better understood by the community, for instance with a system of an annual turnover of at least 1/3 of its members. The multi-stakeholder nature of the MAG is essential with a balance of representatives, on equal footing, that would ensure that different people, from different communities, continents and countries could have a seat at MAG. We support the recent decision to open the MAG meetings open to.

The open consultations should continue to be held in positive spirit with encouragement for interactive dialogue.

SWITCH:
Basically all proceedings should remain open and transparent and all participants should be on equal footing. There may be different views on democratic processes and these different views should be honored. Otherwise the format of the open consultations can remain the same. The composition of the MAG should periodically change. A normal term should be one year. Persons in the MAG should be chosen by a Nomination Committee composed of delegates from all stakeholder groups (public and private sector, civil society, academic sector and international organizations).

UNESCO:
The current forum format appears to be quite effective. UNESCO also strongly supports the current openness of the IGF, which includes the multi-stakeholder approach and a participation of all stakeholders on equal footing.

United States of America:
The Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) has played an essential role in balancing and focusing the IGF substantive program and providing guidance on the preparations of the event. The multi-stakeholder nature of the MAG with a balance of representatives from all stakeholder groups, on an equal footing, has been critical to the success of each IGF. We believe that the credibility of the MAG could be improved through greater transparency in the process of determining the MAG's membership and staff. The same holds true in selecting the MAG Chairman, who should be a person of distinction with a credible international reputation.

The United States believes that one mechanism that would improve the impact of IGF discussions would be to grant the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) greater ability to set the agenda and workshop themes of the IGF. The IGF program has been defined by the same broad themes over the past five years and runs the risk of losing pace with technological change. The MAG could hold open consultations with a wide range of IGF stakeholders that would identify the most critical and relevant Internet governance issues for the given year. With this input the MAG could help set formulate an agenda that reflects the dynamism of the Internet and engages leading Internet stakeholders from around the world.

7.2 IGF Secretariat

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
We believe that the IGF secretariat needs to operate with flexibility, but remain independent, but broadly under a UN umbrella. However, it does need to be sufficiently resourced, and have enough human capacity.

The IGF secretariat should have a base in Geneva, and maximise benefit from the close proximity of other UN bodies based there.

This does not mean it could not make use of remote workers/interns or volunteers. Being in the same location on a permanent basis is not necessary for all secretariat staff.

It is critically important, to preserve the multi-stakeholder nature of the IGF, and its adherence to the WSIS principles. Therefore we believe that the secretariat should be accountable to a multi-stakeholder body of some kind, and not to an intergovernmental body.

The MAG has been supposed to play this role, but, we feel it has not been effective enough, in spite of the effort made by many of its members and the co-chairs.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
The autonomy of the Secretariat should be a paramount consideration. It should remain convened by the UN Secretary General, with an independent budget and a Secretariat under contract with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). This provides it with a formal link to the UN system, which is important to ensure the continued participation of governments in the IGF.

The Secretariat should not be subsumed into any other functional UN organisation or process, because this could jeopardise its perceived independence, and could introduce new impediments to the continuation and development of the informal and open processes that the IGF has innovated.

While the UN should be a funding source and facilitator in aspects in which its neutrality is implicit in the nature of the functions offered, the MAG should be set up to be as independent as possible from the secretariat and the UN.

As a multi-stakeholder body, important organisational decisions for the IGF should by default be the responsibility of the MAG rather than the Secretariat - this should include the responsibility to approve UN appointees to the Secretariat, the appointment of any "special advisers", and (in consultation with the host country) the dates of IGF meetings.

The Secretariat should also strive to improve its transparency and its responsiveness to stakeholders. Very often emails to the Secretariat are not returned, and suggestions made by stakeholders are not specifically responded to. Whilst maintaining its strict neutrality, the Secretariat should also be proactive in facilitating the IGF's evolution and should make statements that detract from the breadth of the IGF's mandate in the Tunis Agenda.

EUROLINC:
The IGF Secretariat should remain in Geneva.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
The IGF secretariat service should be independent, based in Geneva and supported by a multistakeholder advisory group.

It needs to function effectively and efficiently, be objective, and concentrate on being a support function for information exchange between the participating stakeholders.
The IGF Secretariat should be funded through voluntary contributions.

The location of the secretariat should be in Geneva as with the WSIS process and other ICT related international processes that are based in this city.

Finland:
Finland would like to maintain a relatively small secretariat with possibly some staff increase, if appropriate, and depending on the budget. We value the umbrella of the United Nations and its rules. However, the independence of the secretariat should be maintained as to its day-to-day operations and decisions. Located in Geneva, the secretariat is best placed to maintain strong contacts and good cooperation with the key agencies of the WSIS process.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):
The GIIC would like to see the IGF secretariat remain in Geneva – we feel this is an important component of the independent nature of the IGF which we view as important for the IGF.

The IGF secretariat should continue to be funded through a voluntary contribution mechanism. The GIIC understands this is a challenging environment, but the voluntary funding of the IGF is viewed as another key element to the IGF's independence and value.

ICC BASIS:
The IGF secretariat should continue to be independent, and funded through a voluntary contribution mechanism into a centralized funding repository. The ability for large and small funds should be feasible, with limited overhead costs to ensure the most effective use of all contributions made, including for developing country participation and engagement. In kind contributions should be recognized, with an estimated value amount. The secretariat should have sufficient additional funding to retain staff, interns, and continue to improve the efficient and effective website portal and archiving of events to ensure an effective and ongoing resource for all stakeholders.

To ensure efficient use of resources and administrative functions, the secretariat should be in Geneva as the post-WSIS processes and many other ICT related international processes are anchored in Geneva.

We believe the current IGF model is uniquely successful as:
- A body that does not negotiate decisions: without this fundamental characteristic, it would not be possible to have a free exchange and learn from different stakeholders' positions.
- Supported by multistakeholder voluntary funding: voluntary funding acts as a feedback mechanism; multistakeholder funding demonstrates that the IGF is of value.
- Led by an independent secretariat based in Geneva where the Internet policy networks and the history of the WSIS lie: it is important for stakeholders to feel they can trust the secretariat to be unbiased and not unduly influenced by any one interest.
- The Secretariat and support should continue to utilize the Donor's Fund to gather the contributions from countries, business, the Internet technical community and others to support the Secretariat with additional funding to support IGF participation
- Focus should be on broadening financial support for the Secretariat and creative ways of supporting participation by stakeholders who need support by encouraging national/regional partnerships to do this or other mechanisms.

India:
Recommendation: The secretariat is required to be expanded from its present size to be able to take on the additional work that meaningful improvements to the IGF would entail. It also needs to be provided with more resources to be able to steer the process between the sessions that has been recommended in the various parts of this document. The staff selected for the secretariat should have special competencies to manage the uniquely multistakeholder nature of the IGF and should be representative of diverse geographical regions and levels of development.

Internet technical and academic community:
See 7.1

IT for Change:
The secretariat should continue to function out of Geneva, and be in some ways insulated/ independent of the 'day to day' supervision of the UN or UN DESA (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs). It should consist of people who are specifically chosen with the special requirements of the job in mind. These requirements are quite unlike almost all other UN agencies in that the IGF is so quintessentially multi-stakeholder and therefore admits of a very different work culture. Without maintaining and evolving this distinctive work culture, the multi-stakeholder model of the IGF may simply not be sustainable.

However, the secretariat is required to be expanded from its present size to be able to take on the additional work that meaningful improvements to the IGF would entail.

Lithuania:
The Secretariat should be remain independent.
It should remain Geneva based.
Scholarships should be provided to support participation of trainees in the work of the Secretariat

Marilia Maciel:
The Secretariat of the IGF and the former chair have done a remarkable Work during the past few years, With the necessary openness to receive inputs from stakeholders, and also with the ability and experience to moderate debates in such a diverse group of participants.

a) The secretariat should continue to preserve its ability to innovate and the political space it currently has to act in a more flexible Way, if compared to the secretariat of other UN bodies. Openness to innovation and flexibility are necessary to constructively deal with the Multistakeholder culture of the IGF.

b) The secretariat should reinforce its political independence from stakeholder groups. One important way to achieve that is to secure public UN funding to cover the expenses with personnel working for the IGF Secretariat.

Nominet:
The IGF secretariat (including in this the leadership of the UN Secretary General's special envoy as chair of the MAG) has been the bedrock in making the IGF process work. We believe that the independence that both secretariat and chair have shown has been fundamental in the development of trust and engagement that has been the main job for the first five years of the IGF.

In particular, the independence of the IGF secretariat has been crucial in ensuring the private sector and other contributions to the operation of the IGF. If we want to see ever increased outreach to developing countries, increasing support for the process is vital: the current model has shown how this can be achieved and we need to continue to develop this outreach, in particular thorough a higher level engagement in the process. However, we need to be aware that trust and confidence from the multi-stakeholder community are important to ensure this continued support.

We are conscious of the major investment that host countries have made to the support of the process.

Norway:
Norway strongly believes that the secretariat should continue to be located in Geneva although we fully recognize the value of the umbrella of the United Nations in this respect. However, the independent day-to-day operations of the secretariat and its decisions should be maintained.

We can not see any urgent need for a major strengthening of the secretariat, but we understand that it could be relevant with some staff increase if budget allows.

Portugal:
As the IGF has grown immensely and it is desirable to increase outreach to other organizations intersessionally, the size and skills of the IGF Secretariat should increase to meet the new demands, but it should be kept small, non-bureaucratic and accountable to all stakeholders.

The IGF secretariat should be kept totally independent and therefore should be funded by voluntary contributions of stakeholders.

The functioning of the IGF secretariat is crucial to encourage diverse participation by many people around the world who might not otherwise participate if it were a conventional structure accountable to a formal traditional organisation. This deserves cautious attention.

Sri Lanka:
See 7.1

Sweden:
Sweden is satisfied with the overall performance of the secretariat. We want to maintain a relatively small Geneva based secretariat and it should be kept independent and therefore should be funded by voluntary contributions. The secretariat function and funding model should though, based on these principles, be reviewed in the CSTD working group. Located in Geneva, the secretariat is best placed to maintain strong contacts and good cooperation with the key agencies of the WSIS process.

SWITCH:
The location of the secretariat should remain in Geneva. It should consist of an executive secretary and several aides. Aides should preferably be from the academic sector and should either receive funding or periodic salaries. The composition of the secretariat should not feature specific countries, languages or areas.

UNESCO:
UNESCO appreciates the work implemented by the IGF Secretariat and would welcome a strengthening in terms of dedicated extrabudgetary resources, in order it to meet the additional requirements expressed in this consultation process.

United States of America:
The IGF secretariat has successfully prepared and organized the last five IGFs, and their performance record generates confidence, as reflected by 96 percent of participants surveyed at the 2009 IGF meeting in Sharm El Sheik. We believe the IGF Secretariat should remain in Geneva, and that it should continue to maintain its independence from any other UN agency. Geneva provides an excellent headquarters for the IGF Secretariat because it is accessible, neutral, and global. Moreover, co-locating the IGF Secretariat, IGF open consultations, and MAG meetings in Geneva provides for broader multistakeholder participation, due to various other WSIS related activities taking place there (CSTD and WSIS Forums).

8. Format of the IGF meetings

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
Main sessions and new formats
We recommend that the IGF continue to explore innovative and creative meeting formats as well as effective facilitation methods to involve remote participants in sessions and workshops. We suggest that at least 50% of the facilitators are from developing countries.

We believe that workshops should link more effectively to main sessions, and propose a mechanism for achieving this below.

Pre-events
Pre-events are good opportunities to focus on a given theme and they should be encouraged as a format that can contribute to the IGF discourse. They can offer added value and attract participants that might not normally attend an IGF meeting. We recommend that ways to provide more support for organising pre-events should be found, particularly at the level of logistics and the necessary assistance for its effective realisation. It would be very useful for both the IGF Secretariat and the Host Country to appoint contact persons with regard to the organisation of pre-events.

Workshops
Application of the multi-stakeholder format in workshops
The current mechanism for ensuring multi-stakeholder participation in workshops has become too formulaic. Organisers scramble around chaotically in the months leading up to the event to make sure that they have "a civil society speaker" and "a government panellist". Is this tokenism, or is it succeeding in building stakeholder engagement? We believe that MAG should ask this question at its upcoming consultation. Workshops would benefit from ensuring that they include speakers who are stakeholders in the topic under discussion in the sense that they have a stake in it, rather than simply being representatives from different sectors. It could also be useful to create a space for workshops that address the challenges of particular stakeholders, e.g. problems faced by government, regulator, by business, or civil society.

Number and merging of workshops
The agendas of many workshops at Vilnius seemed incoherent. When asked, organisers reported that they had been asked to merge with other workshops making it difficult to maintain a common, coherent thread. The increasing number of workshop proposals that are received every year is an indicator of success.

However, a balance has to be struck between trying to please everyone (with the possibility of diluting the quality of discussion and debate through multi-mergers), and making hard decisions based on stricter criteria (but thereby increasing the possibility of higher quality discussion and debate).

Number of speakers
Generally, workshops have too many speakers. The Secretariat and MAG should limit the number of speakers and inputs or strongly encourage workshop proponents to do so. The goal of the IGF is dialogue and debate and it is the organisers' responsibility to make sure that workshops enable this. Too many speakers results in monologues and disengagement. The MAG should carefully check this aspect at the proposal submission stage.

Proposal template and format
We recommend that the workshop proposal template be changed.

It should include a background document that frames the workshop topic.

The number of speakers should be limited and a minimum time allotment for discussion should be enforced.

A revised template would encourage people to plan their workshops in such a way that enough time is left for discussion.

Participant evaluations of workshops and main sessions
We propose that the IGF secretariat introduce a simple online evaluation form for each workshop and main session which participants can complete online. The results of these evaluations will provide useful input to workshop organisers, the Secretariat and the MAG.

Linking to main sessions
We propose a format that consists of two days of workshops followed by two days of main sessions interspersed with round tables and best practice forums. The main sessions can then more effectively respond to and build on discussion that took place in workshops.

Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA):
CIRA would like to see the IGF as the starting point for the growth of new ideas – a fertile landscape for policy development. This approach should colour the selection of topics, speakers, and tone of the Forum.
As well, CIRA would like to see fewer topics, fewer speakers or panellists for each subject; more time to go into more depth; and fewer moderators when possible. By reducing the number of sessions running simultaneously and providing sufficient time for panellists to finish their presentations, participants will not miss out on important topics and discussions and there will be sufficient time for questions and comments.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
The IGF's main sessions should be focused on specific issues concerning the conduct of Internet governance per se, rather than on more broadly framed issues pertaining to the Internet environment generally.

This requires a willingness to reconsider the current structures and processes that may have seemed necessary at the time of the IGF,s inception but which may now be reconsidered in light of current practices, technology support opportunities, changed international financial and environmental conditions and so on. For example, it may be appropriate for the Internet Governance Forum to be reconceived from a single face-to-face meeting. Rather, the IGF might consider how other Internet governance institutions such as the IETF and ICANN, conduct their work and engagement between meetings in online and regional fora, and for which global face-to-face meetings are a capstone for the work done elsewhere rather than the single element in the process.

Similarly, attention must be given to the effectiveness of the IGF's intersessional work program, which is currently limited to open consultations, MAG meetings, dynamic coalition meetings, and loosely connected national and regional meetings. In particular, there should be a better mechanism than at present for these other groups and meetings to present their outputs to the IGF as a whole. This would require the IGF to set more stringent standards for such groups and meetings, including open membership, democratic processes, and perhaps multi-stakeholder composition.

Concretely, main sessions could be improved by means such as the following:
- Focusing on public policy issues and controversial issues, rather than technical details and innovations.
- Fostering periodical meetings with the participation of the organisers of national and regional IGFs.
- Setting aside a budget for inviting speakers to main sessions. Invitations to speak should be based on expertise, not on who is already attending the IGF.
- Identifying key global policy areas that require attention early in the year, creating working groups around these areas and sharing background material to be discussed in sessions throughout the year (at thematic meetings and/or online). They can then be discussed in a more in-depth way at the IGF.
- Following up from main sessions online, with the help of dedicated working groups for each issue area, who can help in the development of a community-driven

conclusion document (recording consensus or otherwise) as a concrete output from the session.

Workshops could be improved by considering the following suggestions:

- Creating a mechanism for improved, stronger links between the workshops and the main sessions.
- Scheduling the two first days of the IGF for workshops and the two last days dedicated to main sessions, best practices fora and roundtables.
- Giving stricter obligations to the workshop organisers, in line with the idea of the feed to the main session, to provide summaries of the workshops directly to the main sessions and also to the whole outcome of the IGF.
- Developing a template for the proposal of workshops. It would make evaluation of the proposals easier and would allow limiting by default the number of speakers.
- Stricter evaluation of the workshop proposals, including a reduction of the number of panelists.
- Participants should be able to give feedback and evaluate the workshops they attended online.
- Conducting wrap-up workshops that would summarise discussions carried out in several workshops and forward an input to the main session.

EUROLINC:

Many comments have already been made in other contributions on the excess of workshop sessions, overlap between them, crowded panels, late submissions, lacking reports, etc. Without an efficient programme committee too many tasks are dumped too late onto the shoulders of a light secretariat, which does its best, and no more.

The usual dilemma between panels, workshops and main session has no magic formula. It all depends on contents. Any session is interesting if well focused and if speakers contribute original ideas. It is the programme committee's task to extract the best and come up with a session structure.

What fields are relevant in an IGF meeting? The name is the answer. Forum means exchange among a diversity of people. Internet governance covers cross-border issues relating to internet. Absent cross-border issues, topics belong to national or local organisations. The programme committee should assess the relevance of submissions in a cross-border context, and devote session time to IGF core issues.

Main sessions are often a bone of contention because a number of important people must have their podium slot. Such sessions are usually loaded with hackneyed truisms, but are politically necessary. They had better be slated on the very beginning or at the very end of the IGF conference. One or two invited keynote speakers are desirable if their subjects are really topical and inspiring, provided it is not the umpteen IGF speech by the same speaker.

Panels are often a filler, and an opportunity to distinguish less important people. They become entertaining when good debaters throw in provocative ideas, and the moderator manages to get reactions from the audience. Real time translation is needed to prevent conversations ending up in English colloquial lingo.

Workshops should bring in the most substantial contents, when they are not degraded into a series of monologues. Loyal controversy is appreciated, as well as companion documentation for the audience, such as articles, links, references. Real time translation is essential.

To sum up, besides organisational aspects, IGF meetings are deficient in accepting linguistic diversity. Budget constraints are indeed a factor. However the reason why sleepy main sessions are well attended is primarily due to translation. At the very minimum a real time English transcript should be available in every session. A certain number of workshops, e.g. 30%, selected by the programme committee, should be translated in UN languages. Main sessions should be limited to an English transcript, unless sponsors offer to pick up the tab for other languages than English.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
The IGF meetings should be open, transparent, collaborative and inclusive. All stakeholder groups should have the ability to participate. In this regard and to ease physical participation, remote participation is also essential and is one of the many variables that must be taken into account regarding inclusiveness. Additionally, transcription and the archiving of audio and video files is another important mechanism to enable participation in non-real time.

The format at present includes plenary sessions, workshops, best practice sessions. It may be appropriate to consider adjacent skills enhancing sessions that are more in depth. Such topics deserve discussion related to the format of the IGF meeting.

The format for discussion also should address the duration of the IGF event.

However, ETNO strongly supports the open inclusive nature of the meeting itself, avoiding unnecessary protocol, and maintaining the greatest possible openness to all stakeholders to participate on an equal footing.

It is useful to also ensure that national and regional IGFs are reporting in groups into the global IGF.

The main sessions should be the main event. The number of workshops should be reduced and closely related to the main sessions. ETNO proposes that there is a core IGF programme consisting only of main sessions and selected workshops closely related to the main sessions (integrating best practices in both types of meeting), and a parallel programme consisting of Open Forums, Dynamic Coalition meetings and any other workshops as well as any other event
More specifically, ETNO suggests that there is a core of meetings for which the IGF Secretariat (in conjunction with the Advisory Group) takes the responsibility for organizing (or at least selecting in the case of workshops), and all the other events are freely organized, providing that their linkage to the IGF is justified and that there is enough information about them (ie, the titles reflect the content and the description is clearly announced and followed). In this way all participants will have a clearer view of the various IGF meetings and it will be easier for them to decide on their participation according to what they think is important and interesting. Additionally, the organization of the IGF will also be easier and simpler.

ETNO calls for increased transparency in the IGF preparatory process (including the work of the Advisory Group and the Secretariat) and appropriate dissemination of information.

Finland:
We lend our support to the current format of the meetings which encourages open, interactive dialogue with all stakeholders having the right to speak on equal level. The practice of holding main sessions, workshops and best practice fora should be continued. We would like to encourage the workshops which feed in the main sessions. The number of workshops should continue to be limited and the workshop proposals should continue to be approved based on a selection criteria which should include the requirement for a multi-stakeholder organizational basis. The workshop organizers could be requested to provide a more focused information document of their plans for the purpose of the participants to get oriented and prepare for the discussion. The summary reports from the workshops should be as concise and delivered as soon as possible after the event. Adequate time and space should be provided for free discussions during the lunch and coffee breaks. A special space should be provided for such informal encounters.

It should be left for the normal preparatory process to work out the details of each of the IGF meetings. Finland supports this year´s innovation to prepare the sessions with the help of formulating a couple of key questions.

Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC):
The GIIC supports the continuation of IGF meetings that are open, transparent, and inclusive. We support the current multistakeholder approach and want all stakeholders to have the ability to participate. We do not support any additional accreditation requirements for participation as this would detract from the objective of the IGF.

As stated earlier, the GIIC would encourage steps to ensure greater remote participation as the secretariat has undertaken during the last two years. We are pleased with the direction this effort is headed.

The current IGF meeting format includes main sessions, workshops, best practice sessions and open forums. This is certainly a robust and challenging agenda to manage over a four day period. Additional refinement of the conflicting schedule of events would make for a more meaning meeting experience.

Hungary:
The current format of the IGF meetings proved to be successful. This format promoted open discussions among participants with rather different professional, regional, cultural backgrounds. It has enhanced mutual understanding and clarification of positions.
The IGF process – just like the Internet community – is an innovative, forward-looking form. The general interest for IGF meetings – from the very first one – has been high, and the number of participants is in constant increase ever since (last meeting in Vilnius, Lithuania had more than 1400 in-situ participants, and more than 600 remote participants).
Remote participation should be promoted, especially from developing countries.

ICC BASIS:
- The IGF meetings should be open, transparent, collaborative and inclusive.
- All stakeholder groups should have the ability to participate using the current registration model and not requiring any kind of accreditation process.
- Making physical participation easy and as financially feasible as possible by taking into consideration the limited time, human and financial resources of all stakeholders when selecting a venue is important
- Remote participation, high quality real-time transcription and archiving of audio and video files are important mechanisms to enable participation
- The format at present includes main sessions, workshops, best practice sessions and open forums
- Other skills enhancing and practical training sessions before, during or just after the event could be useful
- The IGF is currently 4 days long and the pre-events have been important additions. Discussion about the number of days of the IGF could be useful.
- IGF meetings must be open and inclusive, avoiding unnecessary protocol, and maintaining the greatest possible openness to all stakeholders to participate on an equal footing.
- This section of the report should also report on what has happened to date in the five global IGFs, what is consistent, what is unique, and what has emerged as possible congruent or consistent procedures.
- IGFs must include real-time reporting, transcripts, accessibility for persons with disabilities, remote access/participation. The format of the meetings will need to reflect sensitivity and accommodations to such features.
- A discussion about whether there should be consistent format structures, with the flexibility that is agreed by the MAG, or the host is a useful discussion for this segment of the report, and the past experiences should be reflected, so that the WG and stakeholder appointees, and then the broader CSTD community can review, and make informed comments when they receive the report.
- Each hosting country has unique contributions to share in this section of the report.
- Giving more weight to the national and regional IGFs: encouraging the continued expansion of local events, archiving their preparations and outcomes in a way to use them and take them into account when preparing the global IGF.

- As well we recommend enhancing the bottom-up methodology of the IGF structure, organizing chronologically the discussion of issues at the local, provincial, national, then regional and global level to keep track of the history and the geographical parameters of issues discussed.
- Focusing the discussions: although the open, non-binding discussion format is adequate, too many issues are being discussed. Now that the Forum has reached a more mature level, sessions should not be taken up with talking about the basics of an issue but, instead, should be used to progress understanding of unresolved and more complicated issues.
- Balancing the main sessions and workshops/open forums: continued efforts should be made to increase interaction in the main sessions and balance the overall schedule to ensure active participation in main sessions and workshops/open forums.

India:
The format of the IGF should follow from its intended functions which, in turn, should derive from its mandate. The capacity-building functions are largely being performed well by the present format. We have elaborated how the global policy function should be the primary focus of IGF improvement. This function greatly depends on whether a successful process of obtaining outcomes from the IGF can be developed and sustained. The improvements to the format of the IGF should focus on this key functional imperative.

Recommendation: We have listed in the Annexure, a set of processes that can help develop outcomes in the form of policy assessments and recommendations from the IGF. These also propose specific changes to the format and structure of the IGF.

Internet technical and academic community:
8.1 Current meeting format
We believe the current format of the IGF has been proven to work well. The format of the IGF meetings held to date reflects the open, transparent, and collaborative principles under which the IGF was formed.

The IGF has been an evolutionary process, where meeting formats and themes have developed from year to year, improving in response to input from all stakeholders and evolving as the Internet, and Internet policy issues, have evolved.

The mixture of formal main sessions, more interactive workshops and reports from regional and national IGFs that has developed since the first IGF was held in 2006 has offered the wide range of stakeholders a broad range of ways to participate in the IGF. The format of past IGFs has been refined based on the input of stakeholders through the open consultation process, through the contributions of stakeholders interested in holding workshops and side sessions, and through MAG synthesis of those inputs. We strongly believe the IGF should maintain this democratic, collaborative, and inclusive manner of shaping its meetings from year to year.

8.2 Meeting format in the future
To ensure the IGF continues to be a relevant forum that benefits all participants, it is critical to continue improving the format of the Forum on an iterative basis and to further integrate the momentum regional and national IGFs have been able to create. This could be done by:
1. Looking explicitly at the IGF as a process rather than an annual event. In other words, participants in the IGF should be encouraged to engage in activities relevant to the IGF themes and use the annual IGF meeting as an opportunity to inform the rest of the community of what has been done. Not only will this approach enable the IGF to move beyond being a stand-alone event, but it will also strengthen collaboration among its participants, which is key for success in any Internet related effort. The expanding number of national and regional IGFs is already a step in this direction.
2. Shaping the structure of the IGF (its sessions and workshops) to integrate and reflect the work and the dynamism of the regional and national IGFs. In this regard, archiving tools for easy public access could be useful to keep track of the ongoing work in different regions, and leading to the national IGF.

3. Building further on the format of the last IGF meeting, where "feeder" workshops were scheduled before the relevant main sessions, could be further explored as a basis for future IGF meeting formats. Our experience at past IGF meetings has also shown that more interactive panel discussions that include active audience participation are a good way to engage participants in productive dialogue.

4. Find effective ways of limiting the number of workshops at the meetings, through clear criteria and good communication between the Secretariat and the MAG and workshop organizers. It should of course be done in a manner that does not restrict the openness and inclusiveness of the meeting.

5. Formats such as these were successful experiments in the "trial and error" evolution of the IGF format over the past five years. It is important that this evolutionary model be allowed to continue, as it is the most flexible and innovative way that the IGF can continue to meet the needs of the evolving Internet governance ecosystem. We strongly believe that attempting to set a rigid format for the IGF meetings would restrict the open and inclusive nature of the IGF process.

6. Continuing to develop and refine participation mechanisms, both on-site (such as fellowship programs) and remotely.

Iran:

21.   In order for IGF to fulfill its capacity making role as well as global policy discussion role, any improvement of its format should focus on how to devote its meetings to these roles in line with paragraphs 72 & 77 of the Tunis Agenda.

IT for Change:

While discussing the format of the IGF meetings it will be appropriate to keep in focus what are the primary objectives of the IGF, for that is what the format is supposed to help achieve. As discussed, a discussion on format of the IGF meetings should therefore focus primarily on the global policy related role of the IGF, and its huge under-achievement in this area in the first phase.

Following are a few suggestions in this regard.

1. Plenary sessions should have a clear focus on specific key issues concerning global Internet policy (global net neutrality, for instance) and consist of an outcome oriented discussion on them. Capacity building function should largely be left to workshops or other special formats.

2. Feeder workshops held before the relevant plenary session should help prepare the ground for plenary discussions. To once again take the example of net neutrality guidelines, it may be possible for the feeder workshops to converge towards some general agreements on many areas, while it may be found that some other issues have greater divergences, say, whether pay-for-priority can ever be admissible, or whether special considerations for wireless networks are needed. The plenaries can first sum up the emerging areas of agreement for comments; however, the focus of discussion should be those specific areas where differences may still need to be closed.

3. Round tables and/or smaller multi-stakeholder committee meetings should then try to further close the gaps on key policy questions and look at possible outcome documents. These outcome documents carrying IGF recommendations to policy making bodies can put forward areas where there is a relatively high level of consensus, and present clear sets/ models of alternative policy options where the opinion seems to be more divided.

These suggested multi-stakeholder committees, which could consist of members of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) plus some appropriate outsiders, may need to continue work through online and possibly inter-sessional meetings to finalise appropriate outcome documents on the concerned global Internet policy issues.

The capacity building function of the IGF can be met by another set of workshops more directly devoted to this function, but including policy dialogue on issues not under the immediate focus of the plenaries. More specific formats like good practises sessions,

opportunities for IG related institutions to hold dialogue with IGF attendees, etc. are already being tried at the IGFs and should be further strengthened.

The relationship of the IGF with national and regional level efforts should also be appropriately fostered through special formats. There should be clear guidelines regarding what kind of regional and national efforts can be considered under the IGF rubric.

Lithuania:
Lithuania supports the current format of IGF meetings.

Marilia Maciel:
The IGF represents an innovation when it comes to fostering openness and participation in meetings with global scope. This worked very well for the discussions of Internet governance issues. Innovative principles have become rules of procedure among participants that are worth preserving and reinforcing in the future, such as the ones commented in question I:

Having said that, there is room for improvement in IGF proceedings, in order to rend the discussions more efficient and to optimize the schedule of the meeting:

a) Although the efforts of people who volunteer to organize IGF workshops should be recognized and valued, there has to be a stricter evaluation of workshops proposals, which takes into account the following points, among others: i) the need to reduce the average number of workshops; ii) presence of representatives from all stakeholder groups, who really work with the topics under discussions. Artificial multistakeholderism in workshops (when representatives from stakeholder groups are only invited to comply with a formality) should be avoided; iii) taking into account the time allocated for the workshop, evaluate if the number of speakers would allow meaningful debate; iv) check if workshop organizers have complied with the requests from the secretariat in a timely manner (ex: if they appointed the name of a rapporteur and of a moderator for remote participation).

b) A template for workshop proposals should be developed, in a way that proposals are presented in a more uniform manner, which would render evaluation easier

c) All workshop organizers should appoint a remote moderator for their session.[44]

d) Participants (both in situ and remote participants) should be able to give feedback and evaluate online the workshops they have attended, leaving comments and suggestions for workshop organizers. That would help to improve the quality of workshops.

e) Workshop organizers should appoint rapporteurs that would be responsible to summarize the main positions advanced in the workshop with a special focus positions that could be translated into different policy options.

f) Wrap-up workshops that would congregate rapporteurs from workshops with thematic affinity should be held in order to discuss and organize the inputs that will be forwarded into the main sessions.

g) A more detailed and comprehensive report on the workshops should be made available online by workshop organizers, in accordance with a template developed by the secretariat. Fail to comply with this requirement in due time should be taken into account if the workshop organizers presents another workshop proposal on the next year.

---

[44] In order to allow remote participation in all IGF sessions it is necessary to have someone in the room that will receive the questions and comments sent online by remote participants and voice them in the session. This person needs to receive some basic instructions in advance that will allow him/her to use the platform for interaction with remote participants. The Remote Participation Working Group (www.igfremote.info) has volunteered to provide information and training, but the names and contacts of remote moderators need to be made available by workshop organizers in a timely manner.

h) The connection between workshops and main sessions needs to be improved. Workshops and main sessions have distinct roles. While the workshops are usually forums for more focused and in depth debate of specific issues, main sessions could be an important forum to allow workshop rapporteurs to share with others the positions summarized by them, and to allow experts on the field to debate co-relations between issues that may have been debated in different workshops, such as, for instance, network neutrality and access to knowledge.

i) Assistance to cover travel costs should be able for experts from developing and less developed countries, so they can be panelists in main sessions. This would help to ensure a more balanced regional representation in main sessions. These speakers could also take part in workshops, if organizers want to invite them, contributing to diversity in workshops as well.

Nominet:
We strongly believe that the current model – of engaging interested stakeholders – is the right way to ensure the evolution of the IGF. What is important is that those interested in helping to shape the IGF have an opportunity to engage in the process.

The format and focus of the annual IGF meeting must depend on the interests of the interested parties. We recognise the need for improving engagement and welcome ideas for achieving this.

It has been clear that the workshops associated with the IGF have been important in encouraging engagement. While many have argued for a reduction of the number of workshops, we do believe that workshops have significant importance in the process, as they allow for the identification of upcoming issues and provide an entry point for newcomers to the process, as well as contribute to the plenary discussions.

Norway:
Norway believes that the current format of the meetings should be kept without major changes. The meetings should continue to encourage open and interactive dialogue with all groups of stakeholders. However, the number of workshops should continued to be limited and selected based on criteria laid down prior to the respective IGF-meeting. The normal preparatory process should determine the number of workshops and their selection. We refer also to our remarks under point four.

Portugal:
IGF should continue in its current format as it has been a real success. It has encouraged regional and national IGFs, increased remote participation, promoted the dialogue and mutual understanding and helped to clarify issues that seemed very complex and confusing at the outset.

Its annual meetings and its current format allows discussions in a very forward looking and innovative way, allowing to follow and to cover in a very effective way the Internet fast evolution. New and future issues have been regularly identified and discussed from several perspectives, political, technical and societal. It also allows tackling a broad range of issues, including cross-cutting issues, something that would be impossible to be handled in any other international organization.

It is inappropriate to fix ex ante how many plenaries, workshops and dynamic coalitions should be set up, as this should be left to change each year, depending on the effective evolution of the Internet policies and landscape. The preparation of detailed programs for each meeting should itself be a multistakeholder process.

A very important aspect of the IGF format is the structuring and expansion of remote participation. Remote participation has been improving since the first IGF and reached a very high level in the Vilnius IGF. The experience gained is ripe for building on the lessons learned in the best succeeded cases and passing that experience to others to expand its reach. What is now needed to be done is to:

- Develop operational mechanisms for the remote participants to directly enter in debates (this requires new technical arrangements but it is feasible);
- Organize remote hubs that can operate in a IGF workshop mode in equal standing to on site workshops;
- Set up a scheme for the remote workshops work to be reported to the IGF and reported as outcomes.

Regarding regional and national IGFs that respond to their own dynamics and to their regional or national priorities, their link with the global IGF should be called to contribute to the open consultations and to the format and content of the IGF meetings, to ensure that the priorities identified at those levels are taken into account when building the global IGF agenda, where the added value will be greatly precious.

This exercise could be facilitated and developed through the Secretariat that could also convene meetings between organizers of regional and national IGFs and provide avenues to feed the IGF meetings on regional perspectives to be tabled in main sessions, workshops or in any other sessions to be convened.

The IGF itself should continuously look at possibilities of its further improvement throughout its normal operation. The MAG and the Secretariat should also address regularly possible improvements of the IGF.

Social Aid of Hellas:
The Meetings ,according to our opinion have to be formed and planned by Eminent Specialists ,but also stakeholders be included too.

South Africa:
The IGF should ensure that the workshops aspect is refined. Some workshops are poorly attended and thus it would be advisable to have a limited number of workshops running concurrently to ensure that all workshops attract broad participation and are well attended

Similarly, the themes addressed in this regard should be more focused and focus should be on quality of information rather than quantity. What is placed on the agenda should be weighed against topical issues emanating from the various regions and decided upon on such a basis. A link between the various themes and topics discussed at a particular IGF needs to be more clearly forged.

Invited speakers need to be recognized experts in the topic addressed rather than simply being representatives of a particular interest group. The need to engage effectively and two rather than one way is essential.

The IGF also needs a monitoring and evaluation mechanism. In this regard, a questionnaire should be devised as a mechanism to evaluate the performance of the IGF vis-à-vis its mandate as contained in paragraph 72. The questionnaire should be circulated to all participants of the IGF, including those who participate remotely, as well as all UN Member States. This will ensure that the achievements of the IGF are measureable.

Sweden:
Sweden supports the current format of the meetings which encourages open, interactive dialogue with all stakeholders having the right to speak at equal level. This is a fundamental condition for the open awareness-raising dialogue at the IGF.

We would like to maintain the introductory session "Setting the scene" with the same format as in the IGF meeting in Vilnius and we would like to maintain the practice of holding main sessions and workshops with clear links between them two, the so-called "feeder workshops". The number of workshops should be limited, though, in line with a selection and merging process with requirements determined on a multi-stakeholder organizational basis.

Still interesting and relevant subjects are Critical Internet Resources, Access, Diversity, Openness and Security. A thematic area which should be further explored during the main

sessions is the Internet in its function as a democratic arena where human rights, including freedom of expression and freedom of information are important principles.

We welcome with appreciation that IGF deals much more profoundly with human rights issues now than in the past. The IGF is well suited to promote such discussions and we encourage more governments to take an active role in this process.

Net neutrality as well as the responsibility and different roles of stakeholders as well as governments are issues that would benefit from more discussions and analysis, including from a human rights perspective.

SWITCH:

In addition to the already mentioned attributes from the Tunis Agenda, see para. 73 above, which should not be changed: All stakeholder groups should be welcome on an equal footing. The meeting locations of the international IGF should change from time to time, the meeting location for open consultations should remain at the location of the secretariat, i. e. in Geneva. The basic themes of the IGF should periodically be reviewed and altered if necessary. Calls for submissions should start early enough before international IGF meetings as well as their publication and the reports from open consultations. It appears necessary to slightly change the proceedings, especially of the plenary gatherings, to better incorporate the bottom-up structure the IGF has emerged to. Reports from national and regional IGF's should be encouraged and discussed, results from international discussions of topics brought up by national and regional IGF's should be brought to the attention of the source. In addition, please consult the "Swiss proposals for further improving the functioning of the IGF", URL http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/contributionsigf (under the heading "contributions related to the February 2010 meeting").

United Kingdom:

The UK Government broadly supports the current 4 day format of the IGF though this need not be fixed rule and other options e.g for a shorter 3 day format could usefully be considered. What does need to be improved, however, is the quality and predictability of remote participation; thus encouraging a wide array of participation.

We believe that the well-established programme mix of workshops managed by stakeholders, dynamic coalition meetings, broader open sessions and main sessions structured by MAG with input from hosts, is a proven and tested formula and should be maintained.

The success of the IGF is proven by the consistently high level of inputs - over 100 workshops and the numbers of participants: 2000 in Vilnius including over 400 remote participants.

Such a necessarily diverse event can inevitably be a challenge to manage and to navigate as a participant. Mechanism for linking workshops to main sessions - started in Vilnius - needs perfecting to create the threads for directing inputs into the main sessions within the tight timeframe of the event. The addition of feeder roundtables before the main sessions is a very useful innovation in priming the linkages between workshops and the plenary sessions.

However, we remain confident the self-evolving IGF will succeed in improving these format issues to maximise the impact, outcomes, progress of issues, sharing best practice and model solutions: the take-aways for regions, nations and local communities from such a unique forum for dialogue. The CSTD WG can help shape this dialogue accordingly - and so must listen to views of all stakeholders.

UNESCO:

UNESCO acknowledges the usefulness of the IGF discussion structure, which was shaped around what needs to be done to ensure that the Internet does expand in a way that its potential and power can be harnessed for sustainable social and economic development and the empowerment of people through increased access to knowledge. UNESCO was able to highlight important human dimensions of Internet Governance, such as privacy issues, freedom of expression, linguistic diversity, local content, increased access and accessibility, inclusion and disabilities, information and media literacy. The flexibility of the format allowed

active participants to constantly re-shape the IGF structure. UNESCO advocates to keep the exact format of IGF sessions open to meet new demands.

United States of America:
In general, the United States believes that the current IGF format of workshops and open forums works well. However, we believe a different balance can be struck between main sessions and other events, for example by reducing the time for some of the main sessions, and allowing more emphasis on workshops.

9. Financing the Forum (exploring further options for financing)

Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA):
Financing the IGF through the UN budget could be detrimental to its current multi-stakeholder format and could lead to enabling more control by the UN of not only the IGF but perhaps other internet governance functions. Therefore, CIRA does not support any changes to the existing financing of the IGF.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
Voluntary funding that draws from both countries and the private sector [in the broadest use of that term].

Finland:
The IGF should continue to rely on voluntary donations. Both the governments and the business entities should explore ways and means to enhance their support. In-kind support should be also a recognized option. The secretariat is encouraged to engage in proactive fund raising with potential donors. Donor meetings should continue to be held in the margins of the consultations and in the IGF itself. Perhaps special host country meetings could be also organized.

Hungary:
The independent nature of the Forum and the IGF process should be preserved as much as possible. Hence the IGF organisation and the operation of its Secretariat should be financed on a voluntary basis.

IT for Change:
The worldwide democratic norm has always been that policy forums can remain independent only when they are based on public funding. In fact, if we think of our national level institutions it may be almost unthinkable to have private funding based policy forums. In the case of the IGF, unless we resort to some kind of innovative sector specific cess (explored later in this note), it means core UN funding for the IGF. However, voluntary contributions can be allowed as they are indeed welcomed for many other UN agencies. The independence of the secretariat and other facilitative processes of the IGF are frequently spoken of in discussions regarding the IGF. Relying solely on short-term contributions by private actors who may be interested in the outcomes of the IGF goes against this imperative of independence, and all canons of a democratic polity.

The Internet has contributed so much to the global society and to the global economy in the last few years. We should be able to spare a very very small percentage of this for global governance of the Internet.

ICANN collects a certain amount for every domain registration on the Internet, a collection which owing to the complete monopoly service provider status of ICANN amounts to an Internet tax. It could be explored that a certain fixed percentage (but not varying and voluntary) of this global Internet tax collected by ICANN is committed for IGF activities.

Social Aid of Hellas:
We strongly believe that in order the Meetings be good organized and the Participants assume full responsibility for their work , The Organizers must secure for the Participants and for the implementation of the Meetings a complete sponsorship.

South Africa:
The current model of voluntary funding is well suited to the nature of the forum and should continue. What could be reviewed in going forward is the issue of transparency. In other words the Secretariat should strive to ensure that the source of funding is divulged to participants.

Sri Lanka:

Apart from comments made on 6 above, there appears to be the need for a regular budget line for the IGF from intergovernmental sources with provision for the chanelling of extra-budgetary contributions from other sources through the intergovernmental institution. This would be the only way to ensure predictability, transparency and accountability.

Sweden:

The IGF, its content, organization and its Secretariat should also be financed on a voluntary and multi-stakeholder basis. This is the only way to ensure the independence of this Forum.

United Kingdom:

The UK strongly supports the current multi-stakeholder donation mechanism for funding the IGF Secretariat and related activities, with the host (where possible) financing the IGF event. This has ensured adequate financing with certainty and without the risk of undue influence in the IGF processes by any individual government, business or group. This approach also avoids the problems that can arise with bids for parts of budgets managed externally which can trigger complex negotiations and cause delay. The current simple mechanism works and we see no justification for changing it. The IGF creates opportunities for all stakeholders including users around the world and we firmly believe that all those who share the benefits of the IGF should consider the extent to which they can share the cost burden of managing the consultation and preparatory processes.

9.1 Review of the current situation

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
We believe that two principles should be adhered to in all financing of the IGF: transparency and independence (ensuring that financial contributors do not have specific influence on agenda setting). The IGF secretariat needs independence from any form of undue influence. We propose that a terms of reference for donations could be put in place to protect the IGF secretariat's independence. In addition, there should be a travel fund for speakers from developing countries that is accessible and transparently managed by a multi-stakeholder group, in order to prevent a single stakeholder exerting undue influence over the selection of funded participants in the IGF. Sponsors from the private sector could be encouraged to contribute to this fund.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
We congratulate the IGF secretariat on doing exemplary work in the last few years, on a very thin resource base, and in difficult conditions where different stakeholder groups involved in the IGF have very different orientations and expectations of the secretariat. A lot of the IGF secretariat's work is indeed path-breaking in the UN system.

However, it is very evident that the secretariat needs much better resource support that they have at present, if we are to fulfill all our expectations from this unique global institution. The Secretariat should be provided with resources needed to perform its role effectively.

Further, as noted in section 6 above, perhaps with the exception of webcasting, remote participation mechanisms have not been well resourced to date. This has limited the ability of the IGF to reach out to affected online communities around the world.

EUROLINC:
No budget is provided by the UN. IGF secretariat expenses are covered by donations in kind or in money. While a list of sponsors could be found on the IGF web site, to our knowledge amounts donated were never disclosed.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
Overall, the current funding procedure follows the main principles of an open and easily accessible platform. In respect to this, voluntary and multi stakeholder financing is a logical and sensible method and should be maintained. It is necessary that the funding process itself is designed as simply as possible. Nevertheless a more transparent documentation of the contributions should be strived for in the future, but without it becoming a complicated administrational act.

India:
Recommendation: The accepted norm worldwide is that policy forums can function independently only when they are based on public funding. Indeed, it would be unthinkable for our national policy level institutions to have private funding. In the case of the IGF, this would mean a transition to full UN funding. In addition to predictable and budgeted UN funding, voluntary contributions can be allowed, as is the practice in many UN agencies. In this context, it may, however, be desirable to agree that such voluntary contributions should be un-earmarked to the extent possible, and that they would be used almost exclusively to fund participation of stakeholders from the developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, and marginalised groups among them. The independence of the Secretariat and other facilitative processes of the IGF are frequently spoken of in discussions regarding the IGF. Relying solely on short-term contributions by private actors who may be interested in the outcomes of the IGF goes against the imperative to ensure independence and neutrality of the process, especially in the management of a Forum that itself exemplifies the values of democracy, openness, neutrality and independence.

Internet technical and academic community

IGF funding comes from all stakeholders – from governments, business and nongovernmental organizations of all sizes – all of them with a strong confidence in the current IGF structure. The diversity of funding sources is one key characteristic of the IGF funding structure: no one stakeholder can be said to exert significant influence based on their contribution.

We strongly believe that the financing of the Forum should continue to be on a voluntary basis and done in a transparent manner. This ensures the independence of the IGF structure and it has proven to be a successful model for the IGF to date.

Iran:

22.   It would be important to have a better understanding of past contributions provided to the IGF to date.

23.   The IGF funding structures should be transparent and the secretariat should publish regular funding reports to ensure accountability.

24.   While voluntary contributions which are well suited to the nature of the Forum should be allowed, these contributions should not be earmarked to avoid threatening the independence of IGF activities and its participants.

25.   Member States, the private sector and all other relevant stakeholders are encouraged to consider strengthening the secretariat of the IGF in order to support its activities and operations, in accordance with its mandate, including by providing additional funds.

Lithuania:

IGF should be financed on a voluntary and multistakeholder basis in order to ensure the independence of this forum.
Annual financial report could be placed on the website of IGF.

Marilia Maciel:

There is a considerable lack of transparency regarding the funding of the IGF. The website of the Forum only displays a list of the donors to the Trust Fund, without any further information about the amount of donations or even an indication about when the last update to the list was performed. There are currently no guidelines for donors and no information about expenditures. It is a basic principle of transparency and accountability to publicize balance sheets of spending.

In addition, current financial and human resources are overstretched and will certainly be insufficient in the face of what can be expected from an improved IGF.

Nominet:

Nominet has been happy to contribute to supporting the IGF and its secretariat. We have been willing to do this because the secretariat and the general operation of the IGF have developed the trust of a wide range of stakeholders. Any future development should continue to show independence and accountability: the same level of accountability, equally and not just to its sponsors.

Over the next five years, the IGF needs to engage with, and secure financing from, a wider range of stakeholders.

Norway:

9.1 and 9.2 Norway believes the financing of IGF should continue to be based on voluntary donations from both governments and business and other stakeholder entities. Ways and means to enhance the contributions for financing of the secretariat should be explored, included possible solutions to improve predictability.

It is also important to secure transparency and accountability regarding the financing of the secretariat, and Norway supports the continuation of donor meetings in the margins of the consultation and the early IGF-meeting.

SWITCH:
SWITCH and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) have been donors to the IGF trust fund from the beginning. The current list of donors, however, appears not too well balanced.

UNESCO:
UNESCO acknowledges the significant role of the IGF in stimulating international networking and the creation of partnerships. Throughout the fora, UNESCO has cooperated with governments, civil society, private sector, and academia and explored synergies with stakeholders. Some collaborations were formalized, such as the partnership agreement signed by UNESCO and ICANN on strengthening multilingualism in cyberspace in December 2009, followed by a letter of Intent in 2010 on specific dimensions of the joint work.

United States of America:
We strongly support the current independent funding structure for the IGF. We support the Secretary-General to continue to support an effective and cost-efficient bureau by principally drawing upon voluntary contributions from the multi-stakeholder community. Additionally, the Secretariat should establish a vehicle by which in-kind donations can be effectively utilized.

9.2 Options for ensuring predictability, transparency and accountability in financing IGF

Association for Progressive Communication (APC):
The secretariat should produce a detailed publicly available annual financial report income and expenditure, including grant contributions and donations. In-kind support from host governments and other partners (e.g. those contributing interns, or financing participation of groups of people) should be recognised in this annual report.

Terms of reference for donations could be put in place to protect the IGF secretariat's independence and to make it clear that financial support does not enable the giver to influence the IGF's agenda. This is important in relation to contributions from governments, and from the private sector. However, contributors should be allowed to identify which aspect of the IGF budget they want to contribute to.

Contributors should be encouraged to make longer term commitments. The UN's financial and in-kind contribution should be reflected in the annual financial report.

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus:
As a global policy related institution it is important for the IGF to have stable public funding, and to insulate itself against any possibility of special interests influencing its working through control over funding. Such funding should not only enable appropriate and streamlined functioning of the IGF secretariat, the annual event and other proposed and inter-sessional activities, it should also be used to ensure equity in participation in the IGF across geographies and social groups.

The United Nations needs to recognise that the IGF is the outcome of a UN process and should ensure that it has the resources it needs to fulfill its mandate as defined at the Tunis Summit in 2005. A significant source of funding should be public funding through the UN. Donations from other donors from any stakeholder group should also be facilitated, but a public register of such donations should be maintained so that the IGF's neutrality is not questioned.

In addition, as noted in section 3 above, a fund should be established to support the participation of people from developing and least developed countries in the IGF annual meetings and the IGF preparatory consultations.

EUROLINC:
Ideally the IGF should be financed so as to prevent it being influenced by dominant sponsors. Hence transparency on the value of donations (money, personnel, travel, accommodations) should be the rule. In addition a UN budget is a must for a structure reporting to the UN SG.

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO):
The principle of a multi stakeholder structure should also remain the basis for the funding procedures. This also includes that the donations shall remain voluntary.

A focus should be set on broadening financial support for the Secretariat and creative ways of supporting participation by stakeholders who need support by encouraging national/regional partnerships to do this or other mechanisms.

ICC BASIS:
It is important to have a fact based report on funding to date, which should include the outcomes of additional, or adjacent funding which has brought participants to the IGF, such as the Canadian government funding via the ITU's fellowship program. Additionally, if private sector mechanisms have funded attendance, that may be a useful self-reporting.

This section should identify the costs, and funding mechanisms, including any UN support to the funding of the IGF Secretariat. In many cases, voluntary contributions may not have been

fully identified, and this report should enable a simple understanding of such contributions, without requiring extensive documentation.

The hosting countries make a significant financial contribution, which is not possible to fully document, but this should be noted in a useful but not burdensome manner. For instance, each host provides logistics coordination, and facilities, transport, and much more. It is difficult to impossible, and burdensome to document this, but there needs to be a recognition of this contribution.

Funding for the IGF secretariat should continue to be voluntary, and multistakeholder. In addition, there should be a mechanism that acknowledges in-kind donations. It is clear that national contributions from governments, supported by private sector contributions to the UN Secretariat Donor's fund are a significant contribution. This supports the hosting country contribution, but is the primary support to the Secretariat, and should remain so.

To ease contributions from all stakeholders, the funding process must be as simple as possible, including for small donations. To date, the IGF multistakeholder voluntary funding model has been indicative of the support for the model itself, whether at the global or the national or regional levels. This is important to maintain.

India:
Recommendation: The accepted norm worldwide is that policy forums can function independently only when they are based on public funding. Indeed, it would be unthinkable for our national policy level institutions to have private funding. In the case of the IGF, this would mean a transition to full UN funding. In addition to predictable and budgeted UN funding, voluntary contributions can be allowed, as is the practice in many UN agencies. In this context, it may, however, be desirable to agree that such voluntary contributions should be un-earmarked to the extent possible, and that they would be used almost exclusively to fund participation of stakeholders from the developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, and marginalised groups among them. The independence of the Secretariat and other facilitative processes of the IGF are frequently spoken of in discussions regarding the IGF. Relying solely on short-term contributions by private actors who may be interested in the outcomes of the IGF goes against the imperative to ensure independence and neutrality of the process, especially in the management of a Forum that itself exemplifies the values of democracy, openness, neutrality and independence.

Internet technical and academic community
The continued commitment to the multistakeholder model of the IGF is vital and this multistakeholder model has drawn the willingness by a wide range of stakeholders to provide funding to support the IGF process. In fact, the model has resulted in not only financial support for the IGF Secretariat, but also the hosting of national and regional IGFs.

While we believe that more stakeholders should be encouraged to contribute funding to the IGF, we also feel that the multistakeholder funding the IGF has enjoyed so far is a good measurement of its success. As long as the IGF continues to consider all stakeholder groups as equal participants, stakeholder groups will continue to engage including through voluntary financial and in-kind contributions to the IGF.

Simple ways for individuals or small organizations to make small donations to the IGF should also be set up. For legally incorporated organizations within the business, technical, and civil society stakeholder sectors, a formal process through which ongoing contributions can be made to the IGF would provide a measure of stability for IGF's financial security in the future.

If funding became available from the United Nations budget, it should be used exclusively to fund participation of stakeholders from developing countries, ensuring equity among all stakeholder groups.

In any case, a list of funders should be available to the public. Naturally, any funder who wishes their name to remain confidential should be able to keep their name off this funders' list.

Iran:
See 9.1

Lithuania:
See 9.1

Marilia Maciel:
First and foremost, the funding of the IGF should be transparent and should not hinder the independence of its Secretariat. It is important to consider the following, among other suggestions:

a) Assigning public UN funds that should cover at least the expenses with salaries of the personnel. Additional funding for the development of studies, especially on the interplay between Internet Governance and development, should also be available, since they can be relevant for other UN bodies as well.

b) Encouraging private voluntary donations to the IGF from all stakeholders, since they are made in a transparent manner. A sub-commission from the MAG could assist on fund raising.

c) The Secretariat should present periodic reports of funds received and their expenditure

d) Consider the possibility that private organizations in the IG ecosystem, such as ICANN, contribute with a small percentage of their budgets to fund the IGF.

Nominet:
We would not be willing to guarantee funding without the assurance of continuing transparency and accountability.

As noted above, we do need to secure a wider basis for finance, coming from a wider range of stakeholders. This needs to be done in a way that guarantees independence. We support the current model, which does not give any additional voice to sponsors. Support should continue to be provided because the donors see value in the process, not because they want to secure a particular binding outcome.

Fundamental behind any investment in support for the IGF process is that it should be independent. Similarly, support does depend on assuring the neutrality of the IGF process and secretariat.

We would recommend that any improvements to the IGF need to guarantee this independence between funding and implementation of the IGF. However, we would also note that it will be important for the MAG (in its programme committee function) to continue to ensure the wider interest of a programme, that remains relevant to the international multi-stakeholder community.

Norway:
See 9.1

Portugal:
The IGF, its content, organization and its Secretariat should be financed on a voluntary and multistakeholder basis. This is the only way to ensure the independence of this Forum given its multistakeholder nature, and in particular to avoid its capture by just one of the stakeholders. Financing in kind should also be considered and accountable.

The UN support should be only considered to support logistics and facilities when the IGF host is a developing country, alongside with a program of fellowships that would ensure the participation in IGF of members of the stakeholders groups coming from developing countries and LDCs, as well as needed civil society organizations.

SWITCH:
There could and should be more contributions from governments, from civil society, academia and international organizations. A solution could be for each stakeholder group individually to open a trust fund and to ensure a certain annual financial contribution to the international IGF. This would ensure a economic predictability. Accountability can be established by well balanced donations from all stakeholder groupings and transparency by periodically publishing all donors in public listings, together with the amount of their contributions.

UNESCO:
UNESCO welcomes the idea of enhancing predictability, transparency and accountability in financing, the IGF.

The Organization's financial contributions to the success of the IGF have been considerable. UNESCO financed the participation of speakers from developing countries for main sessions and numerous workshops.   We also covered the cost for stands own participation in the preparatory meetings and the annual IGFs. While we have no innovative, alternative, new financing mechanism to offer, UNESCO is committed to continue contributing in the way described above to financing future IGFs.

United States of America:
While we recognize the UN's role in administering the multi-donor Trust Fund, we do not support the IGF being solely financed by the general UN budget, which would alter the multi-stakeholder nature of IGF support. We recognize that the UN may be able to usefully assist IGF-host countries, but believe that the UN's role should be light-handed and that IGF funding should be based on the voluntary contributions of stakeholders.

USG Supplemental Language for para 9.2:
The United States recommends that the United Nations continue to make contributions to the IGF consistent with Tunis paragraphs 73 and 74. We also recommend that the United Nations continue to work closely with the IGF host country to ensure and efficient and effective IGF forum.

Appendix 1 – Additional comments submitted

1. China
2. EUROLINC, Financing LDCs in the WSIS process
3. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Towards an Improvement of the IGF: Eight proposals for an enhanced role of the IGF
4. ICC, Basis, Additional Comments
5. India, Proposed Improvements to the IGF outcomes, in keeping with the UN General Assembly Mandate

****

China

Review:
First of all, the current IGF cannot solve in substance the issue of unilateral control of the critical internet resources.
Secondly, the developing countries are lack of resources for participating in IGF meetings, and the priority of development agenda has been downplayed, which made IGF lacking of broad representation.
Thirdly, the issues discussed in IGF have duplicated a lot with the work being explored and covered by other UN agencies and international organizations.

Reforms:
First, the future IGF should, in accordance with the provision of Tunis Agenda, focus on how to solve the issue of unilateral control of the critical Internet resources.
Secondly, the representation and voices of the developing countries should be increased in the IGF, and the development issue should be placed as the first priority.
Thirdly, we should seriously consider the possibility of incorporating IGF financing into the regular UN budget, and provide assistance to developing countries for their participation in the IGF meetings.
Fourthly, we should follow rigidly the Tunis Agenda so that the reformed IGF should not duplicate the work and mandate of the other organizations.
Fifthly, a Bureau should be set up with a balanced membership of various parties and geographical regions, and its term of reference and rules of procedures should be formulated by the UN.

****

EUROLINC, Financing LDCs in the WSIS process

From the early days of WSIS preparation a sticky issue was raised and remains unresolved, that of financing the participation of less developed countries (LDC) in the various meetings generated by the WSIS process. So far no practical solution has been found. Internet Governance Forum (IGF) meetings are mostly attended by delegates from developed countries. LDC attendance is sparse, and partially composed of members of well funded transnational lobbies.

However, money is not scarce in the internet milieu. It flows by millions of $.

Some basic internet concepts
Physically, the internet results from the interconnection of thousands autonomous networks, owned by a variety of organizations or individuals.

Functionally, the internet provides a common communication space (CCS), which cannot be owned by any entity. This virtual resource is a common good.

The CCS is structured by an architecture defined at the time the internet was designed, then refined and extended over the years.

Among components of the CCS architecture are identifiers, allowing to designate entities within the CCS. Two major classes of identifiers are IP addresses and domain names.

This document shall elaborate only on domain names.

ICANN cash cow
Historically, domain names come in two varieties: gTLD and ccTLD. The latter variety is under the responsibility of national authorities, and shall not be discussed in this document.

gTLDs are approved by ICANN and the Department of Commerce (DOC) of the US government.

Creating gTLDs involves intricate procedures lasting several years, and costly for the proposing organization (registry). Once a gTLD has been created, additional sub-domain names are created by the registry at the request of registrars, retailers that receive orders from users. Sub-domain names are rented to users at a cost, which feeds the food chain from registrars up to ICANN. This is a basic ingredient of the bottom up model, a mantra within ICANN followers.

ICANN is a de facto worldwide monopoly imposed by the US government and thriving on gTLD fees. Like any monopoly ICANN uses its non competitive advantage in setting gTLD fees so as to enjoy a comfortable budget (around $60M, as it seems). This amount could be compared to ITU-T budget.

Being legally a private Californian organization, ICANN decides at its own discretion the use of the money collected from internet gTLD users. No specific provision guarantees that all users receive a fair share in return for their contributions. ICANN friends and patronage get the jackpot.

The top 5 gTLDs are COM, NET, ORG. INFO, and BIZ. Registrations number:
1. COM 88 298 883
2. NET 13 172 571
3. ORG 8 542 760
4. INFO 6 609 655
5. BIZ 2 129 628

With a surplus of minor gTLDs, registered domain names exceed 120 millions.
ICANN is invited to reveal the booty collected on these registrations.

Some users get their domain names from local registrars located in their own country. Then, they usually pay taxes tacked on the transaction. On the other hand many users get domain names online from US registrars, and do not pay taxes in their own country.

Registrars can expect to be rewarded within reasonable limits for bookkeeping services they provide to their clients. Furthermore, they normally operate on a competitive market which should keep fees from ramping up.

Registries operate on captive markets allocated by ICANN. The top 5 gTLD registries are in the USA. It is not clear that the fees they collect are a legitimate compensation for the services they provide.

Finally one wonders what services ICANN is providing to justify the money collected on domain names.

The bottom line is: a private monopoly levying worldwide taxes on the use of a common good.

A more decent approach
The ICANN monopoly is a rather questionable status in the sense that collecting taxes without accountability to the taxpayers creates a permanent conflict between users interests and ICANN interests.

The field is open to a variety of suggestions for more equitable schemes. Let us explore one in particular.

An internationally agreed council (IAC) to set gTLD fees, taking into account such factors as:
− cost of managing gTLD names and sub-domain names
− needs for future extensions
− services provided by ICANN
− financial capacities of LDCs
− financial help pledged to disadvantaged groups or countries

IAC to determine ICANN appropriate budget, based on agreed projection of activities.

Money collected by gTLD registries to be transferred to a UN accredited trust fund.

Trust fund to transfer approved budget to ICANN and other beneficiaries.

One possible option for a trust fund could be ITU-D, due to its institutional mandate geared to development projects. Additional resources originating from ITU members, IGO/NGOs, private sector, could complement those provided by gTLD fees.

Transition
It would be naive to expect ICANN to willingly shell out a chunk of what it considers as legitimate revenue. Nevertheless, the UN community may have a different opinion. By using a mix of pressure and persuasion it might be possible to bring ICANN to agree on a tiny return of money, say 1¢ per domain name. It would be a test of cooperation to initiate further negotiations.

Knowing that ICANN has been for years pretending to be an international organization, the UN could consider raising ICANN status to some international level, under conditions including a financial control of gTLD domain names fees by the IAC, as stated above, or a similar scheme.

In case of adamant opposition from ICANN, other initiatives could be taken. Governments could collect taxes on gTLD domain names registered off-shore, or set taxes on ICANN. Legal action could be introduced against ICANN for illegitimate monopoly.

* o * o * o *

EUROLINC is a non profit organization founded for promoting native languages in Internet. It is accredited to WSIS.

****

Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Towards an Improvement of the IGF: Eight proposals for an enhanced role of the IGF

1.   Observatory: The IGF is an ideal place to "observe" the broad range of Internet developments, globally and locally. It could be the place where all information about new Internet applications and problems, national and international Internet public policies and other Internet related facts and figures can be collected and made available to the broader Internet community.

Recommendation:

The IGF secretariat should produce an "Annual Internet Development Report" (AIDR) which summarizes facts and figures, including legislation, about main activities and processes with regard to Internet development (globally, regionally and – if possible – on a country-by-country basis) from the previous year. The report could include also a more analytical part where main trends and main themes are analyzed by recognized experts. Additionally there should be brief reports from the various organizations of the global Internet ecosystem about their activities. In an Annex, statistical data about Internet development could be provided. The AIDR could constitute a growing database which is accessible to everybody and would allow in forthcoming years more serious comparative analysis and research.

2.   **Messenger:** The IGF is not a negotiation body and does not produce legally binding international instruments. However, participants expect a more concrete output. The various workshops and plenaries send a lot of messages to governments and non-governmental stakeholders what they should do and how. A systematic collection of those messages would produce a set of guidelines which would help all stakeholders to maneuver through he still unknown territory of the cyberspace.

Recommendation

Each Plenary and workshop organizer/convener should nominate an independent neutral rapporteur who would try to summarize the debate in two or three key messages. Those messages would not be the subject of negotiations and could reflect also controversial approaches (one side says so and the other side says so). The messages should be no longer than four or five lines (like a SMS) and could be numbered (IGF2011-Message xx). All messages together would constitute something like a readable final document (IGF Messages from Nairobi) which would be no longer than six to ten pages and include about 150 individual messages, easy to read and easy to understand. There is no need t constitute a drafting group. The secretariat would just collect the messages and compile them. The diversity of the rapporteurs and the decentralized "production procedure" of the messages would avoid capture or a one side presentation of a certain issue. Delegates and observers would have something which they can take home and outsiders had material to analyze. The "messages" would be complementary to the online transcripts and the published proceedings so that experts who want to dig deeper, can use the "messages" as a first orientation for further research.

3.   **School:** The IGF is a space where people can come to learn and to get all the knowledge they need to understand Internet governance. It is like a "global school" where participants learn from each other and can listen to high-level experts and share best practices. It is interesting to note that the GIGANET has decided to have its annual symposium always at the eve of the IGF. And also the emerging Summer Schools of Internet Governance are linked closely to the IGF.

Recommendation:

The IGF should promote an outreach and educational program for the next generation of Internet Governance leaders. At the eve of each global IGF there should be a "Summer School type" four-day-training course for newcomers from all stakeholder groups (governments, private sector, civil society, technical and academic community) where the various key elements of Internet Governance are presented and discussed in form of lectures by key experts from all over the world which would enable the IGF participants not only to follow more intensively the proceedings of the IGF, but also to make more own contributions to the deliberations. Such a multistakeholder training activity would also strengthen the

collaboration among the various stakeholders so that people from business and civil society and technical community will understand better the role of governments and vice versa.

4.   **Laboratory:** The IGF is a unique place to test and figure out what works and what not in Internet governance. The workshops create platforms where good and bad examples can be discussed, and where stakeholders can learn from each other and get the needed inspiration to translate the global experiences into national and local public policies.

Recommendation

The IGF should promote experiments for new ways to develop public policies related to the Internet in a multistakeholder environment. Based on first experiences of the so-called dynamic coalitions, new forms of interaction among governments, private sector, civil society and the academic-technical community from developed and developing countries in developing political principles, guidelines and norms could be tested out in smaller thematic groups. Such efforts could produce new knowledge how to meet the public policy challenges of the new Internet Governance complexity in a way that the legitimate interests of all stakeholders – in particular also from developing countries - are represented in a balanced way in future political arrangements for Internet related public policy issues taking into account the principles of international law, human rights and the free flow of communication. This could lead to the adoption - on a voluntary basis – of a series of "Frameworks of Commitments" (FoCs) which could be formally signed both by governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and would contribute to the emergence of something like a "Web of Internet Governance Principles" which would enhance the security, stability and further sustainable development of the Internet and enable individual and institutional end users to continue to create new applications and services and to "innovate without permission".

5.   **Clearinghouse:** The dialogue among various governmental and non-governmental organizations and institutions can clear the air with regard to the question who has to do what. It could lead to a more enhanced and developed division of labor where institution can spin a web of interactions, which also can be formalized in informal Memorandum of Understandings (MoU), Letter of Intent (LOI), Affimation of Commitments (AoC), Statements of Interests (SOI) and others.

Recommendation:

The IGF should promote the process of enhanced cooperation among the various partners of the global Internet Governance ecosystem by bringing them together in a collaborative dialogue which would include an annual reporting about their activities, an identification of overlapping issues and a discussion about new forms of coordination and cooperation (enhanced communication, coordination and collaboration/EC³). Such a collaborative dialogue could lead to new forms of bi-lateral arrangements among the various partners of the global Internet Governance ecosystem. By formalizing EC³ and a division of labor (if needed) the stability of a sustainable Internet development would be enhanced.

6.   **Scout:** The IGF is a great place to look into latest Internet developments and to find out what may be the next issues. It is a place where the future can be explored, where creative thinking is stimulated by looking into the "crystal ball" what the next generation networks will provide.

Recommendation:

The IGF should encourage all kinds of exploration into future Internet development trends to find out what the next "big thing" will be. External experts and independent thinkers, also from other constituencies than the "usual suspects" from the established Internet Governance groups, should be invited and encouraged to give their outside views to stimulate debate about the future of the Internet. This could go beyond the "Emerging Issues Plenary" and lead to a special event called "Ten Years from Now: How the Internet will look like?" Such a brainstorming session would help to open eyes, to encourage to "think the unthinkable" and to stimulate further innovation and growth.

7.   **Early Warning System:** The IGF should function as an early warning system. New problems, threats and risks which come with new Internet applications, services and next generation technologies, should envisaged and become the subject of discussion to help to identify emerging problems social, political or economic problems as early as possible.

Recommendation:

The IGF should provide a room for a SWOT analysis (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) of ongoing trends of the Internet development. Such a SWOT would help to build something like an "early warning system" for the future Internet development and new Internet related public policy challenges.

8.   **Watchdog:** Stakeholders have an opportunity to raise their critical points. If a government or an Internet user has concerns about ICANN, IETF, ITU or UNESCO, or with policies executed by national governments and global Internet companies, the IGF is a good place to raise the issue and to enter into a dialogue to get the point recognized.

Recommendation.

There should be an annual review system of the activities both of the IGF itself and of the various global, regional and national institutions of the Internet Governance Ecosystem. Such a review process could be organized by building small "Multistakeholder IGF Review Teams". The review teams would publish an open "Request for Comment" to invite the broader public to send critical remarks and proposals for IGF improvement and the performance of the various actors in the global Internet Governance ecosystem. The review teams could than produce an annual "Internet Governance Review Report" (IGR) which could include concrete recommendations how to enhance and improve both strategic orientation and day to day work of the various actors. The report should constitute the basis for an open public critical discussion at the annual IGF.

Aarhus, March 14, 2011

****

ICC BASIS, Additional Comments

This working group should focus its efforts on addressing the following key issues and improvements:

• Build on the IGF Chairman's and Secretariat's existing report with additional materials that capture the on-going dialogue and progress that is being made within the IGF process. This should include an online component and incorporate expanded reporting from regional and national IGF meetings. It also should expand the report on best practices issued by the Secretariat last year.

• Create new high-level summary materials that are designed to explain the IGF and its work to those who are not directly involved in the process.

• Expand on the successful outreach and participation efforts with specific proposals for increasing remote participation opportunities and increasing the level of participation, including governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.

• Identify development topics and sessions that should be incorporated into the IGF planning process.

****

India, Proposed Improvements to the IGF outcomes, in keeping with the UN General Assembly Mandate

1. **MAG identifies key policy questions**: At the start of the annual IGF cycle, the preparatory body (MAG) selects a set of 3-4 key questions *(not just broad issues, but clear, specific questions)* for consideration at the IGF every year. These questions should reflect the most important policy concerns at the global level in the area of Internet Governance. This selection should be based on wide and inclusive consultations with different stakeholders, including those who may not be able to attend these consultations in person, but are recognised as key actors and interested parties in the area of Internet governance. This selection should also take into account internet-related key policy issues currently being dealt with in various intergovernmental organisations and should specifically focus on how global Internet governance affects development.

2. **MAG establishes Working Groups around the key questions:** Around each such key policy question, issue-based working groups (WGs) should be formed. These WGs should have MAG members plus external experts where necessary, while maintaining overall balance in terms of various forms of diversity, with special consideration for developing country participation, both governmental and non-governmental.

3. **Working Groups develop background material on the theme:** The issue-based WGs will work during the preparatory process to develop the theme with regard to the assigned key policy question; develop appropriate background material *(including commissioning out work to experts if required);* prepare the format of the corresponding plenary sessions; undertake the selection and review of the feeder workshops, etc.

4. **Feeder Workshops followed by 'Round Table' discussions**: IGF participants will be encouraged and helped to hold workshops on various themes linked to the chosen key policy questions. These workshops will be called feeder workshops. These Workshops will examine various aspects of the issue and provide an opportunity to present diverse views and engage in a substantive dialogue. Members of the WG will try to attend as many of the feeder workshops as possible. After the feeder workshops, they will help organise discussions in a 'Round Table' format, involving workshop organizers and other key IGF attendees, to further shape perspectives around the 'key question' and look at seeking convergences, as well as capturing the diversity of views.

5. **Inter-Sessional Thematic meetings**: Where appropriate and possible, inter-sessional thematic meetings or thematic IGFs may be held on the policy issues identified for the IGF's consideration in order to facilitate dialogue and identify possible outcomes.

6. **IGF Plenary:** The convergences and alternate views from the Round Table discussion and Thematic Meetings (if held) will be presented to the IGF plenary for a structured discussion with as wide a participation as possible. *(Alternatively, the policy round table format may be tried out after the plenary discussion, depending on how best coherent outcomes from the IGF can be shaped.)*

7.   **IGF Reports on specific questions:** Based on the discussions in the IGF, the WGs produce a document on the concerned 'key policy question', which can be called as an 'IGF report on such and such issue'. Such a report will present areas of convergence and distil issues where there are divergent views, to a concrete set of policy options. The WGs should endeavour to present coherent policy options, even if there is more than one *(as the WGIG report did with regard to oversight models).*

8.   The vast amount of information and the wide array of views that may have been generated around the year-long process of focussing on a specific policy question can be captured in a background paper, or a set of background documents and annexed with the WGs reports on specific policy questions. This would ensure that the rich deliberations and exchange of views are not lost by the international community. *(This practice was also adopted by the WGIG).*

9. **IGF Reports transmitted to CSTD**:   Since CSTD has been tasked to oversee the WSIS/IGF process in the UN system, these outcome documents, or IGF reports, will then be sent to the CSTD, ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly. The UN General Assembly may forward them, as appropriate, to the concerned global/ international and other institutions involved with Internet related policy making. *(In the interests of time and efficiency, the IGF could also simultaneously forward its reports directly to relevant intergovernmental and other international organisations and/or request the ECOSOC to transmit them to relevant bodies, without waiting for the UN General Assembly to do so).*

10. **Feedback loop and Interface with other relevant bodies:** The organisations and bodies receiving the IGF Reports should be requested to provide their feedback and report on developments that year on the relevant Internet Governance issue, to the next IGF. A session in the annual IGF should be dedicated to the consideration of such reports from other relevant bodies. This would enable the IGF to familiarize itself with other ongoing international processes in the area of Internet Governance. It would also enable it to interface with relevant bodies, as mandated by para 72 (c) of the Tunis Agenda and facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies relating to the Internet, as mandated by para 72 (b) of the Tunis Agenda.

Appendix 2 - List of contributors[45]

1. Association for Progressive Communication (APC)
2. Norbert Bollow
3. Brazil
4. Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA)
5. China
6. Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus
7. EUROLINC
8. European Telecommunications Network Operators (ETNO)
9. Finland
10. Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC)
11. Hungary
12. ICC BASIS
13. India
14. Internet technical and academic community
15. Iran
16. IT for Change
17. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus
18. Lithuania
19. Nominet
20. Norway
21. Marilia Maciel - Center for Technology and Society of Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV) - Brazil (www.direitorio.fgy.br/cts). Member of the IGF Remote Participation Working Group (www.igfremote.info)
22. Portugal
23. Social Aid of Hellas
24. South Africa
25. Sri Lanka
26. Sweden
27. SWITCH
28. United Kingdom
29. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
30. United States of America

---

[45] List as of 30 March 2011