



**Third Meeting of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance  
Forum (IGF)**  
Geneva, Switzerland

31 October- 2 November 2011

**Chairman's summary of the meeting**  
*(amended version on 7 December 2011)*

1. The third meeting of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group (WG) on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) was held in the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland on 31 October-2 November 2011. It was chaired by Mr. Peter Major (Hungary).
2. Following the opening statement by the Chair, the Working Group agreed on the attendance of a representative of the Chair of the CSTD, Mr. Fortunato de la Peña, from the Permanent Mission of the Philippines<sup>1</sup> as well as on the membership of Kenya as host country of a completed IGF<sup>2</sup>.
3. In his opening remarks, the Chair recalled that the Working Group was mandated to give recommendations on improvements to the IGF while preserving its basic features, in particular its multi-stakeholder character and non-binding nature<sup>3</sup>. He expressed his recognition to the previous Chairman of the Working Group, Mr. Frédéric Riehl (Switzerland), for the work performed during the first and second meetings which is summarised in the Report of the Working Group transmitted to the General Assembly (26 October 2011) and to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and considered at its Substantive Session 2011 (Geneva, 4-29 July 2011)<sup>4</sup>.
4. The IGF Secretariat made a brief presentation on the outcome of the last annual IGF meeting, held in Nairobi, Kenya from 27-30 September 2011. The Working Group noted the importance of recalling in its final Report the uniqueness of the IGF as well as its self-improving nature.
5. The Working Group adopted the agenda and held a detailed discussion on its possible working methods on the basis of the proposals of the Chair<sup>5</sup> in this regard. It decided to continue its work in plenary to enhance trust and openness rather than agreeing to the proposal of splitting the work into sub-groups which was perceived by some

---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Elizabeth Te.

<sup>2</sup> The sixth meeting of the IGF was held in Nairobi, Kenya, from 27-30 September 2011.

<sup>3</sup> For more information, the Chair's power point document: 'IGF 2.0: Reflections on the tasks of the CSTD Working Group', will be made available on the CSTD website.

<sup>4</sup> For more information, the Report of the Working Group to the ECOSOC is available at:  
[http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/a66d67\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/a66d67_en.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> The document "Structure and working method of the CSTD WG on Improvements to the IGF" encloses 2 optional working methods to address the "Chairman's draft summary of responses/recommendations to the Questionnaire on Improvements to the IGF". Option 1 invites participants to consider the list of recommendations compiled in the "Chairman's draft summary" in plenary in view of establishing a reduced list of recommendations based on consensus. With option 2, participants are invited to split into 3 Working Parties to address specific themes. For further information, the mentioned documents are at:  
<http://www.unctad.info/en/cstdwg> .

participants as valuable in terms of efficiency while others stressed the sensitivity of issues at stake, their interrelation and the importance of reviewing all issues within the working group as a whole. It considered that the “Chairman’s draft summary of responses/recommendations to the Questionnaire on Improvements to the IGF”<sup>6</sup> should be used as a working basis in view of extracting and classifying possible recommendations. In addition, the Working Group recalled the importance of working on the basis of existing consensus which was established at its first two meetings and taking due account therefore of the “Non-paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance (IGF)”<sup>7</sup> where relevant wording should be used when drafting future recommendations.

6. The Working Group recalled the general themes where broad consensus was established in previous meetings and decided to establish five main topics accordingly to structure its discussions:
  - A. Shaping the outcomes of IGF meetings;
  - B. Working modalities including open consultations, MAG and Secretariat;
  - C. Funding of the IGF;
  - D. Broadening participation;
  - E. Linking the IGF to other related processes/mechanisms/bodies.
7. To ensure constructive discussions, the Working Group decided to establish points of broad agreement for each item, which would serve as guidelines for the drafting of recommendations on improvements to the IGF, and to avoid debating the details of such improvements.
8. The Working Group agreed on a certain number of wide issues in relation to improvements of items A, B, and D and extracted relevant ideas as well as agreeable recommendations from the above-mentioned “Chairman’s draft summary” and “the Non-paper of the Chair”, which were captured in a rolling document: “Broad agreements on possible recommendations on improvements to the IGF” (see *Appendix II*). The main points of broad agreements are summarised in *Appendix III*. During the meeting, various participants provided specific written contributions concerning each item, some of which were included in the document on “Broad agreements”. All contributions will be compiled and made available on the CSTD website.
9. Concerning possible improvements to the funding of the IGF (item C), the Working Group decided to postpone its discussion on this topic pending confirmation of the feasibility of obtaining UN funding for the IGF. Details on the information sought can be found in *Appendix II* and *III*.
10. The Working Group made progress and it was generally felt that consensus may be achieved to establish the expected list of recommendations. Participants agreed to continue their work on-line before the next meeting during which item E will be discussed in details as there was no sufficient time to address this issue in the course of this meeting. The rolling document on “Broad agreements” will be made available

---

<sup>6</sup> See above.

<sup>7</sup> The “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) results from the First and Second Meetings of the Working Group (Geneva, Switzerland, 24 and 26 March 2011) and can be found at Appendix II of the “Chairman’s summary” of the Second Meeting at: [http://www.unctad.org/sections/un\\_cstd/docs//UN\\_WGIGF2011d07\\_summary\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/sections/un_cstd/docs//UN_WGIGF2011d07_summary_en.pdf)

on the CSTD website for comments and further contributions from members of the Working Group.

11. The Working Group agreed with the proposal of the Chair to hold its next meeting in Geneva on 11-13 January 2012.

*Appendix I*  
*List of participants*

**MEMBER STATES**

**Brazil**

Mr. Leandro Silva, Secretary, Permanent Mission of Brazil to the WTO and other economic organizations in Geneva

**Chile**

**Costa Rica**

Ms. Sylvia Poll, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Costa Rica to the United Nations in Geneva

**Egypt**

Ms. Nermine El Saadany, Director of International Relations Division, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology

Mr. Yasser Hassan, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Egypt to the United Nations in Geneva

**El Salvador**

Mr. Félix Ulloa, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the United Nations in Geneva

**Finland**

Ms. Mervi Kultamaa, Counsellor, Information Society & Trade Facilitation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Department for External Economic Relations

Mr. Matti Nissinen, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations in Geneva

**Ghana**

Mr. Anthony Kwasi Nyame-Baafi, Minister (Commercial) at the Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations in Geneva

**Greece**

**Hungary**

Mr. Peter Major, Special Advisor, Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations in Geneva

Mr. Peter Lengyel, Head of Unit, Ministry of National Development

**India**

Ms. Tulika Pandey, Director, Department of Information Technology, Ministry of Communications & Information Technology

**Iran (Islamic Republic of)**

Mr. Abbas Bagher-Pour Ardakani, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations in Geneva

Mr. Alireza Tootoonchian, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations in Geneva

**Lesotho**

Mr. Lefa Thamae, Director for science and technology (*excused*)

**Lithuania**

Mr. Arturas Gailiunas, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Lithuania to the United Nations in Geneva

**Pakistan**

Mr. Ahsan Nabeel, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations in Geneva

**Portugal**

Mr. Luis Magalhães, President of the Knowledge Society Agency (UMIC), Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education

Ms. Ana Cristina Amoroso das Neves, Head, International Affairs Knowledge Society Agency (UMIC), Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education

**Russian Federation**

Mr. Alexander Kushtuev, OJCS Rostelecom Representative

Mr. Alexander Petrov, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations in Geneva.

**Slovakia**

Mr. Igor Kucer, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Slovakia to the UN Office and other International Organizations in Geneva

**South Africa**

Ms. Tshihumbudzo Ravhandalala, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations in Geneva

**Sri Lanka**

Mr. Vijaya Kumar, Chairman, Industrial Technology Institute, Colombo

Ms. Lakmini Peins Mendis, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations in Geneva

**Switzerland**

Mr. Thomas Schneider, Dept Head, International Affairs, Swiss Federal Office of Communications, Bienne

Mr. Dirk-Oliver von der Emden, Legal Adviser, Swiss Federal Office of Communications, Bienne

Mr. Giacomo Mazzone, Media Expert

**Tunisia**

Mr. Moez Chakchouk, Chief Executive Officer of Tunisian Internet Agency (*remote participation*)

**United States of America**

Mr. Craig Reilly, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations in Geneva

**INVITED PARTICIPANTS****Business Community**

Ms. Marilyn Cade, CEO, mCADE LLC

Mr. Patrik Faltstrom, Distinguished Consulting Engineer Cisco Systems -Sweden

Mr. Jimson Olufuye, President Information Technology Association of Nigeria (ITAN) & Vice-Chairman WITSA (Sub-Saharan Africa), Nigeria (*remote participation*)

Mr. Christoph Steck, Public Policy Director, Telefonica S.A.

Ms. Theresa Swinehart, Executive Director - Global Internet Policy, Verizon

**Civil Society**

Mr. Izumi Aizu, Senior Research Fellow & Professor, Institute for InfoSocinomics, Kumon Center, Tama University

Ms. Anriette Esterhuysen, Executive Director, Association for Progressive Communications

Mr. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Professor, Department for Media and Information Sciences, University of Aarhus

Ms. Marilia Maciel, Project leader and researcher, Center for Technology and Society at Fundação Getulio Vargas

Mr. Parminderjeet Singh, Executive Director, IT for Change

#### **Technical and Academic Community**

Ms. Constance Bommelaer, Director, Public Policy, Internet Society

Ms. Samantha Dickinson, Internet Governance Specialist APNIC (*remote participation*)

Mr. Baher Esmat, Manager, Regional Relations - Middle East "Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers Cairo, Egypt

Ms. Nurani Nimpuno, Head of Outreach & Communication, Netnod (Autonomica)

#### **Intergovernmental Organisations**

*International Telecommunication Union (ITU)*

Mr. Preetam Maloor, Corporate Strategy Division

Mr. Jaroslaw Ponder, Corporate Strategy Division

Ms. Regina Valiunia, Corporate Strategy Division

*United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)*

Ms. Michol Lucchi, Intern, Geneva Liaison Office

*World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)*

Mr. Victor Owade, Consultant, Intergovernmental Organizations and Partnerships Section, Department of External Relations

#### **OTHERS**

*Representative of the CSTD Chairman, Mr. Fortunato de la Peña*

Ms. Elizabeth Té, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the United Nations in Geneva

*IGF Secretariat*

Mr. Chengetai Masango, Programme and Technology Manager

Ms. Farzaneh Badiei, Intern

*Appendix II*  
*Rolling document*<sup>8</sup>  
*Broad agreements*<sup>9</sup> *on possible recommendations on improvements to the Internet*  
*Governance Forum (IGF)*

**A. Shaping the outcomes of IGF meetings**

**Broad agreement on the need to improve the outcome documentation from IGF**

**Main points of agreement**<sup>10</sup>

- Outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options.
- Improve formats of outcome documents.
- Broad agreement to identify new ways to extract outcomes of discussions at the IGF.
- Any efforts to synthesise messages must reflect full diversity of views of the IGF community.
- Outcome documents sent to national governments.
- Feedback to CSTD inputs should be ensured.
- Disseminate to international organisations and liaise with them.
- Outcomes transmitted to relevant bodies including the CSTD.
- Include member States, intergovernmental organisations, all stakeholders, other international organisations in space of Internet and governance.
- Set up voluntary on-demand system for dissemination of documents.
- Visibility of the IGF and IGF outcomes.
- Visibility and the IGF relationship with the media.
- Higher visibility to the reports of national and regional IGFs.
- Improve accessibility of outcome documents with additional translations (language).
- Improve accessibility of outputs (for example, include Web 2.0 functionality on Web site).
- Close cooperation with WSIS Forum.
- Outcomes have to be geared at capacity-building.
- Recommendations conveyed to national Governments.
- Compilation of best practices in each region.
- IGF to accept inputs from other organisations and events and distribute outcomes back to these organisations.
- Encourage stakeholder initiatives to document IGF and link to them on the IGF Web site.
- Enhance Web site.
- Provide space on the IGF Web site to document best practices.
- Encourage the establishment of an IG observatory.
- IGF needs to be informed about key discussions that impact on IG taking place in other bodies.
- Map the constellation of organisations that deal with important IG issues. Map them thematically as well.
- Web site and communication tools used by the IGF must be improved.
- Attractiveness of the Web site.

---

<sup>8</sup> The rolling document appeared on the screen during the third meeting of the Working Group to capture main broad agreements and their main points, and a few relevant written contributions which circulated during the meeting. Not every written contribution could be addressed, but they will be compiled and published on the CSTD website.

<sup>9</sup> “Broad agreements” were established to structure the work of the Working Group on the basis of the proposal made by the Technical and Academic communities which took account of established consensus during the first two meetings of the Working Group.

<sup>10</sup> Main points of agreement are elements where a high level of consensus was found during the meeting to serve as guidelines for future recommendations on improvements to the IGF.

## **Included inputs**

### **Portugal:**

1. The IGF should continue to produce its current reports, including the Chairman's report, the sessions' transcripts, the workshops reports and the overall proceedings, to which additional more focused documentation should be added to improve communication and the impact of the results of IGF discussions.
2. New ways should be found to extract the outcomes of discussions at the IGF, for example, in the form of concrete messages. These messages could map out consensus or diverging opinions on a given theme, and capture the range of policy options available.
3. To focus discussions, the preparation process of each IGF should formulate a set of questions and objectives to be considered at the IGF, as part of the overall discussions. The results of the debates on these questions should be specifically stated in an outcome document to be prepared by pre-assigned *rapporteurs* to be identified by the MAG. They may be consensual answers to questions or the expression of the different views presented when consensus does not emerge.
4. To guarantee the impact of the IGF the resulting documentation must be transmitted to the relevant stakeholders. This includes strengthening the IGF communication strategy. A better use of the IGF website would be a first step in this direction. Clear information material would help also to engage stakeholders.
5. To improve the outreach and cooperation with other organizations and *fora* dealing with Internet governance issues, it is important to ensure that messages are transmitted to these organizations and *fora* through appropriate mechanisms. The MAG together with the IGF Secretariat could create an overview of these organizations and *fora* as well as the issues that they are dealing with. The link between the IGF and the CSTD could be strengthened by taking into account inputs from the IGF when drafting annual resolutions at CSTD.

### **Anriette Esterhuysen**

1. IGF has two dimensions: open and exploratory on the one hand, and, on the other, focused on themes and specific policy challenges.
2. Overall modalities of the IGF remains the same: main sessions, feeder workshops, workshops, round tables, open forums.
3. With regard to main sessions, the IGF Secretariat and MAG invites the IGF community to identify pertinent key policy questions. There is precedent for this. This is more or less how the IGF has been organised in the past. Key policy questions were identified for each main theme for the 2011 IGF.
4. Main sessions are structured around these key questions.
5. In response to each main session a report captures the following, in response to the key policy questions:
  - points of convergence
  - points of divergence
  - points that stood out as requiring further exploration
6. When finalising the reporting of each IGF, the MAG and secretariat would discuss these reports, and communicate them to other policy-making institutions.



This report, focused on the main policy questions that were discussed, will not replace the chairman's summary or the proceedings of the IGF.

7. Invite global governance institutions to engage with the IGF on some of these questions, e.g. by convening forums, workshops, etc.

## **B. Working modalities including open consultations, MAG, and Secretariat**

**Broad agreement on the need to rotate MAG members regularly, keep MAG meetings transparent**

**Broad agreement to have the secretariat [remain independent and] based in Geneva**

**Broad agreement to strengthen/expand the IGF Secretariat**

**Broad agreement that the MAG should be more representative of all the groups that Internet governance increasingly impacts.**

**Broad agreement that the use of remote participation tools and resources should be strengthened.**

**Broad agreement that the MAG needs a clear Terms of Reference and that the constitution of the MAG should be done in a transparent and documented fashion.**

### **Main points of agreement**

- Broad agreement on enhancing the bottom-up, open, and inclusive nature of the preparatory process of the IGF.
- Broad agreement on the transparency of the self-management by each stakeholder group.
- Broad agreement on the openness and transparency of MAG meetings.
- In light of transparency, stakeholder groups should publicise their selection process and should identify the process that works best for their own culture and methods of engagement.
- While stakeholder representative selection has to take place in a bottom-up manner, there needs to be general guidelines to ensure transparency, diversity, and widest participation of all groups.
- Set up a framework with guidelines to guide the selection of the MAG (gender balance, regional representation, developed/developing, linkages with stakeholders) and guidelines on actual tour of duty (length of service, rotations, performance criteria such as removal/replacement of MAG members that do not participate)
- Stakeholder groups should strive for geographic diversity, gender balance, and developing country representation. Stakeholder groups should also strive to reflect their internal diversity separating technical community and academic community.
- Stakeholder representatives should be able to clearly demonstrate linkages to and support from a very broad set of groups or constituency.
- The selection of MAG participants, should demonstrate close linkages with the constituencies they seek to represent
- Potential stakeholder representatives should represent groups' or constituencies' interest and not private interests.
- Ensure diversity, widest participation of all groups within the MAG.
- MAG member age distribution and outreach
- Selection of any stakeholder group may not be confined to be mediated through any one particular body.
- Rotation of the MAG members, with one third rotated every year, should be preserved, with a three-year limit to each member's term in order to provide opportunities to all interested participants and to ensure fair representation.
- Giving idea of MAG selection process, keep it a dynamic committee.
- Consider the role of the MAG in the context of an evolving IGF and in the context of IGF improvements and the recommendations for IGF improvements.
- Consider relationships between the MAG and secretariat--roles and responsibilities.
- Consider the role of the MAG in context of IGF no longer being just a single event but rather having evolved into a process.
- Consider mechanisms to enable the MAG to be more efficient.

- Consider the MAG electing coordinating group among its own members.
- Open and transparent selection process and working process.
- Additional outreach with other organizations and in conjunction with secretariat
- Evolution of IGF, evolution of MAG and functioning of MAG. MAG should be more than Program Committee, should guide this process as well
- The MAG works through working groups around each key questions for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue chosen for that year's IGF and also organises preparative background material for that.
- Working groups of the MAG organized around key policy questions for global policy dialogue
- Consider that as IGF evolves, the MAG would also evolve in its functions and will be more than just a Program Committee.
- The secretariat and MAG should seek to find ways to encourage increasing government participation in the open consultations
- Governments should undertake some sort of commitment to undertake more
- Look for mechanisms to encourage the governments to get more actively involved in preparation of IGF meetings.
- Challenges: fundraising, broad and diverse participation from all stakeholders
- Transparency--who funds, guidelines should flow down from regional to national
- Remote participation at the IGF has evolved satisfactorily and needs to be seen as an integral part of the IGF process. It is necessary to strengthen remote participation mechanisms due to its potential contribution for increased inclusiveness.
- Secretariat capacity to adequately support and participate in national and regional IGFs and liaise with national and regional IGFs.
- More deliberate mechanisms developed to reach out to international organizations, intergovernmental organizations, and other stakeholder groups to seek comment on actions and program papers, such as sending letters that specifically invite these entities to submit comment
- Importance of open consultations and role of MAG as facilitator and listener of what happens in consultations, important input into the process

### **Included inputs**

#### **Egypt**

The MAG should open its meeting to observers and make its proceedings available in the form of a live text streaming. This verbatim record is available on the IGF Web site. This proceeding is recommended for future meetings in order to enhance the openness and transparency of its work.

- Specific tasks performed by the MAG members could include:
  - i. Developing the detailed programme including the identification of issues of concern;
  - ii. Selecting workshops and other meetings;
  - iii. Defining how best to plan and organize the meetings;
  - iv. Organizing main sessions and where necessary participate in dedicated thematic working groups;
  - v. Establishing linkages between workshops and main sessions;
  - vi. Facilitating the organization of workshops;
  - vii. Coordinating panels and supporting panellists, moderators and speakers at the annual meeting;
  - viii. Liaising with their respective communities;
  - ix. Publishing reports.
- The commitments of individual MAG members, in their individual capacities, should include:
  - i. Attend three meetings in Geneva per year;
  - ii. Participate in the yearly global meeting;
  - iii. Participate in inter-sessional work;

- iv. Make outreach to wider community, including national and regional IGF type initiatives and bring other networks into the MAG;
  - v. Bring in comments from the community;
  - vi. Explain recommendations to the community.
- Among the criteria for selection of non-governmental MAG members, the following qualifications and competencies were felt to be essential:
    - i. Willingness to commit to work and follow through;
    - ii. Proven ability to work as a team member
    - iii. Active participation in the IGF process;
    - iv. Extensive linkages within one's own stakeholder group and, if possible, to other stakeholder groups;
    - v. Experience and expertise in Internet governance issues.
  - Regarding the selection process for MAG members. It was generally felt that the so-called 'black box' approach used in past should not be pursued in the future as it was not sufficiently transparent. While for the selection of governmental MAG members there were well established processes in place through the regional groups, the selection of non governmental members needed further reflection.
  - It was recognized that all stakeholder groups - other than governments- were organised differently and were based on different cultures and should therefore be allowed to develop their own specific selection procedures.
  - There was a preliminary discussion on the selection process of stakeholders. One possibility mentioned by the MAG group itself last November, was a form of 'triage' that would be used to ensure appropriate geographical balance among MAG members. This 'triage' could be carried out by a trusted group of former non-governmental MAG members, perhaps including some MAG members who are being rotated out.
  - This trusted group would work in active consultation with the respective stakeholder groups. The selection would be based on proposed candidate lists made by the three non-governmental stakeholder groups. The stakeholder groups are encouraged to nominate a sufficiently large slate of candidates to provide some flexibility in selection of MAG members and are asked to ensure appropriate gender balance.
  - The recommendation would then be submitted to the Secretary-General for approval. One proposal was that the list of all MAG nominees to be submitted to the Secretary-General should be published on the IGF website.
  - Another selection process was mentioned capturing the essence of the NomCom idea, or we better call it "selection committee" to avoid confusion with existing systems in other organizations.
  - The selection Committee members, appointed by the IGF Chair, should be drawn fairly from representatives of stakeholders across the different regions and constituencies.
  - Preferably, the Selection Committee would include experts with wide-ranging knowledge of Internet governance, previous experience of program preparation and strong links to various stakeholder groups.

- This Selection Committee would select candidates for the MAG ensuring balanced representation of geographical distribution, gender and the wide range of stakeholders. The final selection of candidates should be submitted to the UN Secretary-General for final approval.

### C. Funding of the IGF

**Broad agreement that additional voluntary funding should be sought, accepted, and encouraged**  
**Broad agreement that funding should be stable, predictable, and independent.**

#### Main points of agreement

- An increased transparency and availability of information about IGF income, expenditure, and to be made available in the public domain.
- Make available background documents like the trust fund requirements and the pledge form (trust fund documents).
- UNESCO strongly supports an independent IGF and a truly multi-stakeholder MAG<sup>11</sup>.

#### Additional background information on the funding of the IGF is required

- Noted that the IGF has a 5 year budget of US\$1.5 million annually which includes outreach and fellowship, such as people from LDCs who work for 3-6 months to learn about IGF issues;
- Noted that the IGF also receives in-kind donations (for example, use of remote participation tools<sup>12</sup>);
- Noted that the IGF trust fund is set up as technical cooperation trust fund, usually bilateral agreements with Governments. There would be no reason to provide the financial statements to external parties. However the IGF is a multi-donor initiative and these are rare in the UN context, so there is some room such as e-mails to donors to see if they object to disclosure;
- Noted that on the Web site, the donors are listed by order of who donates the most. Finland the biggest donor throughout history of IGF, followed by Switzerland, UK, Netherlands, Japan, Norway, European Union. The exact amounts aren't there but after discussion with donors may be able to do something;
- Agreed to contact UNDESA in writing to request information on the following issues:

**Question 1:** Is it possible to get UN funding for the IGF without transgressing the Tunis Agenda? Can the IGF be funded by the regular budget of the UN? If so, which part of the Tunis Agenda would it be transgressing?

**Question 2:** Who and what have been funded? What amount? (if under rules it is permissible to know this)

**Question 3:** Clarification on possible funding models.

**Question 4:** Is it subject to Committee Five approval? If so, would it be vulnerable to 3% across-the-board cut, is risk of entire budget being denied if it goes to Committee Five?

**Question 5:** The Tunis Agenda gives a mandate to the SG (not to the UN) to convene a forum. Therefore this is not a regular program and can only be funded by extra-budgetary contributions.  
 Would funding through the regular budget require the amendment of the mandate?

### D. Broadening participation

**Broad agreement that the preparatory process needs to be made more visible and for more stakeholders to participate in it**

**Broad agreement on need to reach out to new stakeholders**

**Broad agreement on need to enhance remote participation**

<sup>11</sup> The statement of UNESCO was amended after the meeting at their request.

<sup>12</sup> This example was amended at the request of the IGF Secretariat

**Broad agreement to increase and support participation from all stakeholder groups from developing countries in IGF and its preparatory process, increase Internet governance for development (IG4D) topics in IGF, continue to rotate location of IGF annually to enable different regions to have easy access to IGF**

### **Main points of agreement**

- Reference to people with disabilities including age-related disabilities who constitute ~ 1/7 world population according to WHO survey.
- Transparent mechanism for financial support of people from all stakeholder groups who are currently not able to participate with their own resources.
- Fellowship programs supported by participating organisations should also be encouraged.
- Organise a special session during the IGF for parliamentarians and have a broad strategy to encourage attendance of parliamentarians, including possibly having a special corner on the Web site just for parliamentarians.
- Making use of linked events or pre-events that address specific constituencies.
- Recommendation on use of capacity-building activities or processes linked to the IGF in order to broaden participation.
- Captioning of events including workshops to assist remote participants and people with language barriers, investigate the possibility of machine translation such as via Google Translate.
- Broaden interaction between government and other stakeholders.
- Inclusion of representation of disadvantaged groups in preparatory process (disadvantaged refers to the following groups: living in rural areas without connectivity, etc.).
- Make host country Web site visible and accessible to all groups.
- Both captioning and providing real-time text are important.
- Facility must be adjusted/accessible, workshops for government representatives to ensure accessibility.
- Breakout groups should also be linguistically accommodating.
- Important that encourages rotation of members of panels, MCs of working groups, etc.
- Consider improving the nature of the agenda and its drafting process. Agenda framing should include relevant and additional concerns of other specific stakeholders to attract them.
- Purposiveness of the process, whether feeds into real policy-making process.
- Enabling conditions: proactive outreach, approaching different organisations and groups, proactive support to people who can't otherwise attend IGF meetings--given at each level, selecting plenary speakers, workshop selections, funding participants.
- Encourage different organisations with their own funding programmes and central independent corpus administered at central level to support participation
- Diversity matters. Important to include regions that would not otherwise participate. Funding newcomers as opposed to repeat participants.
- Better transparency on funding process, where money originates from, like if Canada funds participation through ITU: Procedure. Space in trust fund for IGF for funding participation, make it more impersonal. Rules of procedure.
- Emphasis on all stakeholders reaching out to new participants and potential new participants. Outreach is the responsibility of the IGF as well as IGF community and all stakeholders.
- Encourage intra-national IGFs, in developing countries in particular
- Secretariat should be empowered to solicit funding from all UN member States without regards to whether for civil society or business
- Should not be discriminated against on need for travel support.
- IGF related events in Geneva. Swiss Foreign Office and Swiss embassies attend to visa requests on UN and IGF events without need to seek appointment dates to participate in these meetings. Need more details in terms of dates for next meetings.
- IGF secretariat facilitating bilateral meetings (>40 bilateral meetings) in terms of logistics (room booking). More transparency of this service and option available for bilateral meetings.
- Formal financial mechanism for funding speakers and moderators, as well as people who cannot come to the IGF on their own resources. Available to all stakeholder groups who request support. Perhaps MAG subcommittee for oversight.

- Diverse agenda to encourage diverse participation.
- Host governments need to be attentive to those with insufficient funding like making low-cost accommodations available and posting on Web site.
- Funding of IGF participation fund.
- Promote the secretariat's experience in broadening participation within its report.

**E. Linking IGF to other related processes/mechanisms/bodies**

**Broad agreement on need to encourage greater links between national, regional, and global IGF  
Broad agreement on need to encourage greater links between IGF and intergovernmental  
organisations and international organisations.**

### ***Appendix III***

#### ***Summary of the main points of broad agreements discussed at the Third meeting of the Working Group on Improvements to the IGF- prepared by the Chairman of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the CSTD after the Third Meeting and on the basis of the written proposals made by Portugal.***

##### **A. Shaping the outcomes of IGF meetings**

- The IGF should continue to produce its current reports, including the Chairman's report, the sessions' transcripts, the workshops reports and the overall proceedings, to which additional more focused documentation should be added to improve communication and the impact of the results of IGF discussions.
- New ways should be found to extract the outcomes of discussions at the IGF, for example, in the form of concrete messages. These messages could map out consensus or diverging opinions on a given theme, and capture the range of policy options available.
- To focus discussions, the preparation process of each IGF should formulate a set of questions and objectives to be considered at the IGF, as part of the overall discussions. The results of the debates on these questions should be specifically stated in an outcome document to be prepared by pre-assigned *rapporteurs* to be identified by the MAG. They may be consensual answers to questions or the expression of the different views presented when consensus does not emerge.
- To guarantee the impact of the IGF the resulting documentation must be transmitted to the relevant stakeholders. This includes strengthening the IGF communication strategy. A better use of the IGF website would be a first step in this direction. Clear information material would help also to engage stakeholders.
- To improve the outreach and cooperation with other organisations and fora dealing with Internet governance issues, it is important to ensure that messages are transmitted to these organisations and fora through appropriate mechanisms. The MAG together with the IGF Secretariat could create an overview of these organisations and fora as well as the issues that they are dealing with. The link between the IGF and the CSTD could be strengthened by taking into account inputs from the IGF when drafting annual resolutions at the CSTD.

##### **B. Working modalities including open consultations, MAG and Secretariat**

- Remote participation at the IGF has evolved very satisfactorily, but a further strengthening of remote participation tools is desirable due to its potential contribution for increased inclusiveness.
- The preparatory process should stand on a bottom-up, open, inclusive process.
- Engage the organisers of groups of national and regional IGFs to enhance their input to the global IGF and vice versa. Preferably all, but at least one of the annual open consultations, should allow for remote participation.

##### **MAG**

- The working methods of the MAG should be made clearer, e.g. through the development of Terms of Reference, and its functioning should be transparent and open.
- The MAG's composition should represent the wide internet community and its membership should be balanced as regards stakeholders, geographic and cultural diversity, and gender. Technical and academic communities should be seen as specific stakeholder groups.

- The MAG's structure and the process of selection of its members must be inclusive, predictable, transparent and fully documented. Stakeholder groups should publicise the guidelines for their selection process and document their application.
- The rotation system which was introduced by the MAG should be further developed in order to allow for a constant renewal of the MAG and to guarantee its openness to new stakeholders. The rules of rotation should be clear, with about one third rotated every year and a three-year limit to each member's term.

#### **Secretariat**

- The IGF Secretariat should continue to operate with transparency and flexibility, be accountable to all stakeholders, independent of other UN bodies and based in Geneva.
- With very limited human and financial resources, the IGF Secretariat, together with many volunteers, has managed to service well the IGF meetings, but it should be strengthened and expanded in order to meet the increasing demands and to support the desired and increased outreach.

### **C. Funding of the IGF**

- The Funding of the IGF should be improved with additional financial resources and, notably, with increased transparency and availability of information.
- Many members stressed the complexity and sensitivity of issues at stake in this regard and recalled the long and inconclusive debates at previous meetings by reason, in particular, of their lack of knowledge of existing mechanisms and possible additional resources.
- The Working Group decided to postpone its discussion on this topic pending confirmation of the possibility and feasibility of obtaining UN funding for the IGF. To this end, a written request will be sent to UNDESA in time for the next meeting.

### **D. Broadening participation**

- Participation in the IGF has increased throughout time, but it should be further broadened to involve new stakeholders, both at IGF meetings and preparatory processes, in particular from developing countries, youth, small and medium enterprises, decision-makers, parliamentarians, and disabled people and other disadvantaged groups.
- Enhancing participation in the IGF should be taken into consideration when developing the IGF agendas in order to make them attractive to a wide variety of stakeholders' interests. Pre-events and linked events directed to special themes could also be useful to increase participation of specific constituencies.
- Effective remote participation is a key element for engaging whoever cannot physically attend meetings. Remote participation has reached a remarkable level in last IGF meetings, in particular through remote hubs, but there is still room for further improvements, in particular to enhance interactivity of remote participants with on-site audiences, provided that adequate resources can be assured.
- The possibility of providing simultaneous machine translation services based on real-time transcripts could be explored to ensure further reach of IGF meetings.
- Special funding and other support for developing country participants should be increased, if possible. A transparent funding mechanism, with clear criteria, should be applied to alleviate barriers to participation from developing countries.



- Dedicated capacity building actions are important to better engage newcomers to the IGF and to create an environment where their participation becomes the most useful for them, but also for other participants.