UNITED NATIONS
COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

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

24 and 25 March 2011

Chairman's summary of the meeting

1. The second meeting of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) was held in the Centre de Conférences de Genève in Geneva, Switzerland on 24 and 25 March 2011. It was chaired by Mr. Frédéric Riehl (Switzerland).

2. After the Chair had opened the meeting, the Working Group adopted the agenda. The Working Group decided to discuss jointly agenda items 2 and 3 and to identify which proposals to retain for the Working Group's report when examining the responses to a questionnaire[1]. It was decided that points 2, 4 and 5 of the questionnaire (on linking the IGF to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance (IG); on shaping the outcome of IGF meetings; and on outreach and cooperation with other organizations and for a dealing with IG issue, respectively) should be considered jointly.

3. Delegations recalled that the IGF was a non-binding, non-decision making body. It was also generally underlined that outcomes of the meeting should become more tangible and concrete. Clearer outcomes would also be easier to transmit to and have a greater impact in the broader dialogue on Internet governance and vis-à-vis other organizations and fora dealing with IG.

4. The Working Group discussed a number of different ways in which the IGF could produce clearer outcomes and what function these outcomes should then fulfil. One delegation considered that the IGF could improve its feedback mechanism, for example in the form of a questionnaire in which participants could provide information if and how they have benefited from the meeting and how it could better serve their needs. Several delegations thought that the Chairman's report could be developed into an easy to read brochure; that workshops should produce summaries; or that dynamic coalitions could sum up the result of their work. More could also be done to collect information transmitted to the IGF, for example from national and regional IGF initiatives. A compendium of best practices discussed at the IGF, was also proposed.

---

[1] The Working Group had elaborated a questionnaire during its first meeting (Montreux, Switzerland, 25 and 26 February 2011). The questionnaire had been sent out to all member states and relevant stakeholders at the beginning of March. At the time of the meeting, 28 responses to the questionnaire had been received. An additional response, by Brazil was circulated during the meeting; another late response, by Norway, was submitted and then made available after the meeting. All individual responses to the questionnaire are available from
http://www.unctad.info/en/CstdWG/WGIGF_Contributions/. A compilation of all responses is available from http://www.unctad.info/upload/CSTD-IGF/Contributions/M1/CompilationWGIGF.pdf.

5. A number of delegations also supported the creation of thematic working groups that would prepare, in particular the discussions of the main sessions (for example, by holding preparatory meetings) and then summarize the outcomes in a succinct manner.

6. Many delegations considered that the IGF meeting agenda could become more focused, in particular as concerns the number of themes discussed in the main sessions. A clearer and tighter agenda that reflects the interests of all stakeholders would also attract many new participants (including those that had been less active in the IGF so far, such as developing country representatives, especially government representatives).

7. For a number of delegations, a tighter agenda and clearer outcomes would also make interaction with the broader dialogue on Internet governance and the cooperation with other organizations dealing with IG easier. Improving communication and specifically inviting the relevant organizations to the IGF meetings were also considered essential in this respect. Some delegations also suggested that the outcomes of the IGF be transmitted to the CSTD. Two delegations also proposed to organize an open dialogue with these organizations at the IGF to hold them accountable about their work on IG.

8. The Working Group then addressed points 7, 8 and 9 (on working methods of the IGF; format of IGF meetings; and financing of the IGF, respectively) of the questionnaire together. A majority of delegations seemed to support clearer rules on the selection of members of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG). In particular, the regular rotation of members was considered important. Some delegations also supported more detailed criteria for the selection of members. It was also mentioned that the MAG should have regulations on their working methods. In this context, one delegation recalled the discussions on improvements to the MAG that the MAG had held at its last meeting.[2]

9. Two delegations submitted specific proposals on the reform of the MAG. One proposal concentrated on a clearer rotation and nomination processes, which would also include better selection and preparation of new members. The second proposal envisaged a more extensive review of the MAG's role and function, in particular in the preparatory process. The MAG would create thematic and functional working groups. The thematic working groups would prepare themes for the main sessions in an open and inclusive manner. The proposals developed in this process would then be discussed at the IGF. Diverging and converging views and clear policy proposals coming out of these discussions would then be summarised by the thematic working group and transmitted to the relevant organizations with the request to provide information on any follow-up action taken on the IGF proposals.

---

[2] Multistakeholder Advisory Group, "Summary report, meeting Geneva 23 March 2011". Available from http://intgovforum.org/cms/2010/MAG.Summary.23.11.2010.pdf.

10. To improve the inclusiveness of the IGF, most delegations supported an increase in financing provided for the participation of representatives of developing countries. Enhanced (and, if possible, also non-real time) remote participation, an agenda that reflects the interests of all stakeholder groups, as well as outreach to and capacity building of groups that so far have not been involved in the IGF yet, were other points that a number of delegations considered essential for increasing the IGF's inclusiveness.

11. Most delegations also agreed that there is a need to reinforce the IGF secretariat. It was noted that the IGF secretariat had done a remarkable job with the very modest resources at its disposal and that the funding for the secretariat as well as other IGF budget items should be increased, the budget of the IGF should become more stable and predictable and that fundraising, financial management and financial reporting should become more transparent and accountable. While all delegations agreed that the IGF's independence should be guaranteed, there were diverging ideas about how the IGF should be financed. While some delegations were of the view that the current multistakeholder financing model based solely on voluntary contributions should be expanded, other delegations considered that (core) funding should come from the United Nations. Other delegations proposed a mix of funding from voluntary contributions and the United Nations (the latter for non-essential budget items).

12. During the meeting, the Chairman collected those issues on which some agreement seemed to have appeared during the discussions and assembled them in a non paper of the chair. He presented this non paper to the Working Group on the second day of the meeting as a basis for an agreement on concrete recommendations. However, the complexity and political sensitivity of the subject and a significant divergence of views among member States on a number of concrete proposals did not, within the short time frame it had been given to complete its task, allow the Working Group to agree on a set of concrete appropriate recommendations on improving the Internet Governance Forum. The non paper is appended to this chairman's report for information.

13. As a consequence, the Chairman decided that he would draw up a short report to the CSTD. This report would state that the Working Group had fulfilled its mandate to seek, compile and review the views of member States and relevant stakeholders on improvements to the IGF but that it had not been able to agree on appropriate concrete recommendations on improvements. The compilation of answers to the Working Group's questionnaire would be appended to that report.

14. Some delegations proposed that the mandate of the Working Group be extended to provide it with the necessary additional time to carry out its task.

Appendix I - Final list of participants

MEMBER STATES

Brazil
Mr. Maurício A. O. Correia, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Brazil to the WTO and other economic organizations in Geneva

Chile
Mr. Fernando Guzman, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Chile to the United Nations in Geneva

Costa Rica
Mr. Norman Lizano, Minister Counsellor, 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

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

Greece
Mr. George Papadatos, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations in Geneva

Hungary
Mr. Árpád Csányi Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations in Geneva
Mr. Istvan Erenyi, Senior Counsellor, Ministry of National Development, State Secretariat of Infocommunications and Media
Mr. Peter Major, Special Advisor, Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations in Geneva

India
Mrs. Kotthapally Nandini, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations in Geneva
Mr. Manharsinh Yadav, Embassy of India, Brussels

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

Lesotho
Mr. Lefeu Ramone, Minister Counsellor at the Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Lesotho to the United Nations in Geneva

Lithuania
Mr. Donatas Tamulaitis, Head of International Economic Organisations Division at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania

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

Portugal
Ms. Ana Cristina Amoroso das Neves, Head, International Affairs Knowledge Society Agency (UMIC), Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education
Prof. Luis Magalhães, President of the Knowledge Society Agency (UMIC), Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education
Mr. Giacomo Mazzone, Radio Television Portugal / European Broadcasting Union
Mr. Ricardo Pracana, Deputy Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations in Geneva

Russian Federation
Mr. Alexander Pisarev, First Counsellor (Political Affairs and ITU), Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations in Geneva

Slovakia
Mr. Anton Frič, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Slovakia to the UN Office and other International Organizations in Geneva
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, South Africa Mission to the United Nations in Geneva

Sri Lanka
Mr. Vijaya Kumar, Chairman, Industrial Technology Institute, Colombo
Ms. Lakmini Peins Mendis, First Secretary, Sri Lanka Mission to the United Nations in Geneva

Switzerland
Mr. Frédéric Riehl, Director, International Relations, Federal Office of Communications, Bienne
Mr. Hassane Makki, Scientific Advisor, Swiss Federal Office of Communications, Bienne
Mr. Thomas Schneider, Dept Head, International Affairs, Swiss Federal Office of Communications, Bienne

Tunisia

United States of America
Ms. Robyn Disselkoen Foreign Affairs Officer, United States Department of State
Mr. Christopher Hemmerlein, Telecommunications Policy Analyst, National
Telecommunications and Information Administration
Mr. Craig Reilly, First Secretary, United States Mission 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
(participating remotely))
Mr. Jimson Olufuye, President Information Technology Association of Nigeria (ITAN) &
Vice-Chairman WITSA (Sub-Saharan Africa), Nigeria
Mr. Christoph Steck, Public Policy Director, Telefonica S.A.
Ms. Theresa Swinehart, 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 *(excused)*
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, Senior Manager Strategic Global Engagement, Internet Society
Ms. Samantha Dickinson, Internet Governance Specialist APNIC
Mr. Baher Esmat, Manager, Regional Relations - Middle East "Internet Corporation for
Assigned Names and Numbers Cairo, Egypt
Ms. Nurani Nimpuno, Outreach & Communications Manager, Netnod (Autonomica)
Mr. Oscar Robles-Garay, General Director for NIC México, LACNIC Board of Directors
(Regional IP Registry for Latin American and Caribbean region)

Intergovernmental Organisations
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
Mr. Preetam Maloor, Corporate Strategy Division
Mr. Jaroslaw Ponder, Corporate Strategy Division

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)
Mr. Roberto Villarreal Gonda, Chief, Development Management Branch, Division for Public
Administration and Development Management United Nations Department of Economic and
Social Affairs

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

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

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
Mr. Victor Owade, Consultant, Intergovernmental Organizations and Partnerships Section, Department of External Relations

OTHERS
IGF Secretariat
Mr. Chengetai Masango, Programme and Technology Manager

Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), presented on 25 March 2011 at 14:00 during the Working Group's second meeting (Geneva, Switzerland, 24 and 26 March 2011)

Background:

1. On 19 July 2010, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) adopted by consensus resolution 2010/2 on the "Assessment of the progress made in the implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society". By this resolution, ECOSOC "*invites the Chair of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development* (CSTD) *to establish, in an open and inclusive manner, a working group which would seek, compile and review inputs from all Member States and all other stakeholders on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum* (IGF), *in line with the mandate set out in the Tunis Agenda, and which would report to the Commission at its fourteenth session in 2011 with recommendation, as appropriate.* This report is *to constitute an input from the Commission to the General Assembly, through* ECOSOC, *should the mandate of the IGF be extended.*

2. In its Resolution "Information and communications technologies for development" (November 2010), the General Assembly decided to extend the mandate of the IGF. In the same Resolution, the General Assembly also underlined the need to improve the IGF "with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance"[3] and that particular consideration should be given to "inter alia, enhancing participation from developing countries, exploring further voluntary options for financing the Forum and improving the preparation process modalities, and the work and functioning of the Forum's secretariat."[4]

3. The Working Group was composed … (to be complemented)

4. It held … consultations, meetings, etc. (to be complemented)

Mandate and characteristics of the Internet Governance Forum of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (TAIS)

5. The members of the Working Group recall the mandate of the IGF as a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue which should be convened in an open and inclusive process as laid out in TAIS § 72:

---

[3] General Assembly Resolution "Information and communications technologies for development", paragraph 17
[4] Ibid. paragraph 19

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;

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;

c) Interface with appropriate inter-governmental organisations 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;

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

f) Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet Governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries;

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

h) Contribute to capacity-building for Internet Governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise;

i) Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet Governance processes;

j) Discuss, *inter alia*, issues relating to critical Internet resources;

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

l) Publish its proceedings.

6. The Group also recalls TAIS § 73 which states that the IGF in its working and function, will be multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent.

7. The Group further recalls the principles laid out in TAIS § 77 which states that the IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organisations, 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.

"Outcomes" of the IGF meetings

8. The members of the Working Group recall the mandate of the IGF as a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue which should be convened in an open and inclusive process as laid out in TAIS § 72.

9. [a paragraph about the achievements of the IGF in creating output in form of dialogue and indirect impact by action taken by participants in their home constituencies as a result of IGF meetings]

10. The Working Group considered that it would now be important for the IGF to place a greater emphasis on improving the visibility of the "outcomes" of the dialogue taking place at the IGF and also to pay more attention to its impact and how this impact could be improved.

11. In order to increase the visibility of the IGF dialogue, new ways should be found to extract the outcomes of discussions at the IGF, for example, in the form of messages. These messages could map out diverging opinions or consensus on a given theme, and capture the range of policy options available.

12. These messages could be based on: an overall chairman's report; discussions in each session; "take-aways", for example by the dynamic coalitions, that capture the key issues discussed; or a repository of best practices discussed at the IGF.

13. To focus discussions, it might also be useful to set questions and objectives at the beginning of each IGF. The Forum can then ask to what extent these questions have 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.

14. In addition, a questionnaire inviting all participants to the IGF to evaluate the meeting, in particular if and how they feel they have benefitted from the meeting, could also help to give more information on the impact of the meeting.

15. To guarantee the impact of these messages, the IGF has to ensure that they are transmitted to the relevant stakeholders. This includes strengthening the IGF's 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.

16. Thematic IGFs (yet to be created) or regional and national IGFs are also a very good way of communicating messages from the IGF and reaching and involving new stakeholders.

17. 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 could create an overview of these organizations and fora as well as the the issues that they are dealing with. For example, the link between the IGF and the CSTD could be strengthened. The CSTD should take into account inputs from the IGF when drafting annual resolutions. [The MAG could then follow-up on what has been done in response to IGF input.]

Enhancing inclusiveness and participation (in particular of developing countries)

18. [paragraph on the ability of past IGF meetings to attract a large variety of stakeholders and the attention paid to date to the issue of development and IG and efforts undertaken to involve participants from developing countries].

19. The Working Group considered it important to further broaden the range of stakeholders involved in the IGF. Steps need to be undertaken to allow the participation of new stakeholders (in particular from developing countries). More efforts in identifying and approaching these new stakeholders should be made. Ways need to be found to involve them actively not just in the meeting but also in the preparatory process, in particular to ensure that their interests are reflected in the IGF's agenda.

20. Representatives from developing countries might be more interested and more likely to participate in the IGF if the agenda reflects their concerns better. The IGF could focus more specifically on addressing issues related to development and Internet governance, including discussions on structural issues of exclusion and marginalization. A better understanding of development as a cross-cutting issue that should be discussed as part of many different Internet governance themes, might help to better address problems faced by developing countries.

21. The IGF also needs to reach out to new stakeholders, which should be involved in discussions on IG but which so far have not participated in the IGF. Internet governance has an impact on many different social, economic and human processes and affects many different groups in society. Those representing these causes or groups should also be involved in discussions on Internet governance. The IGF should develop an outreach strategy to include, for example, representatives of marginalized groups, development, small and medium sized companies, decision-makers, parliamentarians and youth.

22. Regional and national IGF processes already help representatives from developing countries as well as groups that have not traditionally been involved in discussion on IG, to get involved in the global IGF. These processes should therefore be further encouraged and links, especially to the IGF preparatory work, should be enhanced. (See also below for the involvement of new stakeholders in the IGF preparatory process and agenda setting.)

23. Effective remote participation is a key element for engaging those which cannot physically attend meetings. The IGF has already provided great opportunities of linking people remotely not just to the annual meeting but also the preparatory process. More can be done to improve the quality and ability of these services. Especially, more funds should be made available to finance these services, which so far have relied mainly on the generous help of volunteers.

24. Capacity building is important to better engage newcomers to the IGF and to create an environment where their participation becomes as useful as possible for them and other participants.

25. Special funding and other support for developing country participants should be increased, if possible. A transparent funding mechanism, with clear criteria, should be established to allow the participation of both participants and expert speakers from developing countries. One of the criteria for selecting candidates for funding could be to ensure that they represent, in particular, the interests of marginalized groups.

26. An easy way to strengthen inclusiveness of the IGF is also to improve the IGFs communication strategy, in particular by presenting outcomes clearly (e.g. with an improved website).

Preparatory process

27. [paragraph on how the IGF preparatory process as managed to increase transparency and inclusiveness in the past years].

28. The Working Group considered that the preparatory process should allow for a greater inclusiveness, especially of stakeholders which so far have not been involved in the IGF. Greater care should also be taken to make (parts of) the meeting more focused, to make its aims and "outcomes" clearer and therefore attract a greater number of new stakeholders.

29. To increase the efficiency of the meetings and to allow even more people to get involved in the open consultations, at least one of the annual open consultations could be held virtually. Greater efforts could also be made to better reflect the opinions of those groups which have so far not been involved in the IGF, such as marginalized groups in this process. By asking regional and national IGFs and representatives of these groups as well as groups that are part of the Internet governance ecosystem to provide inputs to the open consultations, it might be easier to reflect the opinion of many of the local actors in the agenda.

30. The IGF should try to limit the number of topics covered during the main sessions. The choice of topics for workshops should continue to be open. Feeder workshops, workshops that report into main sessions, were a welcome innovation at the 2010 IGF meeting in Vilnius. This format should be maintained.

31. The MAG could also be given a greater role in setting the agenda, trying to make it more relevant and ensuring that it includes themes of interest to all groups. 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 this given year.

Composition and working methods of the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)

32. The Working Group discussed a number of proposals about how to improve the working methods of the MAG.

33. The working methods of the MAG should be made more clear, e.g. through the development of Terms of Reference, and its functioning should be more transparent. Potential MAG members should be made aware of the key role of the MAG for the functioning of the IGF and the time they need to invest in this work.

34. The MAG should represent the whole internet community and its membership should be balanced as regards stakeholders, geographic and cultural diversity and gender.

35. The MAG's structure and the process of selection of its members must be transparent, inclusive and predictable.

36. The rotation system which had been 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 and enforceable.

37. The selection of non-governmental representatives in the MAG should represent all sections of society, including vulnerable groups. This might mean having to increase the number of non-governmental representatives, to include not only those working primarily on Internet governance issues but also those representing groups that are affected by Internet governance.

38. Governmental representatives, especially from the developing world, should be encouraged to more actively participate in the work of in the MAG.

39. It should be envisaged that the chair is elected by the MAG members.

IGF secretariat

40. The Working Group expressed its high appreciation of the great work accomplished by the secretariat. With very limited human and financial resources, the secretariat, together with many volunteers, has managed to service the IGF meetings in an excellent manner.

41. The Working Group is of the opinion that the resources of the Secretariat would need to be increased in order to meet the increasing demands, to take a maximum benefit of the IGF process and in order to achieve the outreach desired. This will, however, depend on the availability of funds for the IGF process. Ultimately, the Secretariat should remain light-weighed, non-bureaucratic and accountable to all stakeholders.

42. The Secretariat should continue to operate with transparency and flexibility and it should remain independent. It should continue to be based in Geneva as the post-WSIS processes and many other ICT related international processes are anchored in Geneva.

Funding of the IGF

43. In order to assure a proper and effective planning and functioning, the IGF needs stability in its funding. More stability could be reached by broadening the sources and diversity of funding. It could further be reached by encouraging contributors to make longer term commitments. For example, the IGF could organize events, open to all stakeholders, where donors can pledge to make donations for a certain amount of time.

44. The multi-stakeholder nature of the IGF should continue to be reflected in a multi-stakeholder support to its activities. While all stakeholders already contribute in kind and with unpaid working time to the IGF process, so far, mainly governments and private sector entities from developed countries have contributed to the IGF trust fund. A further diversification of funding sources, to include more donations from governments from developing countries, civil society, academia and international organizations, should be considered.

45. As a body discussing matters that are in the public interest, at least part of the IGF budget should come from public sources. [This could mean contribution from the UN to certain elements in the IGF budget, in particular financing the contribution of developing country representatives or support for the IGF host country.]

46. The funding structure for the IGF should be transparent. The IGF Secretariat should make information on the IGF's fund raising process, its budget and its expenditures publicly available. In particular, donor and balance sheets should be made publicly available on the IGF website. The secretariat should produce and publish a annual financial report. This report should include information not only about contributions to the trust fund, but also about in kind contributions, the expenses of hosts of meetings and other costs involved in the IGF process and about who covers these.

47. In order to enhance transparency in the funding of the IGF, donors meeting should be held regularly and be open for observers. The minutes of the meetings should be made available to the public on the IGF website.

48. The funding mechanism should guarantee the independence and neutrality of the IGF and its Secretariat and prevent donors from having specific influence on the IGF agenda setting. The diversity of funding sources already ensures to a certain extent that no single stakeholder can be said to exert significant influence based on their contribution. Other measures could be set in place, for example, terms of reference for donations could be developed.

49. An improved IGF process, as proposed above, would need enhanced support from all stakeholders including increased funding of the IGF. In addition, as discussed above, more funds would need to be made available to increase the capacity of the secretariat and to finance more participation of developing country representatives.

50. The Secretariat should be encouraged to engage in proactive fund raising with potential donors. The MAG and its chair should also support the Secretariat in outreach to potential donors.

51. Financing could be further increased and diversified by the introduction of a mechanism that would allow individuals and small organizations to make small donations as well.