



**Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance
Forum (IGF)**

Geneva, Switzerland

11–13 January 2012

Chairman's summary of the meeting

1. The fourth 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 11-13 January 2012. It was chaired by Mr. Peter Major (Hungary).
2. In his opening statement¹, the Chair recalled the positive results of the third meeting of the Working Group (Geneva, 31 October – 02 November 2011)² and its measurable progress with, in particular, the establishment of points of broad agreements addressing areas of improvements to the IGF, namely items A. Shaping the outcomes of IGF meetings; B. Working modalities including open consultations, MAG and Secretariat; and D. Broadening participation.
3. The Chair of the Working Group outlined expected results for the fourth meeting and invited participating members to continue to discuss and identify broad agreements concerning items C. Funding of the IGF and E. Linking the IGF to other related process/mechanism/bodies and to start its ultimate task of drafting recommendations on the last day of the meeting. In this regard, the Chair stressed the importance of drafting clear and coherent recommendations without leaving room for interpretation and of including provisions concerning the monitoring and evaluation of their implementation.
4. The Chair presented the follow-up given to the third meeting of the Working Group, in particular concerning the letter sent to UNDESA on behalf of members of the Group to seek information on the possibility and feasibility of obtaining UN funding for the IGF³. Given the complex nature of the questions sent to UNDESA requiring sometimes legal interpretation and analysis, the representative of the IGF Secretariat informed participants that the expected written reply could not be sent at this stage and that he would therefore respond verbally on the second day of the meeting on the basis of information provided by UNDESA. Therefore, the Chair and participating members of the Working Group agreed to amend the draft provisional agenda accordingly to address item C on the second day instead of the first day of the meeting.

¹ The “preliminary remarks” made by the Chairman of the Working Group at its Fourth Meeting will be made available on the CSTD website.

² For more information, the “Chairman’s summary” of the Third Meeting of the Working Group on Improvements to the IGF, (Geneva, 31 October-02 November 2011) is available at <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/Meeting.asp?intItemID=2068&lang=1&m=22711&year=2011&month=10>

³ For more information, see paragraph 9 of the “Chairman’s summary” of the Third Meeting of the Working Group.

5. Following the adoption of the draft agenda, the Working Group held a detailed and constructive discussion on item E which is reflected in the rolling document⁴ (see *Appendix II*) and established broad agreements in particular concerning the need to develop an outreach strategy and enhance substantial interactions and communication with other relevant bodies, mechanisms and processes.
6. Concerning possible improvements to the funding of the IGF (item C), and referring to the above-mentioned letter to UNDESA, the IGF Secretariat informed the Working Group that the budget of the IGF, which was established as a project, and related information requests are administered by UNDESA in accordance with UN Rules and Regulations applicable to activities and projects financed on the basis of extra-budgetary resources such as voluntary contributions. In addition, taking into account that the mandate of the IGF was given to the Secretary General and not the UN, UNDESA considers that strictly speaking the IGF is not a UN body and cannot be financed therefore by the UN regular budget without a UN resolution by the competent legislative body. Regarding possible funding models which could apply to the IGF, UNDESA hopes that the answer will come from the Working Group itself when completing its ultimate task with recommendations. For this purpose, the IGF Secretariat stressed UNDESA's will to continue to fully cooperate with the Working Group and contribute to the success of its work by providing additional information if necessary.
7. The Working Group was grateful for these preliminary responses and expressed their hope to receive, in time for the next meeting, a written reply to bring back to their capital or constituencies. On this basis, the Working Group was able to discuss various important issues related to item C as reflected in the rolling document and established broad agreements concerning, in particular the need to increase voluntary funding given that the effective implementation of future recommendations of the Working Group will also depend on it. In this respect, participants decided to consider innovative means to raise funds and possibly to make concrete proposals at the next meeting.
8. It is important to note that various participating members recalled the need to maintain a "top-down approach" which implies, firstly, to broadly agree to possible improvements to the IGF. Determining possible and specific ways of implementing them will be carried out subsequently when drafting the details of the related recommendations. Along these lines, the Working Group agreed to structure recommendations for each item A-E with, firstly, introductory opening acknowledgements, followed by main sections with general recommendations for improvements to the IGF which would have subsections providing concrete examples of possible means and ways for their effective implementation as reflected in numerous broad agreements which were established by the Group. On this basis, the rolling document will be consolidated and published on the website in view of the next meeting of the Working Group.

⁴ The rolling document was established initially at the Third Meeting of the Working Group (Geneva, 31 October – 02 November) to capture points of discussion, including broad agreements concerning items A, B, C, D, as well as proposals which could not find consensus and were therefore put in square brackets. An updated version was transmitted to the working group shortly after the meeting and was published on the website.

9. Within the framework of discussions on item C, members representing civil society expressed their concerns with a written statement⁵ regarding the absence of financial support to ensure the participation of civil society representatives from developing countries thereby preventing two members from physically attending this meeting. The CSTD Secretariat responded by underlining in particular that the Working Group had been established without any additional resources which are, this year, extremely limited.
10. Although there was no sufficient time to start the expected drafting process, the Working Group made significant progress in addressing and reaching consensus concerning complex and crucial issues including in relation to the funding of the IGF which is at the heart of the concrete success of the contribution of the Working Group to improving the IGF. The establishment of broad agreements, the agreed structure for recommendations as well as inputs from members of the Working Group⁶ will be reflected in the consolidated version of the rolling document and will stand as a constructive basis for the Working Group to complete its task successfully at the next and final meeting.
11. The Working Group agreed with the proposal of the Chair to hold its next and final meeting in Geneva on 20-22 February 2012.

⁵ The “Statement from civil society participants in the CSTD working group on IGF improvements – submitted to the 4th meeting of the working group, 11 January 2012” was distributed during the Fourth Meeting to members of the Working Group.

⁶ In view of the fourth meeting, a draft document was specifically prepared by Mr. Vijaya Kumar, Vice-Chair of the Working Group, to make preliminary proposals for a draft report on improvements to the IGF. This document will be updated on the basis of the results of the fourth meeting of the Working Group and will be made available to members of the Working Group at its fifth and final meeting. Ms Marilia Maciel (civil society) who participated remotely, also provided a draft contribution to the Working Group by categorising previous proposals made by the Chair in his “summary” of the third meeting of the Working Group.

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 Ambassador, 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

Ms. Christine Arida, Director of Telecom Planning, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology

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. Andras Dékany, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations in Geneva

Mr. Balazs Ratakai, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations in Geneva

Mr. David Pusztai, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Hungary to the United Nations in Geneva

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

India

Ms. Tulika Pandey, Director, Department of Information Technology, Ministry of Communications & Information Technology (*excused*)

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

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

Kenya

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**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. Vladimir Minkin, Deputy Director General, Russia State Enterprise “Radio Research Institute” (NIIR)

Mr. Alexander Petrov, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation

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, Sri Lanka Mission 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, Swiss Federal Office of Communications, Bienne

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 Fältström, Distinguished Consulting Engineer Cisco Systems -Sweden

Mr. Jimson Olufuye, Vice-Chairman WITSA (Sub-Saharan Africa), Nigeria

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 (*remote participation*)

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 (*remote participation*)

Mr. Parminderjeet Singh, Executive Director, IT for Change

Technical and Academic Community

Ms. Constance Bommelaer, Director, Public Policy, Internet Society (*excused*)

Ms. Samantha Dickinson, Internet Governance Consultant

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)

Mr. Oscar Robles-Garay, General Director for NIC México, LACNIC Board of Directors (Regional IP Registry for Latin American and Caribbean region) (*remote participation*)

Intergovernmental Organisations

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

Mr. Cédric Wacholz, Programme Specialist, Knowledge Societies Division, Communication and Information Sector

Mr. Andrea Beccalli, Associate Expert, Knowledge Societies Division, Communication and Information Sector.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Ms. Marisol Iglesias-Vega, Programme Officer, Department of External Relations

OTHERS

IGF Secretariat

Mr. Chengetai Masango, Programme and Technology Manager

Ms. Farzaneh Badei, Consultant

Appendix II

Draft Rolling document

Broad agreements and main points of discussion in view of establishing possible recommendations on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

(status: 13 January 2012, end of the Fourth Meeting of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF, Geneva, 11-13 January 2012)

A. Shaping the outcomes of IGF meetings

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

Main points of agreement

- 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.

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 ProgramCommittee, 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

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[5]);
- 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?

Points of discussion

- Consider addressing two separate issues: 1) the trust fund and its management; and 2) other donations. Concerning the trust fund and its management, transparency of meetings should be improved with recordings, transcripts, minutes of the donors' meetings, which should be made available.
- Consider dividing recommendations concerning long-term and short-term perspectives.
- The administration of funding should be envisaged during the implementation stage.

- Improve the marketing and outreach efforts of the IGF in order to attract new donors.
- Consider having a multiyear donors' program to reach out to donors and get information from them. For this purpose more staff is needed

- Further improve the transparency of the funding of the IGF (for example, publish minutes of the donor meetings, estimate a dollar cost of in-kind donations, publish an annual report that includes high-level financial data of the IGF)
- An annual accountability and transparency concerning the allocation of donations should be established.
- Consider establishing a simplified operational plan to ensure clarity regarding donation allocations.
- Consider having clear rules concerning funding (who should be funded, such as LDCs, etc.)
- Consider improving the IGF's accounting by including all expenses and contributions.
- Consider having a body to control the budget, either in the MAG or the IGF secretariat.
- The budget should be discussed, even in the MAG.
- Donors should have a chance to discuss the work program.

- Consider the possibility and feasibility of obtaining UN funding as two separate issues.
- Explore UN general funding for the core structure and functions of the IGF, including improving participation and outreach, in addition to welcoming voluntary private funds.
- Consider exploring voluntary options.
- Consider a mixed model of funding.
- Consider a model whereby the SG's office provides (1) in-kind support (2) that this in-kind support is stated clearly (e.g. communications, office space, etc.) and given an

estimated dollar value in IGF budgets (3) that some core operational expenditure, e.g. the salary of the Executive Coordinator be funded through the UN.

- Consider enhancing financial support to host countries.

Broad agreements

A. Broad agreement that among the resources supporting IGF to date including substantial contributions from host countries throughout the hosting of the global IGF should be recognized and acknowledged. Including significant in kind voluntary efforts contributing to the planning and organizing process, including hosting remote hubs and remote participation services, audio visual and ICT requirements as per the host country agreements.

B. Broad agreement that more resources are needed to support the existing functions of the IGF Secretariat, and that furthermore, additional financial resources are needed to enhance the participation of stakeholders from developing and least developed countries throughout the IGF processes.

C. Broad agreement on supporting the continuation of the present funding model, [with a voluntary, stable funding mechanism for the primary support to the Secretariat itself.]

D. Broad agreement to enhance the resource mobilization activities, timely reporting and information sharing on the implementation of the project document and on the use of funds to donors annually and at the end of every project cycle. (Finland's proposal)

E. Broad agreement that resources supporting the IGF to date includes substantial contributions from host countries for the organization and hosting of the global IGF including significant in kind voluntary efforts contributing to the planning and organizing process, including hosting remote hubs and remote participation services, audio visual and ICT requirements as per the host country agreements together with substantial support from voluntary contributions should be recognized and encouraged for future IGFs.

F. Broad agreement to report at least annually to the whole IGF community. The report should cover the full budget and expenses associated with the IGF and its activities, in broad budget items including not only those associated with the IGF Trust Fund, but also those associated with other contributions, in cash or in kind. It should also take into account information provided on a voluntary basis by host countries and in kind contributions by the UN associated with the IGF.

G. Broad agreement that in order to broaden and increase awareness/ transparency of the Trust Fund itself, the following changes are recommended:

- An official announcement, via the Web site and other suitable mechanisms, should be made by the IGF Secretariat to initiate the fund raising process, with a description of the IGF and its activities that will be supported by contributions.

o The announcement should include the description of the donor's fund process (how to contribute, who else contributes, etc.).

o Hold an open meeting with remote participation, where any interested party can attend, hear briefing/presentation, and make pledges to contribute to the donor's fund, and publish the meeting report from the public, open meeting regarding outreach on the donor's fund.

- [Hold an annual status update at the time of the MAG and of IGF consultations that would be open to observers to describe donor's fund, purpose, what funds are used for and receive comments.]

- In addition, publish a meeting report of any formal donors' meetings on the IGF website (include attendees, topics discussed)

H. [Broad agreement on the need to explore additional direct financial support from the UN budget be undertaken.]

[I. Greece has asked for annual budget to be discussed at MAG meeting:
Broad agreement to discuss the annual budget of the IGF at a MAG meeting.]

[J. Broad agreement that an IGF finance committee be established drawing on the MAG membership, relevant people from within UNDESA and the IGF donor community.]

K. With a view to ensuring the necessary funding [basis] [for the improved operation of] for the IGF activities [and in particular its secretariat], explore the possibility of enlarging voluntary contributions from all sources, [particularly from developed countries], and asking for pluriannual commitments from donors who can make them in order to improve stability and predictability of funding.

L. [Broad agreement that creative mechanisms for ensuring predictable funding for the IGF be sought on an ongoing basis. For the above purpose, also specifically seek additional regular voluntary contributions by entities involved in Internet management, with long term pluriannual commitments, as a sustained basis of funding for the IGF.]

M. With a view to ensuring the necessary funding for the IGF, explore the possibility of enlarging voluntary contributions from all sources, including those that can be contributed, on a voluntary basis, by entities involved in Internet management, and asking for pluriannual commitments from donors who can make them in order to improve stability and predictability of funding.

N. Ensure that all stakeholders are able to easily donate to the IGF through mechanisms most suitable to them including multiyear donor program, small donations in kind support, etc.

O. With a view to ensuring sufficient, appropriate, stable and predictable funding for the IGF, explore the possibility, on a voluntary basis, of accessing funds collected, directly or indirectly, from relevant - stakeholders as a long term contribution to the IGF budget and through mutually agreed mechanisms according to each entity rules and procedures.

P. [A further possible creative mechanism could be for the IGF to introduce a voluntary registration fee for participants in the annual event. Income from such a registration fee could, for example, be used to build a fund that can support participation from speakers and moderators from developing countries.]

Q. [IGF stakeholders should be encouraged to come up with creative mechanisms to mobilise alternative funds that can be used to enhance participation from LDCs and developing countries including speakers and moderators. [[and other attendees.]]

R. Broad agreement that:

- 1. Information on the budget and expenses will be made available to the IGF open consultations annually.**
- 2. As consistent with open consultation, views and comments may be provided.**
- 3. The MAG may incorporate these discussions in its work and summary report.**

S. Broad agreement to acknowledge and appreciate that resources supporting the IGF to date include substantial financial and in kind contributions from host countries and all other contributors.

T. Broad agreement that outreach is essential to attract potential donors.

U. Broad agreement to ensure the continuity, stability, [effective] leadership, and staff. not to leave posts vacant

Accepted proposal concerning structure

Funding:

Recognizing the importance of increasing voluntary funding to the continued successful operation of the IGF.

There is broad agreement that stability, continuity and effectiveness of the IGF leadership and staff has a positive impact on the IGF's capability to raise funds.

There's an important relationship between increasing voluntary funding and implementation of other recommendation of the Working Group.

The Working Group recognised key principles such as independent, unencumbered, stable and predictable, voluntary sources.

And on this basis, the Working Group recommends:

1. Encourage increased voluntary financial contributions.
- (Examples)
2. Improve voluntary funding process.
- (Examples)
3. Accountability, transparency.
- (Examples)
4. Acknowledge host country's support and in kind support from other countries, organisations and the UN.
- (Examples)

Inputs from remote participants

MARILIA MACIEL:

My understanding is that we are here to recommend what is best for the IGF. Relying on more funding, stable funding, UN funding is better than just rely on voluntary funding. More is better than less, that is a fact. If the UN cannot fund the IGF, the burden to state that should be UN's, and they have the chance to deny this request in several committees, including the financial committee. But we, as WG members, should not be in the position to deprive IGF of options based on our own partially informed evaluation of feasibility. Let us try to seek for this option and make them reply to us formally. Paralely, of course, donations are and will be the main source of IGF funding.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN:

I think we should first establish if there is agreement on a hybrid model. Once we have established that we can discuss whether there is agreement on the nature of the model and how it operates. In-kind support combined with voluntary funding means that a hybrid model already operates. The question is, can we reach agreement on proposing that the UN commits to maintaining this support? And next, is there agreement on proposing that the UN also provides some financial support.

If there is some agreement that we would like to see the UN provide more than just in-kind support perhaps we can have a very general recommendation to that effect, referring the importance of the IGF being able to rely on some predictable funding to support some basic operations.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN:

In response to Iran. I think that some points made this morning can assist with facilitating voluntary funding. E.g. a clearly articulated plan of action and budget for the IGF. This plan of action should outline how the IGF contributes to building capacity, to development, to strengthening governance, and increasing multi-stakeholder participation in IG. These are all issues that donors are concerned with.

There can be a general document for IGF action planning, as well as a more detailed plan / programme document focused on the annual event. There is already a programme document that is produced after the open consultations. But it can be modified to be more suitable for consideration by potential funders.

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

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

Broad agreement on need to encourage the interaction [linkages] between IGF and relevant [Internet governance related] intergovernmental and international organizations [and countries, particularly developing countries.]

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 to encourage interaction between IGF and regional and national [entities] (particularly in developing countries) [in charge of] Internet governance issues.

Broad agreement on the need to encourage better communication and interaction between national, regional, and global IGFs, and to promote and enhance linkages to the national and regional IGF processes by consistent outreach from the secretariat to these processes and the MAG should ensure that the national and regional IGF initiatives have adequate opportunities to feed into the global IGF.

Broad agreement on enhancing interaction between the various Internet related organizations, technical and political intellectuals, think tanks and experts, in order to enrich the international dialogue and maintain an adequate level of sharing experience in a way that helps in setting the stage for further policy dialogue and policy coherence on global Internet governance.

Broad agreement on developing a defined outreach and communication strategy towards [specific groups].

Points of discussion :

- Public outreach by the wider community is the key to encourage other organizations to participate in the two-way communication street that is the IGF.
- Need to make IGF known to the outside world, marketing, outreach.
- IGF's role to encourage all stakeholders to come to the IGF and participate in the discussions, organization with widest variety of stakeholders involved in these discussions.
- Communication materials and activities need to be thoughtful and sustainable.
- From an early stage, prepare a set of policy questions around which the IGF should organize itself. And sent to regular stakeholders to have their views and perspectives.
- How to encourage greater involvement and participation within the IGF, not the opposite.
- Links should be more substantial and should not be restricted to giving and seeking information. For this purpose, outcome documents are crucial.
- Different relationships to consider:
 - The IGF/regional and national IGFs
 - IGF/UN organizations (WIPO and Human Rights Council for example)
 - Processes not directly linked to the UN, such as Council of Europe, ICANN and OECD

- Empower Secretariat and the MAG to do outreach to invite organizations, to improve the systems the IGF has (Web site, messaging)
- The IGF Secretariat should actively reach out to and inform other relevant bodies of the IGF and the MAG should actively reach out to their respective stakeholder groups to encourage broader participation in the IGF.
- IGF Secretariat should process reports of other institutions and organizations in the database
- Explore all possible ways to obtain data on Internet governance issues.
- IGF Secretariat should collect all relevant information through informal and formal collaboration and cooperation to maintain the database/ IGF Secretariat should maintain the database
- IGF Secretariat should be present in other bodies' meetings.
- The MAG could invite intergovernmental organizations to submit proposals for IGF workshops.
- The MAG and the Secretariat should reach out to countries, particularly developing countries.
- The MAG and Secretariat should do outreach with organizations based in Geneva;
- Important to have formal and informal linkages.
- Multiple forms of communication rather than just formal communication.
- The two-way role : ensure that the IGF is represented in other organizations and that other relevant organizations provide inputs into the IGF.
- Input from the IGF in the review of other organizations (ITU and UNESCO)
- To link the IGF with other bodies dealing with Internet governance issues. Awareness raising measures on the IGF.
- Organizations should appoint rapporteurs or others
- Linking the IGF to the CSTD
- Space in the CSTD meeting for presentation on previous IGF and main items of discussion better connection between IGF and CSTD
- Presentations of information reports to CSTD meetings
- When we mention that we should link the IGF to other bodies we are not just referring to the sharing of information and seeking information as some have pointed out. And it is more than marketing the IGF or making it known to a broader audience. The report of the SG talks about the need to link the IGF to policy dialogue. Therefore, we can assume that the discussions in the IGF are supposed to be a part and have an impact on this policy dialogue.
- Promote and enhance linkages to the national and regional IGF processes by consistent outreach from the secretariat to these processes and by ensuring that the national and regional IGF initiatives have adequate opportunities to feed in to the global IGF.
- There is a merit in examining the possibility of reinforcing cooperation between the various Internet related organizations, technical and political intellectuals, think tanks and experts, in order to enrich the international dialogue and maintain an adequate level of sharing experience in a way that helps in setting the stage for further evolution of the group Internet governance architecture and policy coherence.

Text for the Linking Issue by Egypt:

- There is a merit in examining the possibility of fostering cooperation between the various internet related organizations, technical & political intellectuals, think tanks and experts in order to enrich the international dialogue and maintain an adequate level of sharing experiences on the high level end. Such a cooperation might set the stage for further evolution of **a global Internet governance architecture and policy coherence**.
- While doing that, the international management of the Internet should remain multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full participation of all stakeholders. It should also ensure an equitable distribution of resources, facilitate access for all and maintain a stable and secure functioning of the Internet, taking into account diversity, access, openness, security, critical internet resources, privacy and developmental aspects.
- The level of policy dialogue during the previous five years on issues pertaining to internet governance and related policy aspects have witnessed substantial amount of maturity. Nevertheless, there seems to be a rising need of tackling the question of how to link the constituencies of the Internet governance to one another.
- There are some actions that could help linking IGF to other related processes, mechanisms, bodies, such as enhancing the website and sharing the best practices through it; improving remote participation; packaging information including outcome documents such as the Chariman report, workshop and main session reports in addition to other suggested outcomes recommended in item A ‘Shaping the outcomes of the IGF’; and finally encouraging the secretariat and MAG to continue to report on IGF activities at other meetings and foras.
- In addition, an official invitation issued by the UN Secretary-General on paper and circulated among the diplomatic missions in New York and Geneva is essential if we are serious about including substantial numbers of participants from developing countries.
- In order to maintain high-level representation at IGF events, similar invitations should be issued by host countries, not only to governments but to prominent figures from the private sector, civil society, the technological community and other stakeholders, ensuring that they are provided a clear agenda and an opportunity to participate and express their views.
- While the agendas provided for IGF events have always covered the broad issues to be addressed, we believe that more comprehensive agendas, distributed well in advance, would boost participation and involvement.
- Such agendas should include the following:
 - The overall theme of the event
 - Newly proposed themes
 - A breakdown of the topics that will be discussed under each theme
 - Emerging issues
 - Details of exhibitors

- Details of how to submit proposals for workshops

REMOTE PARTICIPANT STATEMENTS

Regardless of feasibility of public funding, I would like to support Parminder's request for a formal written explanation about on what grounds UN DESA is arguing that the IGF is not part of the UN. I think we should be crystal clear on the understanding of this, as it impacts the IGF in the future. We are always being told to abide by UN rules, even of matters that are dear to us and that maybe the IGF community would have a different view on how to proceed. I remember clearly that when was there was a launch of the book about freedom of expression, UN authorities showed up to forbid one advertisement that mentioned the name of a country, for instance. I mention this because it is a public, well-known fact. That seemed pretty awkward to us, but I think that people accepted, on the understanding that we had a two-way street relation with UN. I am thinking that maybe this relation with UN is asymmetrical and that our responsibilities are not consistent with the support we have received.

I support a mixed model of funding. I think that making the IGF responsible for raising its own funds can encourage a result-oriented approach to IGF management an implementation. However, for the IGF to have the capacity to raise the necessary resources it needs core capacity. I would like a model whereby the SG's office provides (1) in-kind support as mentioned by the US (2) that this in-kind support is stated clearly (e.g. communications, office space, etc.) and given an estimated dollar value in IGF budgets (3) that some core operational expenditure, e.g. the salary of the Executive Coordinator be funded through the UN. Ideally a 35% UN 65% voluntary funds in m view would give the IGF the financial sustainability it needs. It would also demonstrate UN ownership ad commitment without compromising the independence of the IGF. Overall I would like to see the IGF adopt a process of strategic management that involves annual action plans and budgets towards which donors and the UN contributes, with all information about these contributions published and made available to the IGF community on a regular basis.

MARILIA MACIEL:

My understanding is that we are here to recommend what is best for the IGF. Relying on more funding, stable funding, UN funding is better than just rely on voluntary funding. More is better than less, that is a fact. If the UN cannot fund the IGF, the burden to state that should be UN's, and they have the chance to deny this request in several committees, including the financial committee. But we, as WG members, should not be in the position to deprive IGF of options based on our own partially informed evaluation of feasibility. Let us try to seek for this option and make them reply to us formally. Paralely, of course, donations are and will be the main source of IGF funding.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN:

I think we should first establish if there is agreement on a hybrid model. Once we have established that we can discuss whether there is agreement on the nature of the model and how it operates. In-kind support combined with voluntary funding means that a hybrid model already operates. The question is, can we reach agreement on proposing that the UN commits to maintaining this support? And next, is there agreement on proposing that the UN also provides some financial support.

If there is some agreement that we would like to see the UN provide more than just in-kind support perhaps we can have a very general recommendation to that effect, referring the importance of the IGF being able to rely on some predictable funding to support some basic operations.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN:

In response to Iran.. I think that some points made this morning can assist with facilitating voluntary funding. E.g. a clearly articulated plan of action and budget for the IGF. This plan of action should outline how the IGF contributes to building capacity, to development, to strengthening governance, and increasing multi-stakeholder participation in IG. These are all issues that donors are concerned with.

There can be a general document for IGF action planning, as well as a more detailed plan / programme document focused on the annual event. There is already a programme document that is produced after the open consultations. But it can be modified to be more suitable for consideration by potential funders.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN:

The IGF should provide updated financial reports at MAG meetings and at open consultations. The IGF budget should be developed by the secretariat in consultation with the MAG. An annual report on IGF implementation that includes a consolidated financial report should be published and made publicly available

In the light of Marilyn's comments perhaps we can make a recommendation that an IGF finance committee be established drawing on the MAG membership, relevant people from within UNDESA and the IGF donor community.

MARILIA MACIEL:

The voluntary registration fee proposed by Anriette would be positive for potential individual donors who do not have the adequate means to make small amount contributions to the IGF right now. By making it voluntary, we would not be creating a barrier for participation. It is not just a matter of money, but also of symbolic "ownership" of the process that every individual helps to build. Just wanted to make sure that this interesting proposal does not get shaded by the first part of her paragraph. Thanks.