

**Response by the Internet technical and academic community
representatives to the CSTD Working Group on improvements to the IGF
to
The questionnaire drafted by the Working Group in Montreux,
Switzerland, 25-26 February 2011**

- 14 March 2011 -

Introduction

The Internet technical and academic community representatives to the UN CSTD Working Group on improvements to the IGF welcome the opportunity to respond to the issues for discussion agreed to by the Working Group at their first meeting in Montreux, Switzerland, 25-26 February 2011 and subsequently distributed by the CSTD Secretariat as a questionnaire on 1 March 2011.

We also recommend consulting any available documentation that would give an accurate overview of past experience of the IGF and the IGF Secretariat's working methodology (for example, the report sent to donors by the IGF Secretariat). In conjunction with any proposal for improvements, efforts should also be made to identify best practices used in other organizations and institutions that could be emulated in the IGF. Finally, we believe any discussion on improvements should be systematically coupled with a budgetary analysis and a feasibility study.

1 Review of IGF vis-à-vis Tunis Agenda¹ – paragraphs 72 to 80

The Tunis Agenda specified that the IGF:

“in its working and function, will be multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent”.²

The Tunis Agenda further specified that the IGF would:

“(f)acilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body”.³

It was also convened in such a way that:

“The IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process. It would have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet”.⁴

¹ Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (WSIS-05/TUNIS/DOC/6(Rev. 1)-E), 2005, <http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/6rev1.html>

² Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 73

³ Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72.b

⁴ Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 77

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

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

Paragraph 72	Examples of how the IGF has met the specific mandate
<p>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.</p>	<p>Public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance have been a key theme of IGF main sessions and workshops since its first meeting in 2006.</p> <p>These discussions have fostered the identified elements in the development of the Internet, as individual participants return to their home organizations and put into practice what they have learned in an incremental way.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Issues that do not fall into the scope of any existing bodies have been discussed at IGF. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cloud computing, with its associated cross-cutting public policy issues related to security and privacy • The stability of the Internet. In particular, the ISOC-EC-Lithuanian workshop in 2010 on threats to the stability of the Internet⁵ brought together representatives of the Internet technical community—including RIRs and content providers (Google)—government officials, regulators, etc., to discuss this topic of vital concern. A typology of problem types was identified, as well as areas for future work. • Child online protection. At a number of IGFs, there have been main sessions and workshops that have enabled a sharing of experiences and best practices and measures taken in different countries. • Social networks. The complex interaction of policy issues pertaining to privacy, data sharing, retention and security.
<p>c. Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.</p>	<p>Intergovernmental and other organizations can and frequently do interface with the IGF by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating in the IG preparatory processes (through written submissions, at face-to-face Open Consultations, or through remote participation options at Open Consultations). • Organizing workshops in areas of their expertise at the IGF. • Producing reports for their members on their activities and analysis of discussions at the IGF.

⁵ IGF Workshop 28 Report: Priorities For The Long-Term Stability of The Internet, 2010, http://www.isoc.org/pubpolpillar/docs/20101007_igf-workshop.pdf

Paragraph 72	Examples of how the IGF has met the specific mandate
	<p>Perhaps there could be greater efforts by the IGF MAG and Secretariat to disseminate invitations to participate in the IGF to appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The IGF has been able to facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and make full use of experts through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of open calls for workshops, which facilitates workshop proposals from the academic, scientific and technical communities. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Every year since 2007, the ccTLDs, through CENTR, have coordinated a workshop where the main topic is to share information on ccTLD best practices. ○ Root server operators have also held regular workshops to exchange best practices in DNS operations. • Encouraging multistakeholder representation in all main sessions and workshops • The organic bottom-up development of Dynamic Coalitions • Engaging stakeholders from these communities (for example, ICANN, RIRs, ISOC, etc) in providing financial and in-kind support of the IGF to facilitate the attendance of relevant experts. <p>It is clear that the technical community, as the main producer of technical and operational Internet expertise, is one of the most active contributors to the IGF process.</p>
<p>e. Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.</p>	<p>Access has been one of the main themes in all IGF meetings with main sessions and workshops held to discuss, in particular, issues pertaining to availability and affordability of Internet access in developing countries. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been workshops on Internet exchange points (IXPs) almost every year. • Discussions on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) at IGFs⁶ have contributed to the implementation of IDNs in several countries around the world. • There have been workshops on the advantages of open standards and open source software with a focus on accessibility, affordability, and inclusiveness.⁷ • The APC, with the business and technical community, has also conducted a workshop to identify a possible new approach to development.⁸

⁶ For example, “Arabic Script IDNs: Challenges and Solutions”, IGF 2009, <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/chronocontact/?chronoforname=Workshopsreports2009View&curr=1&wr=90>

Paragraph 72	Examples of how the IGF has met the specific mandate
<p>f. Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries.</p>	<p>Open Forums The IGF holds Open Forums, which allow existing Internet governance mechanisms to strengthen and engage new stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, in their processes. At IGF 2010, there were the following Open Forums:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arab ICT Organization • Council of Europe • ICANN • ICC (International Chamber of Commerce) • OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe) • UNESCO <p>Diverse approaches to engaging stakeholders Fellowships and support from DiploFoundation, ISOC ambassadors, remote hubs, and youth-focussed activities are all way in which stakeholders who support the IGF have assisted in bringing new stakeholders into the process.</p> <p>IGF Village In addition, the IGF Village, a collection of stands highlighting Internet related activities and organizations, has also been a more informal way of engaging IGF participants in the activities of related Internet governance organizations.</p> <p>Regional and national IGFs As was pointed out many times at the first CSTD WG on improvements to the IGF, regional and national IGFs have been an invaluable way to engage new stakeholders in Internet governance mechanisms. In many cases, regional IGFs have spun off national IGFs: this is a clear case demonstrating the success of enhancing stakeholder engagement in Internet governance processes at many levels.</p>
<p>g. Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.</p>	<p>Each IGF holds a main session on emerging issues. Emerging issues identified in the past include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cloud computing (IGF 2010) • Impact of social networks (IGF 2009) • Web 2.0 (IGF 2007) <p>There is also the opportunity for workshops to discuss</p>

⁷ For example, “Open Content and Open Licensing in the Arab World: Opportunities and Challenges Facing their Use and Applicability”, IGF 2009, <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/chronocontact/?chronoforname=Workshopsreports2009View&curr=1&wr=103>

⁸ “Reaching the Next Billion(s)”, IGF 2008, http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/workshops_08/main_access.htm

Paragraph 72	Examples of how the IGF has met the specific mandate
	<p>emerging issues, with many workshops focusing on the above emerging issues. An example of this discourse between different bodies in a workshop setting was the ISOC-EC-Lithuanian workshop in 2010 on threats to the stability of the Internet.⁹</p>
<p>h. Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.</p>	<p>At each IGF, there have been a number of main sessions and workshops aimed specifically at capacity building in developing countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assist building capacity with regard to the overall IGF process, there is a Setting the Scene main session to begin each IGF • There are specific workshops conducted. For example, to name just two of the many capacity-building workshops at the most recent IGF in Vilnius: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Best practices as a way of building capacity - what has actually been done to solve specific problems ○ The Internet and FOSS: Applications and Challenges for Africa
<p>i. Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.</p>	<p>The IGF embodies the WSIS principles, so through its own activities promotes the use of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.</p> <p>The themes of the main sessions at the IGF are also an embodiment of the WSIS principles. In addition, the IGF has included a number of community-organized workshops that examine and encourage the use of WSIS principles. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing the WSIS Principles: A Development Agenda for Internet Governance • Code of good practice on participation, access to information and transparency in Internet governance, Version 1.0
<p>j. Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.</p>	<p>Since the first IGF in Athens, critical Internet resources have been discussed as part of the main sessions as well as in workshops. This has included management of IP addresses, domain names, IDNs, and root servers, etc.</p>
<p>k. Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.</p>	<p>Since its inception, the IGF has included a number of workshops on issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet that are of particular interest to everyday users, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child online protection

⁹ IGF Workshop 28 Report: Priorities For The Long-Term Stability of The Internet, 2010, http://www.isoc.org/pubpolpillar/docs/20101007_igf-workshop.pdf

Paragraph 72	Examples of how the IGF has met the specific mandate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats to the stability of the Internet • Freedom of speech on the Internet <p>To build on the foundation workshops have created in this area, perhaps the IGF could elevate such issues to main sessions perhaps a year or so after they appear in workshops. The “Emerging Issues” session could be used as the initial step into main session status.</p>
<p>1. Publish its proceedings.</p>	<p>Over time, the IGF has refined its publication of proceedings to the point where it now publishes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair’s summary • Transcripts of main sessions and workshops • Video archives of main sessions and workshops • Reports from workshops and open forums • Annual book of proceedings <p>In addition, the preparatory proceedings for the IGF are also published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submissions to open consultation meetings • Summary of preparatory discussions (both open consultation and MAG meetings) • Transcripts of preparatory discussions (both open consultation and MAG meetings) • YouTube interviews with a range of IGF participants

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

- **Has effective working modalities and procedures** that are multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic, and transparent.¹⁰
- **Is a forum that does not negotiate decisions:**¹¹

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

- **Is supported by multistakeholder voluntary funding:**

As stated in Paragraph 78a of the Tunis Agenda, the IGF has drawn upon “any appropriate resources from all interested stakeholders”. As well as financial contributions, many stakeholders have contributed in-kind resources to the IGF. This voluntary funding and in-kind sponsorship acts as an effective feedback mechanism. Diverse funding from a cross-

¹⁰ Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 73

¹¹ Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 77

section of the multistakeholder participants who form the IGF community demonstrates that the IGF is of value to the wide spectrum of stakeholder groups.

- **Is led by an independent Secretariat¹² based in Geneva where the Internet policy networks and the history of the WSIS lie:**

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

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

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

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

¹² Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 78.b

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

2.1 The IGF is already having a positive impact on Internet governance globally

The IGF has succeeded in providing a space for all stakeholders to address a broad range of topics related to Internet governance. Discussions at the IGF have become more mature over time, and those who have been involved in the process since the beginning would recognize such development. The IGF has led to **greater understanding and consensus on challenging Internet governance policy issues**. Without the IGF, there is no such open space for discussion of the full range of current and emerging Internet issues among all relevant stakeholders.

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

The IGF has also succeeded in **expanding the participation of government representatives and other stakeholders from all regions**.¹³ This expanding participation is also exemplified by the interest in national and regional IGFs, which are continuing to be added to the annual broader Internet governance calendar of meetings.¹⁴

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

2.2 Proposals for improvements

The Tunis Agenda clearly specified the IGF to be a forum for multistakeholder policy¹⁵ dialogue, not a policy-making forum. As such, one of its primary aims is to facilitate information sharing among all stakeholders. **The following concrete proposals could improve this information sharing:**

1. The outcomes of the IGF should be packaged in a useful way for all stakeholders to take home (see response to section 4.)

¹³ See:

- “Attendance Breakdown by Region and Stakeholder Group of the IGF Rio de Janeiro Meeting”, 2007 http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/rio_stats.htm
- “Vilnius Meeting Participation Figures”, 2010, <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/2010/Stats.2010.pdf>

¹⁴ See “IGF Regional and National Links”, <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/regional-and-national-igfs>

¹⁵ Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 67

2. During the year, funding permitting, more efforts should be made to reach out to governments, international organizations, and other stakeholders who would benefit from briefings on the outcomes of the IGF.
3. The national and regional IGFs, while not part of the formal mandate of the Tunis Agenda, could more consciously build in opportunities to share information and best practices from the IGF into their programs.

3 How to enhance the contribution of IGF to socio-economic development and towards IADGs including enhancing participation of developing countries

3.1 Millennium Development Goals

In September 2010, the UN Summit on the **Millennium Development Goals** concluded with the adoption of a global action plan to achieve the eight anti-poverty goals by their 2015 target date and the announcement of major new commitments for women's and children's health and other initiatives against poverty, hunger, and disease.¹⁶

Paragraph 20 of the Millennium Declaration¹⁷ (referred to by Paragraph 10 of the Tunis Agenda) explicitly recognizes the importance of information and communication technologies and public private partnerships to reach the Millennium Developments Goals. In this regard, **participation in the Internet Governance Forum, which has made Access and Openness key topics of discussion in its meetings, becomes critical, especially for developing countries.**

3.2 Participation of developing countries

We would like to emphasize the importance of expanding the participation of developing countries in the IGF preparatory process and in the Forum itself. Through the Trust Fund, the donors have financed the participation of many MAG members in the preparatory meeting and the annual IGF meeting.¹⁸ In addition, **many organizations and governments have continuously sponsored the participation of individuals** from all continents in the IGF. For example:

- Canada has demonstrated a remarkable commitment in this regard.¹⁹
- The DiploFoundation, through its own efforts and in collaboration with governmental and intergovernmental agencies, and the Internet Society (ISOC IGF Ambassadors program²⁰) have helped several dozens of individuals to participate in the IGF, year after year.
- Similarly, dotAsia and Nominet have sponsored the participation of young people.²¹

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

Encouraging participation does not need to be limited to physical attendance at the IGF. For example, in Latin America there is a Regional Preparatory Meeting for the IGF where local and regional concerns are addressed in the three main languages of the region growing from 40 in its first meeting to almost 200 participants from a variety of stakeholder groups in its latest meeting.

¹⁶ “UN Summit on the Millennium Development Goals”, 2010, <http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010>

¹⁷ “55/2. United Nations Millennium Declaration”, 2000, <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>

¹⁸ “Funding”, <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/funding>

¹⁹ See page 2 of “Government of Canada Submission to the Open Consultation on Enhanced Cooperation and International Public Policy Issues Pertaining to the Internet”, 2010, <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan043211.pdf>

²⁰ “IGF Ambassadors Program”, <http://www.isoc.org/pubpolpillar/igfambassadors>

²¹ See:

- “NetMission.Asia 2.0”, <http://www.netmission.asia/2010>
- “Childnet International”, <http://www.ntkc.org.uk/ntkc-search/grant/481>

Statistics²² regarding participation in the IGF are encouraging and show that these efforts have paid off:

- The overall attendance during IGF meetings, 2007 to 2009, has been, on average, 1300 participants.
- The number of countries that have participated in the IGF meetings increased during the years 2007 to 2009.²³
- Since 2007, there has been a positive trend concerning participation of stakeholders from developing and less developed regions, as well as a growing balance between different categories of stakeholders (civil society, business, governments, parliamentary, Internet technical and academic communities, media and intergovernmental organizations).

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

3.3 Improving all mechanisms for IGF participation by all stakeholders

We believe that participation mechanisms for all stakeholders, not only those from developing countries, can still be greatly improved. This includes mechanisms to facilitate both on-site (for example, via fellowships) and remote (for example, remote hubs, webcasts, etc) participation.

Participation to the IGF is a collective responsibility and all stakeholders should commit to providing resources to assist improve participation mechanisms. As noted in section 3.2 above, one way this could be achieved is a fellowship program funded by multiple stakeholders and managed by the IGF Secretariat. It is important to not only get a greater balance between participants from developed and developing countries, but also continuously work towards improving gender balance, geographical diversity, and full participation from all stakeholder groups.

3.4 Ensuring the IGF continues to be held in a different region each year

Convening the IGF meetings in various locations around the world, in particular, developing countries, makes it more accessible to local IGF participants who are not able to travel far for the IGF meetings.

²² See page 2 and 3 of “The Importance of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)”, http://www.isoc.org/isoc/conferences/wsis/docs/igf_20101021_en.pdf

²³ See:

- “Attendance Breakdown by Region and Stakeholder Group of the IGF Rio de Janeiro Meeting”, 2007
http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/rio_stats.htm
- “Attendance Breakdown of the Hyderabad Meeting”, 2008,
<http://igf.wgig.org/cms/index.php/component/content/article/42-igf-meetings/414-attendance-breakdown-of-the-hyderabad-meeting>
- “IGF Sharm El Sheikh Attendance Statistics”, 2009,
<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/content/article/87-programme/484-igf-sharm-el-sheikh-attendance-statistics>

4 Shaping the outcome of IGF meetings

4.1 Shaping outcomes within the mandate of the Tunis Agenda

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

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

This characteristic has been key in encouraging participants to engage willingly in discussions, and exchange views with others without having to negotiate positions, as would be the case if resolutions were to be adopted. The IGF is successful precisely because the focus is on **sharing knowledge and perspectives, the free flow of ideas, debate, listening, and learning** from one another’s experiences. Moving away from these principles and turning the IGF into a decision-making body would not only disregard the consensus reached in the Tunis Agenda by creating duplication of efforts and existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations, but it would shift the focus to a more closed state (for example, the pedantic creation of documents), instead of open exchange and discussion.

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

4.2 Proposals for improvements

As noted in section 1 above, the IGF already publishes a wide variety of its outcomes as mandated by the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72.1. However, **it is fundamental for the continued success of the IGF to maintain continuous improvement on the shape of its outcomes** to ensure that it adapts to the changing needs of all participants as the Internet governance dialogue progresses. And it seems that one of the critical underlying issues in this case, is to integrate further the regional and national threads in the working process, and therefore in the outcomes. We would like to propose practical solutions to make progress on this front:

1. It is vital to **make the resources of the IGF available as widely as possible**. Where resources permit, the website should be improved to transform the extensive material produced by those within the IGF community into a valuable resource available to anyone interested in the issues discussed within the IGF. Any efforts to synthesize messages coming out of the IGF need to respect the full diversity of views within the IGF community.
2. Improve the **structure of the outcomes of the international IGF itself**. For example: fed by local input, the workshops could be structured in a way that would emphasize their linkages, producing usefully packaged information. This information could cover, for each issue, a summary of the state of the debate, the principles used by all stakeholders facing these issues, and include, where possible, an identification of possible new approaches to these issues. This coordinated and informational outcome would provide each participant with a set of valuable tools to take home.

3. The IGF website should utilize web tools that make its information searchable and easy to be reached. Such web tools can also provide an interactive environment for the public to provide input and comments, and engage in discussions online.
4. The IGF could find ways to define and document how the IGF is progressing in the fulfillment of its mandate, as defined in the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72.
5. The IGF website currently publishes the national and regional IGF reports, but they could be given a higher visibility on the IGF website. In addition, these valuable resources should be archived, and be widely used to feed the international process.
6. There have also been very positive individual initiatives in the past to capture some of the key messages and different views at the IGF in an accessible way, such as the video project “Imagining the Internet”.²⁴ The Secretariat could not only encourage such initiatives, but also link to them in an effective way through the IGF website.

²⁴ “Imagining the Internet”, <http://www.imaginingtheinternet.org>

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

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

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

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

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

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

As noted in our responses in section 1—how the IGF has met its mandate, in particular, according to the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 72f—and section 2—how the IGF links into the broader dialogue on global Internet governance—it is clear that the **IGF has succeeded in building linkages with other Internet bodies.** Internet governance sessions have become a standard agenda item in other Internet meetings, such as ICANN and RIR meetings, and many of the participants in those meetings are also active participants in the IGF.

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

Please see response to section 3.

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

7.1 and 7.2. Current modalities: open consultation, MAG, and IGF Secretariat

We believe that the working methods of the IGF have been successful due to its unique, **multistakeholder approach**. The components established to support the working methods of the IGF include: **the Secretariat; the MAG; open consultations**; and the **IGF event** itself.

We believe that:

1. The Secretariat should be an **independent body, based in Geneva** to ensure the continued trust by all stakeholders in the IGF. The Secretariat should continue as a lightweight administrative body that supports the implementation of the IGF program of activities developed through both open consultations and MAG consultations, consistent with their recommendations and taking into account the mandate of the Tunis Agenda²⁵ and the particular interests of the host countries, where applicable.
2. The MAG's current working methods are effective due to the MAG's **composition, comprising representatives from all stakeholder groups**, including the technical community, which ensures full representation of all parties in the process. We welcome the recent change by the MAG to make their meetings open to observers, thereby increasing transparency in the process. We believe this shows that there is increased trust among participants in the IGF, a welcoming sign of the maturity of the process.

We support the continuation of the MAG and its multistakeholder composition. We also support the continuous efforts made to further increase gender balance, geographical diversity and balanced representation from both developed and developing countries in the MAG. We believe the selection process of the MAG members should continue to allow each stakeholder group to define its appropriate nomination method, leaving the Secretariat to ensure wider representation based on the stakeholder nominations. In its summary report of 23 November 2010,²⁶ the MAG discussed the selection process of its members and made recommendations to enhance this process. We support the recommendations put forward by the MAG, specifically:

- a) A third of the MAG members be rotated every year.
- b) A de facto three-year limit to each member's term.

²⁵ In particular, Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 73b, "Have a lightweight and decentralized structure that would be subject to periodic review".

²⁶ "Multistakeholder Advisory Group Meeting: Summary Report", 2010, <http://intgovforum.org/cms/2010/MAG.Summary.23.11.2010.pdf>

- c) Maintaining the private sector, civil society and the technical community as separate stakeholder groups.
 - d) Recognition that all of the stakeholder groups are organized differently and based on different cultures and should therefore be allowed to develop their own specific selection procedures.
 - e) A form of ‘triage’ carried out by the Secretariat to ensure appropriate diversity and geographical balance among MAG members.
3. **Open consultations** should continue to be held as a way of further **enabling a wide cross section of stakeholders to contribute** to the IGF program development.

We strongly believe that the IGF event should continue to be **completely open to all participants**. **No accreditation or restriction** should be imposed on participation in the IGF meetings, and no special labels should be used by any specific group. Anyone participating in the meeting should not only be permitted, but be encouraged, to make their voices heard.

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

8 Format of the IGF meetings

8.1 Current meeting format

We believe **the current format of the IGF has been proven to work well**. The format of the IGF meetings held to date reflects the open, transparent, and **collaborative principles** under which the IGF was formed.

The IGF has been an **evolutionary process**, where meeting formats and themes have developed from year to year, improving in response to input from all stakeholders and evolving as the Internet, and Internet policy issues, have evolved.

The mixture of formal main sessions, more interactive workshops and reports from regional and national IGFs that has developed since the first IGF was held in 2006 has offered the wide range of stakeholders a broad range of ways to participate in the IGF. The format of past IGFs has been refined based on the input of stakeholders through the open consultation process, through the contributions of stakeholders interested in holding workshops and side sessions, and through MAG synthesis of those inputs. We strongly believe the IGF should **maintain this democratic, collaborative, and inclusive manner** of shaping its meetings from year to year.

8.2 Meeting format in the future

To ensure the IGF continues to be a relevant forum that benefits all participants, it is critical to **continue improving the format of the Forum on an iterative basis** and to further integrate the momentum regional and national IGFs have been able to create. This could be done by:

1. Looking explicitly at the IGF as a process rather than an annual event. In other words, participants in the IGF should be encouraged to engage in activities relevant to the IGF themes and use the annual IGF meeting as an opportunity to inform the rest of the community of what has been done. Not only will this approach enable the IGF to move beyond being a stand-alone event, but it will also strengthen collaboration among its participants, which is key for success in any Internet related effort. The expanding number of national and regional IGFs is already a step in this direction.
2. Shaping the structure of the IGF (its sessions and workshops) to integrate and reflect the work and the dynamism of the regional and national IGFs. In this regard, archiving tools for easy public access could be useful to keep track of the ongoing work in different regions, and leading to the national IGF.
3. Building further on the format of the last IGF meeting, where “feeder” workshops were scheduled before the relevant main sessions, could be further explored as a basis for future IGF meeting formats. Our experience at past IGF meetings has also shown that more interactive panel discussions that include active audience participation are a good way to engage participants in productive dialogue.
4. Find effective ways of limiting the number of workshops at the meetings, through clear criteria and good communication between the Secretariat and the MAG and workshop organizers. It should of course be done in a manner that does not restrict the openness and inclusiveness of the meeting.

5. Formats such as these were successful experiments in the “trial and error” evolution of the IGF format over the past five years. **It is important that this evolutionary model be allowed to continue, as it is the most flexible and innovative way that the IGF can continue to meet the needs of the evolving Internet governance ecosystem.** We strongly believe that **attempting to set a rigid format for the IGF meetings would restrict the open and inclusive nature of the IGF process.**
6. Continuing to develop and refine participation mechanisms, both on-site (such as fellowship programs) and remotely.

9 Financing the Forum (exploring further options for financing)

9.1 Review of the current situation

IGF funding comes from all stakeholders – from governments, business and nongovernmental organizations of all sizes – all of them with a strong confidence in the current IGF structure. **The diversity of funding sources is one key characteristic of the IGF funding structure: no one stakeholder can be said to exert significant influence based on their contribution.**

We strongly believe that the financing of the Forum should continue to be on a **voluntary basis and done in a transparent manner**. This ensures the **independence of the IGF structure** and it has proven to be a successful model for the IGF to date.

9.2 Options for ensuring predictability, transparency and accountability in financing IGF

The **continued commitment to the multistakeholder model** of the IGF is vital and this multistakeholder model has drawn the willingness by a wide range of stakeholders to provide funding to support the IGF process. In fact, the model has resulted in not only financial support for the IGF Secretariat, but also the hosting of national and regional IGFs.

While we believe that **more stakeholders should be encouraged to contribute funding to the IGF**, we also feel that the multistakeholder funding the IGF has enjoyed so far is a good measurement of its success. **As long as the IGF continues to consider all stakeholder groups as equal participants, stakeholder groups will continue to engage** including through voluntary financial and in-kind contributions to the IGF.

Simple ways for individuals or small organizations to make small donations to the IGF should also be set up. For legally incorporated organizations within the business, technical, and civil society stakeholder sectors, a formal process through which ongoing contributions can be made to the IGF would provide a measure of stability for IGF's financial security in the future.

If funding became available from the United Nations budget, it should be used exclusively to fund participation of stakeholders from developing countries, ensuring equity among all stakeholder groups.

In any case, a list of funders should be available to the public. Naturally, any funder who wishes their name to remain confidential should be able to keep their name off this funders' list.

Conclusion

The IGF has grown quickly in its first five years to become the pre-eminent—and perhaps only—place where all stakeholder groups can come together and, through an open and inclusive process, learn about and discuss public policy issues related to Internet governance. During the IGF’s first five-year mandate, it has evolved to achieve a level of stability in its structure, in its processes, and in its level of funding. It is also clear that the discussions within the IGF have matured and evolved, reflecting the increased level of trust that has grown between the different stakeholders over the years. But it must continue to improve.

This brief paper has described some of the IGF’s key areas of strength and identified several areas for improvement. Of all the issues raised in this paper, perhaps the most vital one is to continue to attract participants from all stakeholder groups in developing countries and from among under-represented groups.

We look forward to continuing to contribute to the work of the CSTD Chair’s Working Group on improvements to the IGF as full and active participants.

This document was written by the Internet technical and academic community representatives to the CSTD Working Group on improvements to the IGF²⁷:

Ms Constance Bommelaer
Senior Manager, Strategic Global Engagement
Internet Society
Email: bommelaer@isoc.org

Ms Samantha Dickinson
Internet Governance Specialist
APNIC
Email: sam@apnic.net

Mr Baher Esmat
Manager, Regional Relations – Middle East
ICANN
Email: baher.esmat@icann.org

Ms Nurani Nimpuno
Outreach & Communications Manager
Netnod
Email: nurani@netnod.se

Mr Oscar Robles-Garay
General Director for NIC México
LACNIC Board of Directors
Email: orobles@nic.mx

²⁷ First written contribution of the Internet technical and academic representatives to the CSTD Working Group on improvements to the IGF: “**Suggestions on the draft structure of the Report on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)**”: http://www.isoc.org/isoc/conferences/wsis/docs/cstd_20110131.pdf