

**THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
FOR DEVELOPMENT**

15TH SESSION

**21–25 May 2012
Geneva**

Contribution by

**Center for Technology and Society
Fundação Getulio Vargas**

**Report of the CSTD Working Group on the improvements
to the Internet Governance Forum**

**Ms. Marilia Maciel
Project Leader and Researcher**

The views presented here are the contributor's and do not necessarily reflect the views and the position of the United Nations or the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Report of the CSTD Working Group on the improvements to the Internet Governance Forum

Marília Maciel
Center for Technology and Society - Brazil

First of all, I take the opportunity to thank Mr. Peter Major from Hungary and Mr. Kumar, from Sri Lanka, for wisely facilitating the work of the group. Without their experience and leadership I don't think it would have been possible to conclude such an extensive and complicated task. As you can imagine, the views of the group members were polarized on some important issues. But, since it was early decided that we would have a consensual report that would not go into micromanaging of the IGF, the report is a good picture of the possible consensus that could be reached among group members, and this was achievable thanks to the facilitation of our chairs.

Exactly because we decided to take a more general approach, this report should be seen as a starting of a cycle of improvements rather than as a conclusion of the task of improving the IGF. There are pertinent suggestions of actions, but now it is necessary to develop an implementation plan for the report, that defines clear responsibilities and timetables. MAG members can play an important role in developing this plan, and I think MAG should be seen as more than a program committee; it should be a driving force of implementation, and the Secretariat needs to ensure that MAG members are informed about this report and that they understand their responsibilities in implementing it, as part of their job description.

I believe it is also necessary to establish a procedure for a follow-up of the implementation, probably by creating opportunities to report back to CSTD sessions. One of the suggestions of the report is that IGF is given a space to share information at CSTD, and this could be an opportunity to also promote this follow-up. I also wonder if, by completing its task the WG therefore would cease to exist or if it could continue to assist CSTD, even if in a more informal basis, with follow-up. These are some issues that remain to be discussed and that I hope we can tackle today.

Besides these procedural aspects, I think that we should keep in mind, first and foremost, the importance of this report to participants of the IGF, and we should have participants in mind when interpreting this document, bearing in mind the suggestions in the document are broad: what interpretation would benefit IGF participants the most?

It is the positive impact of the report on the community that we should primarily seek to ensure. There are several proposals that aim to have such a direct positive impact, such as the ones related to participation. For instance:

- To provide support for participation of all stakeholder groups from developing countries and LDCs in the preparatory process, in order to give these actors equitable conditions to include their issues of interest and concern in the agenda of the meeting

- To provide financial support to their attendance in the IGF, and that this support is made transparent with regular reports provided by the IGF Secretariat on progress made
- To recognize Remote participation is an integral part of the IGF, to ensure availability of adequate financial and human resources for it and equal recognition and opportunity to participate to remote and onsite participants
- To produce more clear outcomes – to me is a key proposal of the report that is really about valuing the discussions that take place in the IGF, it is about making sure that the sessions that the community organized, usually based on public policy issues, are reflected on documents with clear policy options that can be offered as a contribution to pertinent organizations. This would certainly help to link the IGF to other global organizations, as mandated by the SG report, as well as to a future mechanism of EC, if and when one is created.

It is impossible to speak about implementation and responsibilities without mentioning funding. The issue of funding was one of the polarized topics in the group. Some of us believed that the IGF should receive voluntary funding, but that its core functions should be funded by the UN. The WG made a consultation to the UN about this possibility and we were told that this would not be feasible due to legal issues and to recent budget cuts. This response frustrated the discussion of other sources; there was no point to discuss this topic in depth in face of this response, and the IGF will continue to rely on voluntary funding to support it.

A considerable number of suggestions for improvement do not require additional funding but many of them do. That is why we need a collective effort from all stakeholder groups to raise funding for the IGF. The report suggests some funding raising actions, some measures for enhancing transparency and to facilitate the procedures for donations. And these are important measures.

But it is not only financial resources that needed. The ongoing political support of member states of the UN to the IGF is also very much needed, especially to resolve some urgent and pending issues. For more than one year IGF is lacking an Executive Coordinator and a Special Advisor. This has a very negative impact on the facilitation of political discussions in the IGF, on any possibility of long-time planning and on the ability to raise funding. Furthermore, it seems contradictory that the UN on the one hand, cannot fund the IGF, and on the other, on this particular aspect, is not sufficiently assisting to create conditions for self-financing. This is a serious problem and whatever the reason for this delay is, budgetary or other reasons, I hope that this issue is solved at the earliest time possible.

As final remarks I just would like to express my appreciation for the way that the discussions in WG took place, we engaged in a real dialogue both physically and through the mailing list, in a very open manner and it is my impression that stakeholder groups have all recognized the importance of the diversity of views that multistakeholder participation brought to the table.

Last but not least, I would also like to thank CSTD for their assistance and particularly for making remote participation available during the work of the WG. On more than one occasion, I was one of the remote participants in the meeting. It still

does not substitute physical participation, but it a very useful instrument to provide more inclusion and I hope we can see the increasing use of it in the UN.