

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

**15<sup>TH</sup> SESSION**

**21–25 May 2012  
Geneva**

**Contribution by**

**mCADE LLC**

**Comments on Panel on Improvements to the IGF**

**Ms. Marilyn Cade  
Principal and CEO**

**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**

**Marilyn Cade- Comments on Panel on Improvements to the  
IGF  
May 22, 2012  
Commission on Science and Technology for Development**

Thank you, Chair, and thanks to the distinguished delegates to CSTD, and Secretariat, and to all participants in the WG. The full list is in the report, of course, and speaks to the diversity of the participants who worked together since the WG was agreed .

It is also a pleasure to see so many countries represented here who have hosted an IGF, or have supported an IGF national or Regional Initiative. I was privileged to attend all 6 of the IGFs to date, hosted in Greece, Brazil, India, Egypt, Lithuania, in the first five year cycle. Kenya was the host of the first IGF in the second five-year renewal period, and I look forward to Baku, Azerbaijan in November this year, and to Indonesia for 2013.

Leading up to establishment of the WG, it is worth recalling that the assessment process and agreement about IGF improvements and even initial and preliminary assessment had been undertaken in the IGF community and by the MAG through a questionnaire/survey. And, the V.Chair of the CSTD, Switzerland, had undertaken consultations on this topic which enabled broad discussions. All of this pre work then supported the CSTD's considerations about establishing the WG.

Our outcome was successful. Even so, our work was challenging, and the importance of commitment of all participants to work collaboratively, and the stewardship of our two chairs – Switzerland and Hungary, and the vice Chair of the second phase of our work, Sri Lanka are appreciated.

While all are important, I will focus on only three of the categories of the Recommendations:

#### Enhancing Outputs:

It is certainly a fact that we all agree on the importance of further steps to document, and enhance what people who participate take away – in information; resources; and in knowledge. There has been a lot of discussion about the lack of decision making at the IGF, but I note that there strong evidence of the impact of the IGF at a national and local level. We all understand that through our shared interactions and information and opinion sharing, we do influence one another, and the influence of the IGF can be felt in many ways. I would mention that the openness of the IGF, the use of remote participation tools and mechanisms is already being felt in many other organizations.

However, I do want to be clear that we all wanted to see further outputs, and we struggled, but did find a phrasing which is broadly embraced – tangible outputs.

Will recall my discussions with some governments and small businesses that have noted the importance of effective documentations and documents.

We also agreed on improvements in visibility and availability of communications materials, and I am pleased to note that all embraced this. We face now the challenge to ensure adequate resources to advance all our improvements recommendations. I will speak to funding as a specific item due to its basic and fundamental role.

#### Participation: Deepening and broadening Participation:

I won't elaborate on the statistics of participation, but note that the Secretariat shared useful information that helped to guide and inform us. Even with good growth in participation from developing countries, we all endorse that this must be a priority.

Funding model is reliant upon the UN Trust Fund:  
Contributions of governments, business, and the technical community provide the basic budget today.

Enhancing the available funding, in particular to enable participation for people, from all stakeholders – from govts, CS, academia, technical, and small business – to attend consultations and the IGF itself was agreed as a priority.

Creative solutions were considered to augment the core budget approach of the UN Donors Fund mechanism. You will take note that we were specific in noting that the IGF itself, and the Secretariat and special advisor roles will be important to help to advance understanding of the funding process and how to participate.

Today, I am a donor, in my small way, as a micro enterprise, and so are a number of others. I am confident of our ability to ensure the operating funds to ensure a successful IGF in 2012.

We also added an enhancement that was always done in practice, but the WG wanted to formalize the acknowledgement of the Host Country, as well as such elements as in kind verifiable support.

Linking the IGF to other IG related entities:  
We followed the guidance of the Tunis Agenda in much of our considerations, including recognizing that the IGF extend its

communication with other IG related entities engaged in the global policy dialogue.

The IGF Secretariat carries the responsibility for the day to day operational functioning of the IGF.

RELATIONSHIP WITH CSTD: THE WG was strongly supportive of the relationship of the IGF to the CSTD and called for strengthening such linkages. Thus, I am very appreciative of the growing interest and awareness of all delegates of the IGF and its role and contribution to advancing the Tunis Agenda

National and Regional IGFs are a particular interest of mine, as an individual member of the WG. [intgovforum.org]

Here I note that many CSTD member states have organized or are helping to collaborate in a national or regional IGF Initiative – I note Tanzania, Uganda, Russia, Finland, US, Switzerland, Brazil, Cameroon, Nigeria, Ghana, Sweden, Japan, ... and more. These initiatives are focused on national priorities and on helping to prepare for the IGF. Many are now acting as a remote hub for the IGF, convening not once for their own initiative, but then offering a linkage and hosting to a remote participation cite to the IGF. An excellent example of an outcome that is growing.

In 2010, we had a number of such initiatives, but in 2011 – 11 regional IGF initiatives and 17 IGF Initiatives.

Improving and strengthening the IGF was the agreed objective in our discussion, and although there some differences in HOW to accomplish this, there was not a difference in the interest in supporting the IGF. And thus, I believe that the CSTD can be

actually quite pleased and supportive of this approach it has taken to deal with what was a challenging set of discussions.

Undoubtedly the spirit and attitudes of this Commission were part of the ingredients that led to the success of the WG.

Marilyn Cade