



**Compilation of contributions made by members of the Commission on Science and Technology (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum circulated at its Third Meeting, Geneva, 31 October-02 November 2011**

**I. Contribution of the Technical and Academic communities: list of broad agreements on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum.**

**A. Shaping the outcomes of the IGF meetings**

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

**B. Working modalities including open consultations, MAG and Secretariat**

- Broad agreement on need to rotate MAG members regularly, keep MAG deliberations transparent
- Broad agreement to have the Secretariat remain independent and based in Geneva

**C. Funding of the IGF**

- Broad agreement that additional funding should be sought, that voluntary donations should be accepted and encouraged

**D. Participation - broadening**

- Broad agreement that the preparatory process needs to be made more visible, and for more stakeholders to participate in it
- Broad agreement on the need to reach out to new stakeholders.
- Broad agreement on need to enhance remote participation
- Broad agreement to increase participation of developing country participants in IGF, increase IG4D topics in IGF, continue to rotate location of IGF annually to enable different regions to have easy access to IGF

**E. Linking IGF to other related processes/mechanisms/bodies**

- Broad agreement on the need to encourage greater links between national, regional & global IG

**II. Specific contributions on broad agreements for each theme A, B, C, D, E**

**A. Shaping the outcomes of the IGF**

**Anriette Esterhuysen**

This proposal has been discussed by the civil society participants in the working group. It also addresses concern raised in IGF open consultations that main sessions are increasingly hard to organise.

- 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, round tables, open forums
- 3) With regard to main sessions, the IGF secretariat and MAG invites 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.
- 7) This report, focused on the main policy questions that were discussed, will not replace the chairman's summary or the proceedings of the IGF.
- 8) Invite global governance institutions to engage with the IGF on some of these questions, e.g. by convening forums, workshops, etc.



**Egypt<sup>1</sup> – drafted from the “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum”<sup>2</sup>**

1. Tunis Agenda – Paragraph 72: “We ask the UN Secretary-General, in an open and inclusive process, to convene, by the second quarter of 2006, a meeting of the new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue – called the Internet Governance Forum (IGF). The mandate of the Forum is to: “g. Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations”;
2. Recommendations conveyed to national governments;
3. Additionally, the compilation of messages from the various workshops and panel discussions could be helpful in materializing an informal output from the IGF;
4. IGF should present reports of its discussions to the General Assembly;
5. It would now be important for the IGF to place a greater emphasis on improving the visibility of the “outcomes” of the dialogue taking place at the IGF;
6. Outcomes sent to CSTD;
7. Policy advice and recommendations through outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options.

**India**

- IGF is not a policy making body, its contributions must come in the form of policy advice and recommendations on global Internet related policies.
- The documentation of the outcomes of the annual IGF should be enhance the current chairman's summary by including exclusive chapters on main session reports prepared by *rapporteurs*, and reports from workshops, best practices. Both converging and diverging points should be fully retained (represented) in the document while attempting to identify actionable points vis à vis internet management bodies/ governments/ other stakeholders.
- Dissemination of this document to member states / intergovernmental bodies/ Internet management bodies and all other stakeholders, with expected response from them to the action points if any.
- Extending the MAG's mandate from just being a program committee to be focused on outcomes of the IGF.
- Background papers for each key policy question.
- Engagement with processes of regional and national IGF
- Chose a few very clear policy question for each years IGF

**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

---

<sup>1</sup> The original input of Egypt concerning each theme A, B,C, D, E was presented in one big table. To facilitate the reading of the compilation which will serve as a working basis, the suggestions of Egypt have been classified under each relevant theme.

<sup>2</sup> The “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) can be found at Appendix II of the “Chairman's summary” of the Second Meeting at: [http://www.unctad.org/sections/un\\_cstd/docs//UN\\_WGIGF2011d07\\_summary\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/sections/un_cstd/docs//UN_WGIGF2011d07_summary_en.pdf)



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's communication strategy. A better use of the IGF website would be a first step in this direction. Clear information material would help also to engage stakeholders.

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.

#### **Sri Lanka's proposal to amend the last sentence of item 5 of Portugal's input (see above)**

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 [the CSTD with the presentation of a report on developments on IG at the CSTD Annual sessions based on the inputs from the IGF and providing feedback to the IGF for discussion at its next meeting](#) when drafting annual resolutions at the CSTD.

#### **Izumi Aizu**

We need to consider IGF as 4-year process (now that first year is ending), more of a continuum process, or cycles. In this regard, a self-review and improvement mechanism on a regular basis should be implemented into the work of IGF. In particular, we think the assessment of how the outcomes of IGF have been taken by relevant institutions, or how much impact has IGF actually made in specific areas after the given IGF will be very important. This assessment should then be fed to the preparatory process of the next IGF meeting.

### **B. Working modalities including open consultations, MAG and Secretariat**

#### **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:
  - Developing the detailed programme including the identification of issues of concern;
  - Selecting workshops and other meetings;
  - Defining how best to plan and organize the meetings;
  - Organizing main sessions and where necessary participate in dedicated thematic working groups;
  - Establishing linkages between workshops and main sessions;
  - Facilitating the organization of workshops;
  - Coordinating panels and supporting panellists, moderators and speakers at the annual meeting;
  - Liaising with their respective communities;
  - Publishing reports.
- The commitments of individual MAG members, in their individual capacities, should include:
  - Attend three meetings in Geneva per year;
  - Participate in the yearly global meeting;
  - Participate in intersessional work;
  - Make outreach to wider community, including national and regional IGF type initiatives and bring other networks into the MAG;
  - Bring in comments from the community,
  - 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:
  - Willingness to commit to work and follow through;
  - Proven ability to work as a team member;
  - Active participation in the IGF process;
  - Extensive linkages within one's own stakeholder group and, if possible, to other stakeholder groups;
  - 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 of the stakeholder groups - other than governments- where organized differently and where 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 themselves 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.

**Egypt<sup>3</sup> – drafted from the “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum”<sup>4</sup>**

#### **Open Consultations**

- A detailed explanatory agenda should be issued within the appropriate time together with an official call for proposals or contributions regarding questions to be raised during consultations.
- Open Consultations would be convened for two full days. Documents compiled could be displayed on a screen to facilitate discussion, review and enhancement by attendees.
- At the beginning of each year, participants should identify key global policy areas that require attention.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid

<sup>4</sup> Ibid



## **MAG**

### ***MAG Roles:***

- Recommend that the Secretariat assigns a coordinator to work with the MAG
- The positions in this group could be pre-defined e.g. a liaison for fundraising, for regional meetings, remote participation, for evaluation and feedback to stakeholders.
- The IGF Secretariat should direct more resources towards facilitating the work of the MAG so that it reaches its full potential.
- MAG to be more proactive in identifying emerging issues. The MAG should find a way of making recommendations for follow up on them.
- MAG could be more effective if it worked through thematic and functional working groups
- Ensuring that MAG meetings are always open to observers and that their quality opinions when expressed count.
- The MAG could hold open consultations with a wide range of IGF stakeholders that would identify the most critical and relevant Internet governance issues for the given year. With this input the MAG could help set formulate an agenda that reflects the dynamism of the Internet and engages leading Internet stakeholders from around the world.
- Multi-stakeholderism must be adopted in the MAG composition with a balance of Government, Civil Society, Private Sector, Technical Community and Academic Community. In addition, IGOs should continue to have observer status/so that that all interested can participate
- Potential MAG members should be made aware of the key role of the MAG for the functioning of the IGF and the time they need to invest in this work.
- The MAG and its chair should also support the Secretariat in outreach to potential donors

### ***Rotation & Renewal Mandate:***

- Clear annual or bi-annual rotation and mandate renewal process should be in place to ensure greater representational parity between different stakeholders.
- It is also very important that the established process by which one-third of the MAG members are rotated each year is executed methodically, so that the composition of the MAG is completely refreshed every three years.
- Insists that certain criteria on the rotation of members of the Advisory Group are established from now on.
- Recommend trying out the stakeholder selection process of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee.
  - The business sector members of this committee are representatives of different trade associations like in the areas of telecom, software companies etc. There are no direct company representatives on the committee, which makes perfect sense for keeping out special interests.
  - The selection process for civil society members is similarly democratic. The members are selected by a network of hundreds of NGOs working in areas associated with Internet policies, and thus represent a really broad spectrum of civil society. To get the selection process right is very important for the success of the unique multi-stakeholder experiment in global governance that the IGF represents.
- Would support creating Terms of Reference for the MAG in line with its own reflections made in the report of its last meeting.
- The selection of non-governmental representatives in the MAG should represent all sections of society, including vulnerable groups. This might mean having to increase the number of non-governmental representatives, to include not only those working primarily on Internet governance issues but also those representing groups that are affected by Internet governance.

### ***Nomination of MAG chair***

- Have co-chairs (or a chair and a vice-chair) with one position chosen by the UN and the other by the MAG itself.
- Terms of reference and criteria should be developed for this position and a non-com process instituted to propose names for the SG to appoint a chair.
- The MAG Chairman should be a person of distinction with a credible international reputation.
- The holder of this position should be selected by the UN Secretary-General.



### **IGF Secretariat**

#### ***Location:***

- The IGF Secretariat should remain in Geneva, and that it should continue to maintain its independence from any other UN agency (the UN or UN DESA (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs)).

#### ***Secretariat Independence:***

- Resources of the Secretariat would need to be increased in order to meet the increasing demands, to take a maximum benefit of the IGF process and in order to achieve the outreach desired. This will, however, depend on the availability of funds for the IGF process.
- Ultimately, the Secretariat should remain light-weighted, non-bureaucratic and accountable to all stakeholders. Preserve the multi-stakeholder nature of the IGF, and its adherence to the WSIS principles, hence the secretariat should be accountable to a multi-stakeholder body of some kind, and not to an intergovernmental body.
- The Secretariat should continue to operate with transparency and flexibility and should remain independent.
- The autonomy of the Secretariat should be a paramount consideration. It should remain convened by the UN Secretary General, with an independent budget and a Secretariat under contract with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). This provides it with a formal link to the UN system, which is important to ensure the continued participation of governments in the IGF.

#### ***Secretariat responsiveness:***

- The Secretariat should also strive to improve its transparency and its responsiveness to stakeholders. Very often emails to the Secretariat are not returned, and suggestions made by stakeholders are not specifically responded to. Whilst maintaining its strict neutrality.
- The Secretariat should also be proactive in facilitating the IGF's evolution and should make statements that detract from the breadth of the IGF's mandate in the Tunis Agenda.

#### ***IGF Secretariat Fund:***

- The IGF secretariat should continue to be funded through a voluntary contribution mechanism
- In kind contributions should be recognized, with an estimated value amount. The secretariat should have sufficient additional funding to retain staff, interns, and continue to improve the efficient and effective website portal and archiving of events to ensure an effective and ongoing resource for all stakeholders.
- The Secretariat and support should continue to utilize the Donor's Fund to gather the contributions from countries, business, the Internet technical community and others to support the Secretariat with additional funding to support IGF participation.
- Focus should be on broadening financial support for the Secretariat and creative ways of supporting participation by stakeholders who need support by encouraging national/regional partnerships to do this or other mechanisms.

#### ***Secretariat size:***

- The secretariat is required to be expanded from its present size to be able to take on the additional work that meaningful improvements to the IGF would entail
- Scholarships should be provided to support participation of trainees in the work of the Secretariat
- The composition of the secretariat should not feature specific countries, languages or areas.

#### **India**

- WGs around key policy/thematic questions with some MAG plus invited experts.
- More than program committee
- Selection of MAG members in an open and transparent manner and process published on the IGF website.

#### **Portugal**

1. All parties participating in the IGF are taken to act on equal footing.
2. Remote participation at the IGF as evolved very satisfactorily, but a further strengthening of remote participation tools is desirable due to its potential contribution for increased inclusiveness.



3. The preparatory process should stand on a bottom-up, open, inclusive process and engage the organizer groups of national and regional IGFs so that these can better input to the global IGF and vice versa. Preferably all, but at least one of the annual open consultations, should allow for remote participation.

#### **MAG**

1. The working methods of the MAG should be made more clear, e.g. through the development of Terms of Reference, and its functioning should be transparent and open.
2. The MAG composition should represent the wide internet community and its membership should be balanced as regards stakeholders, geographic and cultural diversity, and gender. Technical and academic community should be seen as specific stakeholder groups.
3. The MAG's structure and the process of selection of its members must be inclusive, predictable, transparent and fully documented. Stakeholder groups should publicize the guidelines for their selection process and document their application.
4. The rotation system which was introduced by the MAG should be further developed in order to allow for a constant renewal of the MAG and to guarantee its openness to new stakeholders. The rules of rotation should be clear, with about one third rotated every year and a three-year limit to each member's term.

#### **Secretariat**

1. The IGF Secretariat should continue to operate with transparency and flexibility, be accountable to all stakeholders, independent of other UN bodies and based in Geneva.
2. With very limited human and financial resources, the IGF Secretariat, together with many volunteers, has managed to service well the IGF meetings, but it should be strengthened and expanded in order to meet the increasing demands and to support the desired increased outreach.

#### **Theresa Swinehart**

##### **MAG selection process**

- Multi-stakeholder composition with balance of Government, Civil Society, Private Sector, Technical Community and Academic Community.
- IGOs should continue to have observer status/so that all interested can participate.
- Transparent selection process/self-managed by each stakeholder group.
- Respect for stakeholders in light of each stakeholder group's own culture and methods of engagement, each group should be allowed to define their own selection procedures.
  - In light of transparency, stakeholder groups should publicize their selection process. Stakeholder groups should identify process that work best for their own culture and methods of engagement, e.g. nomination committee, call for expressions of interest, etc.
  - Stakeholder groups should strive for geographic diversity, gender balance, developing countries' representation.
  - To ensure appropriate geographic balance among MAG members, a form of 'triage' could be used. 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.
- Openness and transparency of MAG meetings
  - MAG Meetings should continue to be open to observers;
  - MAG meetings should continue to facilitate remote participation and transcription;
  - All proceedings should continue to be published;



- Notification of MAG meetings should be provided as early as possible;
- The MAG has the prerogative of holding executive sessions.
- MAG operations:
  - Rotation of the MAG members with one third rotated every year, with a de facto three year limit to each members' term:
    - Ensure fair representation;
    - Opportunities provided to all interested participants;
    - Avoidance of capture.
  - Responsibilities of MAG members should be documented and published.  
Examples of MAG's main functions:
    - Participating in open consultations;
    - Reviewing materials and input from open consultations;
    - Setting the agenda for the annual IGF meeting incorporating input from open consultations;
    - Overall programme development and support function;
    - Outreach and awareness building of IGF;
    - Developing the detailed programme including the identification of issues of concern;
    - Facilitating the selection of and organization of workshops and other meetings;
    - Assist in planning and organizing the meetings as appropriate;
    - Identify linkages between workshops and main sessions;
    - Coordinating panels and supporting panellists, moderators and speakers at the annual meeting;
    - Liaising with their respective communities;
    - Publishing reports as appropriate.
  - The commitments of individual MAG members, in their individual capacities, include:
    - Attend three meetings in Geneva per year, either on site or remotely;
    - Participate in the yearly meeting;
    - Participate in inter-sessional work;
    - Make outreach to wider community, including national and regional
    - IGF type initiatives and bring other networks into the MAG;
    - Bring in comments from the community;
    - Explain recommendations to the community.

### C. Funding of the IGF

#### **Egypt<sup>5</sup> – drafted from the “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum”<sup>6</sup>**

- Supporting the existing voluntary multi-stakeholder funding of IGF secretariat and related activities, with the host financing the IGF event.
- Financing the forum through the UN budget enables more control of the UN.
- Encouraging voluntary funding from governments and the private sector, including in kind support.
- A further diversification of funding sources, to include more donations from governments from developing countries, civil society, academia and international organizations, should be considered.
- A fixed percentage of the amount that ICANN collects for every domain registration on the Internet is to be committed for IGF activities.
- Recommending transparency of sources of funding.
- The funding mechanism should guarantee the independence and neutrality of the IGF and its Secretariat and prevent donors from having specific influence on the IGF agenda setting.
- Extra-budgetary contributions from other sources through intergovernmental institutions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> Ibid



#### India

- Funding to be stable, predictable & transparent
- Additional funding from the UN to fully support the IGF Secretariat
- Encourage additional voluntary funding - as it is accepted in all UN bodies, should be sought and accepted.
- However clear and strong measures should be put in place to make sure that funds do not come with any strings attached the processes should be completely transparent and accountable.
- It is also a good idea to seek some part of the funds from the corpus of collections form Internet users done by various technical management agencies, especially those associated with names and addresses.
- Equitable representation to cater to diversity, gender, regional
- Expansion of IGF Secretariat to bring in strong linkages with national and regional linkages
- Secretariat to be independent, transparent, fully funded.

#### D. Broadening participation

##### **Egypt<sup>7</sup> – drafted from the “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum”<sup>8</sup>**

- Stronger link with WSIS follow-up.

##### Examples mentioned:

- a) Develop clear rules of procedure to link with other organizations involved in WSIS follow-up
- b) IGF should disseminate information about WSIS implementation (by UN organizations and by regional action plans, such as [AISI](#), [eLac](#))

- Fostering 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 of experience. Such cooperation might set the stage for further evolution of the global Internet governance architecture and policy coherence.

- Furthermore, some actions could help linking IGF to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance, such as enhancing the website and sharing the best practices through it, improving the remote participation, generating outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options, and finally encouraging the secretariat and MAG to attend meetings of other fora.
  - Strengthen the link particularly with CSTD
  - Improve remote participation

#### India

- Open Consultations be raised to garner greater visibility and participation for countries, communities and stakeholders to put up issues of current concerns into the IGF process.
- Fund support for those needing financial support for participation in the open consultations managed by the secretariat.
- Fortifying the remote participation not just in open consultation but every processes of IGF.

#### Portugal

1) Participation in the IGF has increased throughout time, but it should be further broadened to involve new stakeholders, both at IGF meetings and preparatory processes, in particular from developing countries, youth, small and medium enterprises, decision-makers, parliamentarians, and disabled people and other disadvantaged groups.

2) Enhancing participation in the IGF should be taken into consideration when developing the IGF agendas in order to make them attractive to a wide variety of stakeholder interests. Pre-events and linked events directed to special themes could also be useful to increase participation of specific constituencies.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid

<sup>8</sup> Ibid



3) Effective remote participation is a key element for engaging whoever cannot physically attend meetings. Remote participation has reached a remarkable level in the most recent IGF meetings, in particular through remote hubs, but there still is room for further improvements, in particular to enhance interactivity of remote participants with in site audiences, provided adequate resources can be assured.

4) The possibility of providing simultaneous machine translation services based on the real-time transcripts could be explored to ensure further reach of IGF meetings.

5) Special funding and other support for developing country participants should be increased, if possible. A transparent funding mechanism, with clear criteria, should be applied to alleviate barriers to participation from developing countries.

6) Dedicated capacity building actions are important to better engage newcomers to the IGF and to create an environment where their participation becomes the most useful for them, but also for other participants.

**E. Linking IGF to other related processes/mechanisms/bodies**

**Egypt<sup>9</sup> – drafted from the “Non paper of the Chair for concrete recommendations of the Working Group on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum”<sup>10</sup>**

- Fellowship administered by UN to increase the participation of developing countries and LDCs.
- Funding available for the participation from civil society and policy makers from developing countries, managed carefully not to hamper their independence.
- Organize a special session in the IGF for policy-makers and parliamentarians.
- Remote participation recognized as an integral part of the IGF.
- Translation of workshop discussions should be made available. Translators can be re-allocated from main sessions since the most substantial debates take place in workshops nowadays.
- MAG should include members from youth.
- Improve the archiving of the proceedings.
- Take advantage from the support of other UN organizations to promote capacity building.

**India**

- Integrate regional and national IGFs as extended processes of the UNIGF through the MAG and the Secretariat direct engagements in these.

**III. Proposals by Switzerland on the “Chairman’s draft summary of responses/recommendations to the Questionnaire on improvements to the IGF”<sup>11</sup>**

**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)**

No.	Recommendation	Status	Comment
2.1	Each session organizer should appoint a Rapporteur whose job would be to summarize relevant discussions	P	A, [B, E]
2.2	Involving other organizations (IGOs) during IGF meetings	P	E, [D-A]
2.3	Ensure regional and national IGFs can play a meaningful role in the IGF process Exs mentioned: a) inclusion in open consultations b) intersessional meetings between organizers of regional and national IGFs (can be conducted online)	P	A [D], link to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45

<sup>9</sup> Ibid

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> The “Chairman’s draft summary of responses/recommendations to the Questionnaire on improvements to the IGF” was prepared in view of the Third Meeting of the Working Group on Improvements to the IGF and is available at <http://www.unctad.info/en/cstdwg> .



	c) regional and national issues tabled at IGF sessions		
2.4	Information about the IGF shared in national and regional meetings	P	D, link to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
2.5	The secretariat and MAG should attend meetings of other for a	P	A [E]
2.6	Enhance the website	P	A [D-E], link to points 2.6, 6.27.7.3, 7.65
2.7	Improve remote participation	P	D [B-C]
2.8	Generate outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options	P	A, [B-E], duplication of points 3.5, 4.38, 4.4, 4.40, 4.9 AND 4.11 ?
2.9	Generate outcomes packaged in a useful way	P	A [B-E]
2.10	Put forth an annual Report of the IGF	P	A [B-E]
2.11	Disseminate chair's report and transcripts of sessions	P	A [E]
2.13	Reaching out to governments and IGOs with outcomes	P	A [E]
2.14	Follow-up of the use that is made from the outcome documents	P	A [C-E]
2.15	Stronger link with WSIS follow-up Ex. mentioned: a) Develop clear rules of procedure to link with other organizations involved in WSIS follow-up b) IGF should disseminate information about WSIS implementation (by UN organizations and by regional action plans, such as <a href="#">AISI</a> , <a href="#">eLac</a> )	P	A [C-E]
2.16	Strengthen the link particularly with CSTD	P	A

**3. How to enhance the contribution of IGF to socio-economic development and towards Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs) including enhancing participation of developing countries**

No.	Recommendation	Status	Comment
3.1	Invite other policy communities (development, trade, A2K, environment)	P	E [A]
3.2	Mainstream a sustainable development perspective in the IGF	P	B
3.3	Mainstream development considerations into IGF	P	B
3.4	Put forth a concrete development agenda for IG	P	A [E]
3.5	Outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options	P	A [E], duplication of points 2.8, 3.5, 4.38, 4.4, 4.40, 4.9 ?
3.6	Improve the consolidation of IGF materials for better research and use	P	A [C-E]
3.7	Focus on structural reasons for marginalization of certain groups and inequality	P	D [C]
3.8	Make marginalized groups and developing countries actually take part in decision-making and decision-shaping of IG issues	P	D [C]
3.9	Increase participation from developing countries in meetings and in agenda-setting	P	D [C]
3.10	Funding for the participation of developing countries Fellowship program managed by the secretariat b) Voluntary contribution to that purpose	P	D [C]
3.11	Funding for the participation of speakers from developing countries	P	B [C-D]
3.12	Capacity building (with emphasis on policy-makers and engineers)	P	D [A-E]
3.13	Convening IGF meetings in various locations, particularly developing countries	P	D [B-C]
3.14	Improve the sharing of good practices in the IGF	P	B
3.15	Choose one particular development goal as starting point		B



	for discussion		
3.16	Mainstream national and regional IGFs	P	E [B] linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
3.17	Guidelines to regional and national IGF, to foster full multi-stakeholder participation and WSIS principles in their meetings	P	B [A-D] linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
3.18	Best practices section on IGF	P	B [A-C]
3.19	Encourage the creation of Dynamic Coalitions with socio-economic goals	P	B
3.20	Development issues should be addressed on the national level first		

#### 4. Shaping the outcome of IGF meetings

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
4.1	Document outcomes and conclusions of workshop and main sessions in the form of messages	P	A [B-E]
4.2	Distill messages for future discussions	P	A [B-E]
4.3	Report on the capacity building outcomes	P	A [B-C]
4.4	Outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options (based on: chairman's report, compilation of each session, repository of best practices, work of thematic working groups)	P	A [B-C], duplication of points 2.8, 3.5, 4.38, 4.4, 4.40, 4.9 ?
4.5	Report template by workshops and main sessions	P	A [B]
4.6	Outcomes transmitted to relevant bodies	P	A [E]
4.7	Rapporteur that would distribute and follow-up the messages from the IGF	P	A [B]
4.8	Annual report to capture the impact of the IGF	P	A [C]
4.9	Outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options	P	A [B-C] duplication of points 2.8, 3.5 , 4.4 , 4.9 AND 4.11 ?
4.10	Whenever possible, strive towards convergence and to make recommendations	P	B [A-E]
4.11	Outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options (based on: clear questions for each session, compilation of each session, work of thematic working groups)	P	A [B-C], duplication of points 2.8, 3.5, 4.4, 4.9 and 4.11 ?
4.12	Outcomes transmitted to relevant bodies including CSTD	P	A [E]
4.13	Repository of good practices (policy and regulation)	P	A [B-E]
4.14	Any omission of viewpoints should have the opportunity to be corrected	P	B [A]
4.15	No change is required		
4.16	Extract targeted messages	P	A [B-E]
4.17	More robust set of takeaways	P	A [E]
4.18	Develop a glossy takeaway capturing key issues discussed, highlights information about policy choices and options on the range of issues	P	A [B-C]
4.19	Build on the IGF's chairman's and secretariat's existing report with additional materials that capture on-going dialogue and progress that is being made within the IGF process	P	A [B-C]
4.20	Expanded reporting from regional and national IGF's	P	A [E], linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
4.21	Expand on report on best practices	P	B [A]
4.22	Accurate reporting	P	B [A] linked to points 4.7 and 2.1



4.23	Outcomes in the form of specific recommendations on certain topics	P	A [B-E]
4.24	Compilation of best practices in each region	P	B [E]
4.25	Integrate regional and national IGFs in the process of achieving outcomes	P	B [E]
4.26	Improvement of the (web tools to make information searchable)	P	A [B-C] linked to points 2.6, 6.27.7.3, 7.65
4.27	Synthesize messages that would respect the full diversity of views in the community	P	A [B]
4.28	Workshop summary with synthesis of the debate, principles used by stakeholders facing the issues, and identification of possible new approaches	P	B
4.29	Higher visibility to the reports of national and regional IGFs	P	B [A] linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
4.30	Chairman's report; Workshop reports; Dynamic coalitions summarize their own takeaways; Collection of views expressed in the IGF; Repository of good practices	P	B [A-C]
4.31	Workshop summary with synthesis of the debate (bullet points, outcome highlights)	P	B [A]
4.32	Setting of clear questions and objectives for the discussions and assess them	P	B
4.33	Chairman's report A compendium of views expressed by stakeholders at an IGF meeting	P	B [A]
4.34	Enhance outreach and reporting of discussions	P	B [A]
4.35	Report to present accomplishments of dynamic coalitions	P	B [A]
4.36	Capacity-oriented outcomes. Outlines of best practices and relevant information IGF should present reports of its discussions to the General Assembly	P	A [E]
4.37	Recommendations conveyed to national governments	P	A [E]
4.38	Outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options	P	A [B-E], duplication of points 2.8, 3.5, 4.38, 4.4, 4.9, 4.11
4.39	Outcomes sent to CSTD		A [E]
4.40	Policy advice and recommendations through outcome documents that map areas of consensus and alternative policy options		A [B], duplication of points 3.5, 4.38, 4.4, 4.40, 4.9, 4.11 ?

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

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
5.1	Ensure regional and national IGFs can play a meaningful role in Open consultations and agenda-setting	P	Linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
5.2	Reinforce the watchdog function of the IGF: review the accountability of all fora dealing with IG	P	B [C]
5.3	Raise the profile of the IGF with decision-makers and parliamentarians around the world	P	B [E]
5.4	Organize thematic IGFs	P	B [E]
5.5	Invite relevant policy-making organizations to the IGF	P	E [B]
5.6	Clear protocol for communicating outcomes to other for a dealing with WSIS implementation	P	E
5.7	IGF needs to be informed about key discussions that impact on IG taking place in other bodies	P	E
5.8	Map the constellation of organizations that deal with important IG issues. Map them thematically as well	P	E [C]



5.9	Strengthen link with CSTD	P	E
5.10	CSTD should give visibility to the IGF	P	E

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

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
6.1	The main thematic area of the IGF should include the intersection between IG and development	P	D [B]
6.2	Seek feedback among stakeholders about real obstacles to participation	P	D [B]
6.3	Carry out targeted outreach to include those who have not been included in the IGF (civil society, small and medium sized companies, youth, decision-makers and parliamentarians, people from LDCs)	P	D
6.4	Representatives from marginalized groups should be included as speakers in all sessions	P	D
6.5	Make sure that the agenda address issues that are important to those marginalized groups	P	D
6.6	Reach out to economic sectors such as healthcare and education whose work is impacted by the Internet		B
6.7	Develop a clear outreach strategy put forth and coordinated by the MAG	P	A
6.8	Double the number of MAG representatives from civil society. Half of places should be given to organizations who have not taken part in the IG debate significantly (human rights, linguistic and cultural diversity, disabled, etc)	P	A [E]
6.9	Workshop organizers should make greater use of remote participation to increase the diversity of speakers	P	B
6.10	At least one of the open consultations should be carried out online	P	B [D]
6.11	Asynchronous channels should be used to remain in touch with the Forum participants throughout the year.	P	B [C]
6.12	Funding available for the participation from civil society and policy makers from developing countries, managed carefully not to hamper their independence	P	D [B]
6.13	Fellowship administered by UN to increase the participation of developing countries and LDCs	P	D
6.14	Funding specially targeted at marginalized groups	P	D
6.15	Funding should be given based on clear, transparent criteria, and decisions should be announced timely	P	D
6.16	Organize a special session in the IGF for policy-makers and parliamentarians	P	B
6.17	Enhance capacity building, with focus on institutional capacity rather than on individual capacity	P	B [E]
6.18	Remote participation recognized as an integral part of the IGF	P	D
6.19	Improve the dynamics of remote participation to bring in voices of remote participants more effectively so they can impact on discussions	P	B [D]
6.20	Funding to remote participation. Technical, financial and human resources to put in place remote participation should be provided.	P	D [B]
6.21	Workshops organized and carried out by remote hubs should be made possible	P	B [D]
6.22	Presentations from remote hubs delivered in workshops should be encouraged	P	B [D]
6.23	All stakeholders should raise awareness about the hubs	P	B [D]



	and give support to the creation of hubs in their regions		
6.24	Translation of workshop discussions should be made available. Translators can be re-allocated from main sessions since the most substantial debates take place in workshops nowadays	P	B [C]
6.25	MAG should include members from youth	P	D
6.26	Improve the archiving of the proceedings	P	B [C]
6.27	Improve the website	P	B [C], Linked to points 2.6, 6.27.7.3, 7.65
6.28	Take advantage from the support of other UN organizations to promote capacity building	P	E [A]

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

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.1	Continue to build opportunities for remote hubs and remote participants to contribute throughout the preparations	P	C
7.2	Use community projects such as Rural Information Centres equipped with Internet service to promote remote and active participation in IGF at all levels	P	D
7.3	Devote resources to the website to develop it further as a 'one stop' educational and training resource of substantive information and also information about the regional and national IGF initiatives	P	D
7.4	Continue to build on and encourage local, national and regional IGF dialogues to also contribute to the preparation process and to deepen awareness and inclusivity	P	Linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
7.5	supports the current framework for preparations: lightweight secretariat in Geneva	P	C
7.6	Assisted and guided by a fully inclusive geographically diverse MAG which is informed by open consultation meetings and written contributions from stakeholders all over the world.	P	B
7.7	Providing greater financial support for physical participation in these preparatory processes.	P	D
7.8	The bottom up process of applications for workshops has proved to be the most effective means in bringing key current and emerging issues to the IGF.	P	B
7.9	Consider that the management of that process still needs perfecting in order to make navigation at the event itself easier. However, the current efficiencies of this management process <b>should be preserved at all costs</b>	P	B
7.10	The Secretariat and MAG <b>must also allow</b> a role for the IGF host to help shape specific overarching theme for each event, e.g. we support <b>the young entrepreneurship theme of development at the Nairobi IGF</b> - a key policy objective for Africa and its opportunity focus for the Internet.	P	B [E]
7.11	All IGF meetings and preparatory meetings <b>should be open to all interested stakeholders</b>	P	D
7.12	<b>Main sessions:</b> a few focused topics and two moderators who are experts, is still the most successful format. Almost all main sessions should follow this format.	P	B
7.13	Development is the most important element of Internet		



	governance and it should remain as a cross-cutting theme in all IGF sessions. For this reason, IG4D session should be a workshop and not a main session.		
7.14	<b>The Setting the Scene and Regional Perspectives sessions:</b> First separate orientation session for newcomers second bringing together the various regional perspectives on each of the main IGF topics should be their format	P	B
7.15	Would like to have a shorter opening ceremony and opening session. Besides a formal opening part, the rest of the opening session should be short, <b>with a few key addresses, instead of a questionable line-up of speakers.</b>	P	B
7.16	Request more transparency regarding the selection of speakers for the opening or closing session and a clarification as to the criteria used for selection.	P	B [E]
7.17	suggest that the opening session and the 'setting the scene' is combined in one 3 hour slot, <b>while the Regional Perspectives session takes a separate 3 hour slot.</b> We believe that a separate 3 hour Regional Perspectives session is well justified, given the rise of the regional and national IGFs.	P	B [E]
7.18	Better link the main sessions with workshops, push for workshops to merge, to keep workshops at a reasonable number – as they are still high in our view - and to have more discussions.	P	B
7.19	Training for remote moderators, remote hubs, all these are greatly appreciated.	P	B [C]
7.20	Live transcription is also very much appreciated. This should be extended to all meetings and not just in the main room.	P	B [C]
7.21	Recommend a brief training session for transcribers before the IGF, as it was the case for remote moderators, so that they get acquainted with the IGF terminology and names.	P	B
7.22	stress for future meetings that proper attention is given to the venue, that it is clear <b>what is expected from the host country</b> , and that participants <u>know in advance what the costs of participating in an IGF are.</u>	P	B [C]
7.23	In addition, future host countries should fill a candidacy file which will provide answers to the "requirements" document or will commit to provide what is required. This way, planning will be separated into two things: logistics and substance.	P	B [E]
7.24	The host country is normally in charge of the local organisation. This should be an opportunity for host government and institutions to boost local awareness to internet related issues.	P	B [E]
7.25	The IGF should be annually organized, in different countries, both developed and developing, as it has been the case so far.	P	B [E]



**Part Two: Current modalities: open consultation and MAG**

**Open Consultation:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comment</b>
7.26	At least one of the annual open consultations should be held virtually to enable all stakeholders to participate equally, irrespective of whether they are in Geneva or not.	P	B duplicates point n.7.26, 7.29 ?
7.27	There should be, at the Geneva meetings, two open days and one day of the MAG meeting on its own.	P	B
7.28	Organisations that are part of the Internet governance ecosystem could be invited to share a one-page document regarding their suggestions on specific thematic issues.	P	B [A]
7.29	At least one of the open consultations should take place as an online meeting. Online meetings are not only eco-friendly, but can also foster more equal participation among regions.	P	B [D] duplicate point n. 7.26, 7.29 ?
7.30	Early each year, in Open Consultations, participants should identify key global policy areas that require attention. Thematic commissions coordinated by MAG members could be created around these areas.	P	B

**MAG roles:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comment</b>
7.31	Recommend that the Secretariat assigns a coordinator to work with the MAG	P	B [C]
7.32	The MAG elects a small coordinating group from among its own members to help facilitate its work. This group could assist the chair and the executive coordinator in facilitating the work of the MAG.	P	B
7.33	The positions in this group could be pre-defined e.g. A liaison for fundraising, for regional meetings, remote participation, for evaluation and feedback to stakeholders.	P	Linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
7.34	The IGF Secretariat should direct more resources towards facilitating the work of the MAG so that it realises its full potential.	P	B [C]
7.35	Would like the MAG to be more proactive in identifying emerging issues. The MAG should find a way of making recommendations for follow up on them.	P	B
7.36	Recommend that the MAG makes use of online platforms for meetings in between face-to-face meetings in addition to their existing use of a mailing list.	P	B
7.37	We agree that the organisations having an important role in Internet administration and the development of Internet-related technical standards should continue to be represented in the MAG. However, their representation should not be at the expense of civil society participation.	P	B
7.38	the MAG could be more effective if it worked through thematic and functional working groups	P	B
7.39	A programme committee should be set up each year, with enough referees for evaluating submitted contributions and proposals. Some	P	B



	MAG members could participate as long as they are personally committed to put in the necessary resources.		
7.40	Ensuring that MAG meetings are always open to observers and that their quality opinions when expressed count.	P	B
7.41	support the recommendations put forward by the MAG, specifically: - A third of the MAG members be rotated every year. - A de facto three-year limit to each member's term. - Maintaining the private sector, civil society and the technical community as separate stakeholder groups. - 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. - A form of 'triage' carried out by the Secretariat to ensure appropriate diversity and geographical balance among MAG members.	P	B
7.42	The members of the MAG should approve an annual Working plan and implementation strategy on the beginning of every year, right after the first round of open consultations.	P	B
7.43	Sub-committees could be created in the MAG. These committees could have an administrative nature, such as a coordinating committee, or deal with more substantive themes that are agreed to be priority in the beginning of the year, integrating the thematic committees mentioned above	P	B
7.44	MAG should have an important role in the process of helping to identify policy messages from the IGF. The valuable but rough summaries of Workshops discussions and main sessions need to be translated into a language and format that could serve as input for policy development in other fora. Thematic groups coordinated by MAG members could perform this role.	P	B
7.45	The MAG could establish a close dialogue with regional and national IGF organizers, to make sure that a feedback relation is created and that information flows on both Ways - from regional to the global level and from the IGF to regional meetings.	P	B [E] linked to points 2.3, 2.4, 4.29, 5.1, 5.21, 7.4, 7.33, 7.45
7.46	The MAG could hold open consultations with a wide range of IGF stakeholders that would identify the most critical and relevant Internet governance issues for the given year. With this input the MAG could help set formulate an agenda that reflects the dynamism of the Internet and engages leading Internet stakeholders from around the world.	P	E

**Rotation & Renewal Mandate:**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comment</b>
7.47	Clear annual or bi-annual rotation and mandate renewal process should be in place to ensure greater representational parity between different stakeholders.	P	B
7.48	It is also very important that the established process by which one-third of the MAG members are rotated each year is executed methodically, so that the composition of the MAG is completely refreshed every three years.	P	B
7.49	Insists that certain criteria on the rotation of members of the Advisory Group are established from now on.	P	B
7.50	By all means the balance of the multistakeholder groups within the Advisory Group must be kept.	P	B
7.51	Would support creating Terms of Reference for the MAG in line with its	P	B



	own reflections made in the report of its last meeting.		
7.52	We greatly recommend trying out the stakeholder selection process of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee. The business sector members of this committee are representatives of different trade associations like in the areas of telecom, software companies etc. There are no direct company representatives on the committee, which makes perfect sense for keeping out special interests. The selection process for civil society members is similarly democratic. The members are selected by a network of hundreds of NGOs working in areas associated with Internet policies, and thus represent a really broad spectrum of civil society. To get the selection process right is very important for the success of the unique multi-stakeholder experiment in global governance that the IGF represents.	P	B

**Nomination of MAG chair**

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.53	Terms of reference and criteria should be developed for this position and a non-com process instituted to propose names for the SG to appoint a chair.	P	B
7.54	One idea could be to have co-chairs (or a chair and a vice-chair) with one position chosen by the UN and the other by the MAG itself.	P	B
7.55	This would be consistent with the IGF leading the way in terms of process at the UN, and it would also support continual communication between MAG members, the Secretariat and the chairs.	P	B
7.56	The MAG Chairman should be a person of distinction with a credible international reputation.	P	B

**Part 3: IGF Secretariat**

**Secretariat Location:**

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.57.	The IGF Secretariat should remain in Geneva, and that it should continue to maintain its independence from any other UN agency (the UN or UN DESA (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs). Geneva provides an excellent headquarters for the IGF Secretariat because it is accessible, neutral, and global. Moreover, co-locating the IGF Secretariat, IGF open consultations, and MAG meetings in Geneva provides for broader multi-stakeholder participation, due to various other WSIS related activities taking place there (CSTD and WSIS Forums).	P	B
7.58	The IGF secretariat should have a base in Geneva, while making use of remote workers/interns or volunteers- Being in the same location on a permanent basis is not necessary for all secretariat staff	P	B

**Secretariat Independence:**

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.59	The autonomy of the Secretariat should be a paramount consideration. It should remain convened by the UN Secretary General, with an independent budget and a Secretariat under contract with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). This provides it with a formal link to the UN system, which is important to ensure the continued participation of governments in the IGF.	P	B



7.60	Preserve the multi-stakeholder nature of the IGF, and its adherence to the WSIS principles, hence the secretariat should be accountable to a multi-stakeholder body of some kind, and not to an intergovernmental body. The MAG has been supposed to play this role, but, we feel it has not been effective enough, in spite of the effort made by many of its members and the co-chairs.	P	B
7.61	The Secretariat should not be subsumed into any other functional UN organisation or process, because this could jeopardise its perceived independence, and could introduce new impediments to the continuation and development of the informal and open processes that the IGF has innovated.	P	B
7.62	As a multi-stakeholder body, important organisational decisions for the IGF should by default be the responsibility of the MAG rather than the Secretariat - this should include the responsibility to approve UN appointees to the Secretariat, the appointment of any "special advisers", and (in consultation with the host country) the dates of IGF meetings.	P	B

**Secretariat responsiveness:**

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.63	The Secretariat should also strive to improve its transparency and its responsiveness to stakeholders. Very often emails to the Secretariat are not returned, and suggestions made by stakeholders are not specifically responded to. Whilst maintaining its strict neutrality, the Secretariat should also be proactive in facilitating the IGF's evolution and should make statements that detract from the breadth of the IGF's mandate in the Tunis Agenda.	P	B

**Secretariat Fund:**

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.64	The IGF secretariat should continue to be funded through a voluntary contribution mechanism - as it is key element to the IGF's independence - with limited overhead costs to ensure the most effective use of all contributions made, including for developing country participation and engagement.	P	C
7.65	In kind contributions should be recognized, with an estimated value amount. The secretariat should have sufficient additional funding to retain staff, interns, and continue to improve the efficient and effective website portal and archiving of events to ensure an effective and ongoing resource for all stakeholders.	P	C
7.66	While the UN should be a funding source and facilitator in aspects in which its neutrality is implicit in the nature of the functions offered, the MAG should be set up to be as independent as possible from the secretariat and the UN.	P	C
7.67	Public UN funding should be secured to cover the expenses with personnel working for the IGF Secretariat	P	C
7.68	The Secretariat and support should continue to utilize the Donor's Fund to gather the contributions from countries, business, the Internet technical community and others to support the Secretariat with additional funding to support IGF participation.	P	C
7.69	Focus should be on broadening financial support for the Secretariat and creative ways of supporting participation by stakeholders who need support by encouraging national/regional partnerships to do this or other	P	C



	mechanisms.		
7.70	UNESCO appreciates the work implemented by the IGF Secretariat and would welcome a strengthening in terms of dedicated extra-budgetary resources, in order it to meet the additional requirements expressed in this consultation process.	P	C

**Secretariat size:**

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
7.71	The secretariat is required to be expanded from its present size to be able to take on the additional work that meaningful improvements to the IGF would entail. It also needs to be provided with more resources to be able to steer the process between the sessions that has been recommended in the various parts of this document. The staff selected for the secretariat should have special competencies to manage the uniquely multi-stakeholder nature of the IGF and should be representative of diverse geographical regions and levels of development, but it should be kept small, non-bureaucratic and accountable to all stakeholders.	P	C
7.72	Scholarships should be provided to support participation of trainees in the work of the Secretariat	P	C
7.73	The composition of the secretariat should not feature specific countries, languages or areas.	P	C

**Question 9: Financing the Forum**

I. Exploring further options for financing the forum

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
9.1	Supporting the existing voluntary multi-stakeholder funding of IGF secretariat and related activities, with the host financing the IGF event	P	C
9.2	Financing the forum through the UN budget enables more control of the UN	P	C
9.3	Encouraging voluntary funding from governments and the private sector, including in kind support	P	C
9.4	Secretariat to engage in proactive fund raising with potential donors (donor meetings on the margin of the consultations and the IGF)	P	C
9.5	A fixed percentage of the amount that ICANN collects for every domain registration on the Internet is to be committed for IGF activities	P	C
9.6	Organizers must sponsor participants and the implementation of meetings	P	C
9.7	Recommending transparency of sources of funding	P	C
9.8	A regular budget line for the IGF from intergovernmental sources	P	C
9.9	Extra-budgetary contributions from other sources through intergovernmental institution	P	C

II. Review of the current situation

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
9.10	Transparency: A travel fund for speakers from developing countries should be accessible and transparently managed by a multi-stakeholder group. Private sector contributions should be encouraged.	P	C
9.11	Transparency of contributions is recommended.	P	C



9.12	Independence: A terms of reference for donations to protect independence.	P	C
9.13	Public funding is recommended to ensure independence.	P	C
9.14	Voluntary contributions can be allowed. They should be un-earmarked, and should be used to fund participation of stakeholders from the developing countries.	P	C
9.15	IGF should be financed on a voluntary and multi-stakeholder basis in order to ensure the independence of this forum.	P	C
9.16	Annual financial report could be placed on the website of IGF.	P	C
9.17	Relying solely on short term contributions by private sector – who may be interested in the outcomes of the IGF - goes against ensuring independence and neutrality of the process.	P	C
9.18	The secretariat needs much better resource support.	P	C
9.19	Current financial and human resources are overstretched and will certainly be insufficient in the face of what can be expected from an improved IGF.	P	C
9.20	Providing more financial support for remote participation mechanisms to reach out to affected online communities around the world.	P	C
9.21	Voluntary and multi stakeholder financing is a logical and sensible method and should be maintained.	P	C
9.22	The funding process should be designed as simply as possible.	P	C
9.23	The IGF needs to engage with, and secure financing from, a wider range of stakeholders.	P	C

III. Options for ensuring predictability, transparency and accountability in financing IGF

No.	Recommendation/ Concrete suggestions for improvement	Status	Comment
9.24	Publicly available annual financial report (income, expenditure, grant contributions, donations, in-kind support). & a public register of such donations should be maintained.	P	C
9.25	Terms of reference for donations to ensure independence.	P	C
9.26	Contributors should be allowed to identify which aspect of budget they want to contribute to.	P	C
9.27	Contributors should be encouraged to make longer term commitments.	P	C
9.28	Stable funding mechanism, with a focus on independence, to ensure functioning of the secretariat, the annual event and equity in participation in the IGF across geographies and social groups.	P	C
9.29	A significant source of funding should be public funding through the UN.	P	C
9.30	Transparency on the value of donations should be the rule.	P	C
9.31	A UN budget is a must for a structure reporting to the UN SG.	P	C
9.32	A multi stakeholder structure should remain the basis for the funding procedures.	P	C
9.33	Donations shall remain voluntary.	P	C
9.34	Broadening financial support for the Secretariat.	P	C
9.35	Creative ways of supporting participation by stakeholders.	P	C
9.36	National contributions from governments, supported by private sector contributions to the UN Secretariat Donor's fund are a significant contribution.	P	C
9.37	The funding process must be as simple as possible, including for small donations.	P	C
9.38	Public funding is recommended to ensure independence.	P	C
9.39	Voluntary contributions can be allowed. They should be un-earmarked,	P	C



	and should be used to fund participation of stakeholders from the developing countries.		
9.40	Relying solely on short term contributions by private sector – who may be interested in the outcomes of the IGF - goes against ensuring independence and neutrality of the process.	P	C
9.41	Supporting the multi stakeholder model of IGF, considering all stakeholders as equal participants.	P	C
9.42	Simple ways for individuals or small organisations to make small donations to the IGF.	P	C
9.43	Formal process of contributions for legally incorporated organisations.	P	C
9.44	UN Funding should be directed towards funding participations from developing countries.	P	C
9.45	Assigning public UN funds that should cover at least salaries.	P	C
9.46	Encouraging private voluntary donations to the IGF from all stakeholders. A sub-commission from MAG could assist.	P	C
9.47	Periodic reports of funds and expenditure.	P	C
9.48	Private organizations in the IG ecosystem should contribute with a small percentage of their budgets to fund the IGF.	P	C
9.49	Supporting the current model that does not give any additional voice to sponsors.	P	C
9.50	Support depends on assuring the neutrality of the IGF process and secretariat.	P	C
9.51	Voluntary and multi stakeholder finance.	P	C
9.52	Financing in kind should be considered and accountable.	P	C
9.53	UN should support logistics and facilities when the IGF host is a developing country.	P	C
9.54	There could and should be more contributions from governments, from civil society, academia and international organizations.	P	C
9.55	Each stakeholder group individually to open a trust fund and to ensure a certain annual financial contribution to the international IGF. This would ensure a economic predictability.	P	C
9.56	Accountability can be established by well balanced donations from all stakeholder groupings and transparency by periodically publishing all donors in public listings, together with the amount of their contributions.	P	C
9.57	Not supporting the IGF being solely financed by the general UN budget which would alter the multi-stakeholder nature of IGF support.	P	C
9.58	The UN's role should be light-handed and IGF funding should be based on the voluntary contributions of stakeholders.	P	C