

V1.2

Francis Muguet

IGF Open Consultations
24 February 2009
Geneva

IGF PROCEDURE PROPOSAL

I am the IGF focal point of the Linguistic Diversity Dynamic Coalition, and chair, co-chair, webmaster of various WSIS working groups that are still active to various extent.

I am speaking in my personal capacity.

I am going to be brutally honest in my assessment and then propose a pragmatic solution.

While being supported by the majority of its participants, the IGF process is nevertheless in a difficult position, because its usefulness is criticized from two parties. From one side, there are stakeholders, that are more in favor of an intergovernmental process because they feel that there is a lack of output, in particular in terms of recommendations. On the other side, there are stakeholders who perceive the IGF as annoyance that could be avoided, and would be glad to revert to the old ways before the WSIS. Both sides, could, from outside the IGF process, at the CSTD level, the ECOSOC level, impose an external review.

According to the Tunis Agenda :

76. We ask the UN Secretary-General to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in formal consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and to make recommendations to the UN Membership in this regard.

I agree with Markus Kummer that normally all review processes are performed by people that are not stakeholders directly involved in the activity under review. Even a "internal review" means usually review by people in the same organization, with no outsiders, but not by the very people involved in the activity.

Whatever the type of review, it is unavoidable that the extent to which each point of the mandate is going to be precisely assessed. It is clear also the review report is going to be the basis of the recommendations of the UN Secretary General is going to send, along with the review report, to the UN general assembly who is going to have the final say.

Let us examine briefly the Tunis agenda and assess the progress that have been made.
Concerning IGF organization :

78. The UN Secretary-General should extend invitations to all stakeholders and relevant parti
2. establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau to support the IGF,
not fulfilled, no bureau has been established,

Concerning the IGF mandate

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:

5. *Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.*

Not fulfilled. There is no advisory document in the name of IGF, or from the IGF, on this topic

7. *Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.*

The point is not fulfilled at all.

9. *Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.*

Not fulfilled. There is no assessment document in the name of IGF on this topic

10. *Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.*

12. *Publish its proceedings*

OK, fulfilled partially, Are transcripts proceedings ?

It might be supplemented by a scientific proceeding (it is suggested a special issue of [Future Internet](#) (ISSN 1999-5903), a new open access journal where contributions are formatted in terms of papers.).

Personally I see that the unfulfillment of articles 5, 7 and 9 of the mandate is linked to the lack of establishment of a bureau. Since there is no bureau no rules of procedures can be determined so that no documents , statements, recommendations can be produced in the name of the IGF. It appeared to me, for a long time, as a stalemate without solution. .

At the end of the Hyderabad meeting, I envisioned a way that could offer a pragmatic compromise with the help of the Dynamic Coalitions, a completely unexpected concept that arose during the IGF .and I am developing further this idea now

Considering key article 7 :

Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public,

It could be considered that the creation of Dynamic Coalition on some issues pertains to the task of identifying emerging issues. (emerging : that emerge from the debate to differentiate from emergent issues, meaning new, novel topics) . By facilitating the creation of Dynamic Coalitions recognized by the secretariat and listed on the IGF web site, the IGF has fulfilled its mandate in Identifying emerging issues. The dynamic coalitions are effectively bringing the issues to *the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public*. So this works.

and, where appropriate, make recommendations.

following this line of reasoning, it is the dynamic coalitions that are making recommendations. The set of the DC recommendations is regrouped in one document entitled : Recommendations at the IGF. The **at** is put in bold instead of **of** to make it clear that it is the recommendations made by the IGF entities that have been recognized by the IGF as dealing with emerging issues. The Recommendation at the IGF does not have to be in agreement with one another, depending on each DC approach.

In addition The MAG could held sessions dedicated to the agreement of DCs, and those sessions be called Bureau session, since in some sense, there are dealing with procedural issues that may lead to recommendation **at** the IGF.

5. *Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.*

may be fulfilled by asking DC to producing advisory documents for this topic.

Similarly, the set of advices of each DC could be regrouped in a document called :

Advices at the IGF concerning ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.

and also

9. *Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.*

may be fulfilled by asking DC to producing promotion and assessment documents for this topic. Similarly, the set of documents of each DC be regrouped in one general document called :

Assessment at the IGF concerning the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes..

and in this way the IGF could be considered as having fulfilled its entire mandate.

The IGF process has not lived up to the expectations of many, but also to the fears of many... Its role is crucial, and the IGF must be continued.

Now considering the consultations process since the DC are playing a formal role in the IGF, the formal consultation with Forum participants could be conducted, possibly partially, through the dynamic coalitions.

In this way, we have a legal and political coherence both for the implementation of the mandate and the consultation.