

Consultations on the convening of the IGF

16 February 2006

Selected EXCERPTS from the Morning Session

F.Muguet V0.1 13 March 2007

Corrected for typos and minor errors.

10 *Important statements in **bold**.*

Explanatory notes in italic.

Most upper case letters are removed.

Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the
15 Consultations on the Convening of the Internet Governance Forum, in
Geneva on 16-17 February in Geneva, Switzerland. Although it is largely
accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible
passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the
proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative
20 record.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: ../..

Because, essentially, my job is as a messenger, a messenger to convey to
the secretary general what views and sentiments here are. So I will try and
25 give you a sense towards the end of the session tomorrow evening on what
the messages that I think I have received from listening to people here. This
is the process that I hope that we will be able to follow.

../..

>>AUSTRIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking on
30 behalf of the European Union and the acceding countries Bulgarian and
Romania. ../.. For the preparation and support of the IGF, the E.U. submits
that **it would be necessary to have in line with the Tunis Agenda both a
representative multistakeholder steering committee and a Secretariat
which is small and cost-effective.**

35

>> BRAZIL: ../.. The most important question to the international community is face -- that the international community is facing nowadays, and that is why we decided to create a forum to discuss it, is that due to a lack of any obvious international organization to deal with Internet public policy issues, a number of entities which should ideally be only in charge of the technical management of the day-to-day operation of the Internet are pushed to fill the void and take political, which is public policy decisions.

45 Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to quote paragraph 60 of the Tunis Agenda, quote: We further recognize that there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms. Unquote. In a nutshell, what we are trying to say is, technical bodies are deciding upon public policy issues. This awkward situation cannot go on forever without causing serious trouble and, as we have said before, things that cannot go on forever don't.

Mr. Chairman, the root of the problem is the absence of an appropriate international treaty. That is why Brazil favors the Internet Governance Forum should be the locus to discuss the willingness by the international community at large -- and I emphasize again, at large -- **to create the necessary international applicable legal framework for Internet-related public policy issues.** Therefore, at Athens -- and I shall emphasize that my government is very much grateful to the Greek government for hosting the first IGF meeting -- we have an excellent **opportunity to initiate negotiations on a framework treaty to deal with international Internet public policy issues.**

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: ../.. The United States believes that the Internet Governance Forum should be a truly multistakeholder event. Therefore, **it is important that it not be encumbered by extensive, existing United Nations processes and procedures.** Attendance and participation in the forum should be open to a broad array of stakeholders including governments, business entities, civil society, scientists, and intergovernmental organizations. to facilitate broad participation in the event. Finally, **a multistakeholder bureau will be extremely important to act as a program committee and to offer input as to discussion topics, speakers, and format.** The promise of the Internet Governance Forum, an open and

inclusive dialogue amongst all stakeholders of the international Internet
75 community, **to discuss critical issues concerning the future of the Internet**, is viewed by the United States as a positive development.

../..

>>CANADA: ../.. As for the agenda of the IGF, at least for the first few
meetings, Canada believes it is essential to concentrate on issues where
80 positive outcome can be anticipated rather than those issues known to be
divisive.

>>UNESCO: ../.. Discussion should result in complete recommendations to
relevant stakeholders. The structure of the IGF could build on the
experiences of the working Group on Internet Governance, particularly as
85 regards the participation of stakeholders on a need for full (inaudible). For
more focused approach the IGF may decide to establish subgroups on
special issues as identified on the report of the Working Group on Internet
Governance, drawing on expertise of the academic, scientific and technical
communities. Here again, the multistakeholder approach should be fully
90 respected. IGF meetings should be organized once a year. The preparation
of and follow-up of the meetings should make maximum use of electronic
working methods. IGF meetings should be prepared by a preparatory
committee or **bureau** which comprises representatives from all stakeholders.

Furthermore, this body should ensure the facilitation of transparent
95 decision-making and promotion of dialogue. **An independent Secretariat
with a light structure, possibly under the auspices of the United Nations
could carry out the necessary organizational tasks.**

../.. But as Internet Governance will be discussed in an environment
characterized by very rapid changes and new issues may emerge, **the IGF**
100 **bureau (inaudible) committee should have the authority to modify the
sequence of work.**

CCBI : ../.. Four, supporting the IGF. Lastly, on matters supporting the IGF,
we see a **fully multistakeholder bureau taking any and all operational**
105 **and program decisions by consensus, in consultation with all
stakeholder groups regarding the IGF.**

The host would take the logistical decisions necessary on the ground
and a Secretariat in cooperation with those providing logistical support should
put the operational decisions of the bureau into practice and facilitate the
110 participation of all stakeholders. The topic identified for an IGF event should

be agreed upon by consensus among the stakeholders. A bureau that is in fact multistakeholder with all on an equal footing as discussed earlier.

115 >>SWITZERLAND: ../.. With regard to structures, Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated by a number of speakers already, we think the Secretariat should be independent and light in weight. In this regard, I would also stress that **Switzerland would be prepared to contribute substantively if the Secretariat were to be set up in Geneva. It is also important for us to have not a rigid bureau under the U.N. system, but, rather, a steering committee with the participation of all those involved, in other words, governments, but also civil society, the private sector, and international organizations.**

../..

125 >>JAPAN: ../.. Thirdly, any private sector-held forums that satisfy the criteria indicated in paragraph 72 and 77 of the Tunis Agenda should be regarded as candidates for **additional joint IGF meetings** in addition to a forum that the United Nations secretary general convenes. In order to discuss the diversity of Internet issues, the utilization of these forums should be taken into consideration to incorporate a broad range of professional opinions. And
130 lastly, a substantive priority issue, Japan believes that the discussion at IGF should be broad and inclusive, as paragraph 58 of the Tunis Agenda states, namely, much broader than Internet naming and addressing, and inclusive of other significant public policy issues. In addition, **we find it's important for the IGF to identify emerging issues, as stated in paragraph 72 (G) of**
135 Tunis Agenda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> ISOC Argentina: ../.. I am also involved in the ICANN at-large advisory committee. I am talking in my individual capacity../.. **In this regard, WSIS rules of procedures should not be considered as a starting point. These**
140 **rules were tailored for a different kind of forum and are not treatable for a much broader, inclusive policy dialogue. The nature of the IGF is different than WSIS, and hence this should be reflected in the rules.** There are many examples of how the WSIS strict rules will undermine the results of the IGF. The input received by a large group of stakeholders was
145 limited to the observer role they have had during WSIS. Some of these stakeholders were very representative of the Internet community, and even when the Tunis Agenda recognized the importance of their ongoing roles in

coordinating technical matters, and their expertise, the process did not recognize them as a (inaudible) GENEROUS stakeholder, and did not allocate a specific time to hear and consider their thoughts on the different matters. Fortunately, members of the civil society and the private sector were kind enough to donate some of their scarce time for this proposal on that opportunity. There were also many organizations a member of the civil society that were precluded because of the rules. Just as an example, the first hours of the last PrepCom here in Geneva were used to discuss the situation of an organization that was excluded because they refused to declare their funding sources. This example shows some of the reason why we should not use the U.N. procedures rules beyond the multilingual capacities. A much higher degree of flexibility is desired to promote an open and inclusive, multistakeholder dialogue. **These consultations of the convening for the IETF provide a good example of how a multistakeholder forum should be put in place.** The openness and inclusiveness on the process should also be a guideline when considering the mechanism of participation. Physical presence exclude many stakeholders, especially those coming from less-developed countries. This is why we ought to ensure mechanism of remote participation, namely, online discussion forums, E-mail discussion list, WIKIS, Web casts, just to name a few. Physical presence should not be a requirement to fully participate in the different debates that may arise in the forum. IGF meetings should be done mainly through Internet-based mechanism and only one yearly meeting. This meeting shouldn't take more than three or four working days to cope with financial constraints and assure broad participation. It will be also important to promote some financing mechanisms to ensure participation of those who are in a disadvantaged position, an example, those who come from less-developed countries.

../..

>>CONGO: ../.. So at the same time, need to see that **the rules and procedures will be as flexible as possible**, and we'll take on this, what we had already here, in the same way as it has been applied here for this consultation. And I think **the IGF forum should not duplicate in general the whole Tunis agenda**, but should really focus on the Internet issues, and we have heard many of them which are vital. But at the same time, I would like to see that the **Internet Governance Forum has the linkages and has the synergies with all other mechanisms for follow-up, including the**

185 **mechanism of the commission** (*ie CSTD*), including what will happen in other areas; that it will benefit from all the thinking and from all the input from all areas.

>>AUSTRALIA: ../.. From Australia's perspective, these include open and ongoing consultation like that we are currently engaged in on crucial issues; a strong preference for the IGF to be run as a multistakeholder entity by a competent multistakeholder organization or consortium; an IGF Secretariat and advisory group being multistakeholder; accreditation and procedural rules that support inclusiveness, openness and equal participation; active promotion of the IGF and its relevance, particularly to developing countries and the use of ICTs to the maximum extent to maximize access and engagement.

The second principle that Australia would like to emphasize is that the IGF as a whole should be lightweight and cost effective. As many have noted, financial and other resources are limited and we all have competing priorities. In interprets of the IGF's design, this suggestion a relatively flat structure without a proliferation of subgroups and subcommittees, relatively short, focused annual meetings, **possibly back-to-back with related events**, both intergovernmental and private sector or civil society.

../.. From a broader perspective it's suggested that IGF discussions should be nonduplicative and should be productive and this leads us to our final theme, the aims of the IGF. Australia considers the IGF can make a valuable contribution to the development of the Internet but this opportunity may be squandered if discussion is too abstract and diffuse. We may end up with a set of fine principles but of little practical value to stakeholders, everyday users of the Internet and world communities, particularly in developing countries. **The IGF must consciously aim to produce in relevant time frames substantive outputs that are of real practical value.** In terms of its design, Australia therefore considers that the IGF should have its procedural and organizational structures decided before the first meeting.

IGTF: Thank you, chairman Desai. Also, I REALLY appreciate this opportunity given again, and maybe again and again, to continue our dialogue. I'm here not on behalf of the IGTF, but I am a member of the IGTF as well. That's Internet Governance task force of Japan, but I am also a member of ICANN's At-Large Advisory Committee for more than three years, and also a member

of the CIVIL SOCIETY INTERNET GOVERNANCE FOCUS, but this is simply my personal observational comment or contribution. ../.. But practicing or implementing the true multistakeholder approach is not an easy thing. As a member of ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee which is trying to bring the individual user's voices to the ICANN'S public policy development process, that was not an easy task. ICANN has been trying to be a multistakeholder organization, and it is more so, I can testify, than most international bodies or so far as we know of. But still, there are good challenges. Most governments in the advisory committee at ICANN, the GAC, and At-Large Advisory Committee again, it's an advisory committee, ALAC, have not been given equal footing on the decision-making process. Again, there are good reasons, perhaps, for this framework, but I would ask you to seriously consider what is the best modality or the mode of the multistakeholder approach in this Internet Governance Forum.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: ../.. Quite a few people mentioned the importance of having a multistakeholder group to direct the work, to organize the work, if you like. The terminology used varied. Some people called it a program committee, some called it a steering group, some called it a bureau, but everybody said something like this is required. ../..

How will we constitute such a multistakeholder bureau. when we constitute a group such as this, there are certain well-established proceedings we can follow in terms of representation on an equal basis from all regions and so on. We don't have proceedings in the case of this, and I invite your thoughts and reflections; if necessary, In a thinking aloud, which is how could we do this, what are the categories that we would have, who would name the members of the (inaudible).

In the case of the member states, there's a very simple process we have in the U.N. which is easy to use, which is you simply turn to the regional groups and say that we need two names from that regional group and they have their own process, and say these other two names. Now, how do we follow -- what's the process that can be followed for the others? Is there perhaps a distinction between the way the first group of direction gets constituted and the subsequent ones? In a sense, a problem in the first one is we have no starting point. **We have nobody to whom we can pass the responsibility and say please a constitute a bureau because WE HAVE NOT HAD A MEETING. SO MAYBE THE PROBLEM IS LESS**

**AFTER THE FIRST MEETING. BUT please give A LITTLE thought and
260 reflection to this and come up and see what sort of suggestions you
have.**

265

270

275

280