Consultations on the convening of the IGF

16 February 2006

Selected EXCERPTS
from the Afternoon Session

F.Muguet V0.1 13 March 2007

10 *Corrected for typos and minor errors.*
*Important statements in **bold**.*
Explanatory notes in italic.
Most upper case letters are removed.

15 Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the 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
20 proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

>>CCBI: ../.. First, for the private sector, **multistakeholder participation on an equal footing is a fundamental principle** that shall guide all aspects of
25 the IGF, including participation, representation, leadership, access, operations, all dimensions. Second, the format for the IGF event should be shaped to meet the clear objective of facilitating the exchange of information, experiences, best practices.
../..On the question that you raised regarding the outcomes of the IGF event,
30 **the tangible outcomes should be neutral summaries of the discussions,** and in addition, we should consider that a real outcome is the actual exchange of information. That is the process of open, interactive multistakeholder exchange and discussion is the outcome in many ways.

35 >>WILLIAM DRAKE: ../..When it says that the IGF is to, and I again quote, facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting

international public policy issues, interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview, facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, strengthen
40   and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, and identify emerging issues and bring them to the attention of relevant bodies, and where appropriate, make recommendations.

../.. I have heard the forum referred to this morning as an "event" or "a meeting," which sounds like a series of one-off sessions that would be held
45   on an annual basis, sort of like the ITU's world telecom forums, with some online dialogue in between. **I've also heard it said that there should not be any subsidiary bodies related to the IGF.** From the beginning, civil society participants have understood this differently. **We have long thought of the**
50   **IGF as a process, not as a series of one-off meetings but as a process that would promote collective dialogue, learning, and mutual understanding on an ongoing basis. The IGF in this formulation would be an umbrella under which various initiatives could be taken on a bottom-up basis by concerned stakeholders.** One possible formulation in
55   that regard would be to create working groups. If there is a set of actors who have a particular interest, they could form a working group. They could have online dialogue amongst themselves. If they had resource and a desire, perhaps they could have an actual face-to-face meeting. And perhaps they would generate some sort of report or text or recommendations which might
60   be brought into the annual large-scale meeting. In that context, I would suggest, for example, and in light of my first point, the possibility of creating a working group on application of the WSIS principles in Internet governance. There are other types of initiatives that one can imagine related to the forum as well, and these are envisioned both in the WGIG report and in the Tunis
65   Agenda. My colleague Wolfgang will mention later, but some of us are planning on forming **an Internet governance research network that would bring together scholars who work in a social science tradition on Internet governance issues,** and perhaps that's something that could plug into this more dynamic, flexible, ongoing process kind of conception of the
70   IGF. I think this is particularly important if **the Secretariat itself does not have an independent research capacity**, somewhere, ideas are going to have to be generated and brought to the table. Otherwise, we're going to have simply, again, a series of sort of one-off meetings with not a lot of

connective tissue and cumulative collective learning. The last points I would simply reiterate, and this is, again, in response, I think, to some of the points that have been made, civil society and the Internet governance caucus has always argued that the Internet Governance Forum ought to be convened under the authority of the U.N. secretary general, and I think that we also believe that it should be coordinated by the United Nations as the appropriate inclusive forum that brings all stakeholders together. ../..

>>MILTON MUELLER: ../.. I want to note that the **Internet governance project issued a paper addressing many of those questions**. That paper is available (*The Distributed Secretariat: Making the Internet Governance Forum Work* .16 May 2006) In general, we proposed **a specific structure with a defined role for a plenary, a program committee or bureau, and a process for recognizing topics, a BOTTOM-UP process for recognizing topics for IGF activities.** We envision, like Mr. Drake, **the IGF as an ongoing process, with annual meetings as simply a capstone.**

>> El Salvador: ../.. We believe that the forum should be a **preparatory body made up of experts similar in that respect to the way other expert groups operate in the area of the environment, human rights, and other areas.** As a form of experts, these would act in their personal capacity, these experts, the governments would appoint the experts to take part, and they would convey the points of view of the governments. Similarly, for the rest of the sectors, organized civil society and private sector and the academic world, et cetera, the same method would be adopted
../.. El Salvador considers that **the forum will need a bureau as well as a Secretariat.** The setup of both should be multistakeholder in nature. For us, the decentralized structure that appears in the Tunis Agenda could refer to the working group that would then report to the forum. **The forum, as a body of experts that generates nonbinding recommendations, should have**

The **the abilcRõger t an**

forum or the merits of the recommendations themselves.

>>SOUTH AFRICA: ../.. I think that in our view, the **roundtable would be something, in a way, based on a model like the world economic forum, but not quite as high level in terms of -- that is, the global, which focuses on CEOs and heads of state. It would be more people who are geared towards -- who have an interest in terms of the Internet governance,** you know, issues that we've been talking about. This would mean that in the end, the plenary session at the IGF would then have the effect of **consolidating the views from the various discussions of the roundtables,** and thereafter, **all countries in attendance would be able to endorse this as the outcome of the meeting.** The subsequent report would be submitted to the SGS, the instructions of the Tunis Agenda, paragraph 75, which, of course, outlines the fact that this is not in any way binding, since there will be a process which would take place as well as outlined in paragraph 61.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: ../.. Such issues need (inaudible) public discussion and should not be discussed in small technical circles or closed governmental negotiations.ssue   scuss.a rmdh   bt

lightweight, dynamic space for dialogue, and that over focus on procedural matters or organizational issues will pull against this, leading those people that you want to engage to disengage.../..

150

>>SENEGAL: ../.. We think the international community must speed up the adoption of that technology and invite migration from IPv4 to IPv6. We believe that the coming of age of IPv6 will give rise to considerable trade stakes, and **we suggest that the WTO become involved in the**

155 **discussions on the Internet Governance Forum.** ../..

>>IZUMI AIZU: ../.. From the multistakeholder perspectives we have been talking about, we like to see this to be one of the main activities of the IGF in making ICANN or ITU or any other bodies to be more open and inclusive to

160 all stakeholders to participate on equal footing. And I emphasize this, on equal footing. It was in Tunis at the very last minute in the negotiations, the participation of all stakeholders on equal footing on certain paragraphs were just deleted without much debate, as I observed. ../.. Finally, in the same spirit, **we have some serious concern about the enhanced cooperation**

165 **process, which might become the old-fashioned way of closed-door in the government negotiation**. If anything is to happen under this enhanced cooperation process, we urge the governments to open the door, allow the participation of all stakeholders in the spirit of multistakeholderism as agreed in tunis, and make relevant bridge between that process and this process at

170 IGF.

>>KAREN BANKS: ../.. But a huge part of this, I think, is capacity building and we had the benefit of several people being together last week at a very useful conference that Diplo organized and emerging from that is a concrete

175 proposal on sort of an Internet Governance capacity building support mechanism for the IGF. And this is building very much on the findings of the louder voices study which came out of the dot Force in 2002. ../.. Just a final note on the bureau Secretariat question. **We don't see a need for a bureau in the context of the WSIS or other U.N. processes. And we feel it raises**

180 **questions of representativity that are very difficult to address in the context and spirit of the IGF and feel more comfortable with a trusted chair, a resource Secretariat, and the support of a multistakeholder program committee advisory group and working groups.**

5

185 >>VITTORIO BERTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to start by the concept that was agreed in Tunis Agenda about forum based on authoritativeness and not on authority. I think this implies that participation and inclusiveness are vital elements to get support and for a forum to be effective. And this leads me to my first very specific point which regards rules

190 for accreditation and participation in the meetings. **I think it is very important that there are no barriers, there are no obstacles for anyone who wants to participate in these meetings. It should be very simple online-based registration system.** In general, you should make it possible for any stakeholder who wants to participate to join the meetings. And this,

195 speaking for what regards civil society, does not just include accredited or established NGOs but also includes informal groups, online campaigns, and even the individual users participating as individuals. And then the most important point I wanted to make I think we all want this forum to have an impact.

200 I think we want this forum to be able to solve issues; otherwise, it will be useless. And so I would like to reiterate **the idea that the IGF should be seen as a process and not as an event**, and the reason is clear. I think that -- I mean, can you solve issues by meeting once a year for three days, maybe discussing 10 or 15 different issues, maybe in a room filled up by 500

205 people? I think it's clear that you can't. And so **if you want to change the Internet, I think you need to do it the Internet way.** You need to encompass the flow of spontaneous initiatives that are born every day on the Internet to solve the issues about which all the users of the Internet care. And so, my proposal, you need working groups. You need to have open, online

210 collaborative initiatives that are started by the people who care. So all stakeholders that care about the specific issue can gather and form an online discussion forum and start to discuss and build consensus and actually work out best practices and recommendations. **And then at the same time, I think you need some coordination among all these different working**

215 **groups. And this is why I think you also need a steering group. Not a bureau, but a steering group that can advance the work and oversee the advancement of this work, can adopt the documents and the recommendations that are prepared and agreed by the different working groups, and also can take care, of course, of the program of**

220 **the meeting.** And I think this should be a sort of moral leader of this entire

6

process, a group of people coming from all the different stakeholders that are spears in their individual capacities, that   are broadly respected and are especially open minded. And possibly, these people should be self-selected by the different constituencies and stakeholder groups. But perhaps just to
225   advance the work at an interim stage, I would   suggest that they are appointed by the secretary general. ../..

>>FRANCIS MUGUET: ../.. It is striking to note, almost schizophrenic, in fact, that most of the questions concerning the net itself, which went before
230   the Internet, or, rather, after the Internet, are ignored unknown. So I'd like to cite a few examples, very simple examples, which are very important, for example, perhaps the audience doesn't know that Microsoft, with its Internet Explorer browser, decided not to respect the HTML specifications, the Acid2 (*Acid2 Browser Test*) for navigators, which means that many producers of
235   Web sites have to write two versions. Well, that's an extremely important issue, because this is the Net (*in practice*). On the other hand, there are questions, for example, digital object identifiers and also there are problems of P2P, and there are search engines. All of this is completely ignored. ../.. I would suggest that **it (IGF) should be structured with a specific unit**
240   **dedicated to the study of emerging technologies which are building the Internet of tomorrow, which will soon be today's Internet.** The reason is to have a more serene atmosphere to get away from political debates. Who would be in this unit, this scientific unit, devoted to the future of the Internet? From civil society, I think it should be scientists and free software developers.
245   Now, on the practical level, this unit should have the moral authority, mandate, and also the financial resources to bring experts in, because if experts don't come in, there won't be any constructive opinions, and also, another important thing, the representatives of the unit should be able to attend scientific events concerning the Internet, and also events organized
250   by the software makers concerning the Internet. **Because it may seem incredible, but those who are building tomorrow's Internet are not at all involved in this forum here,   and vice versa.** In the conferences concerning the web, for example, we don't talk about governance at all. So there is a problem. We have to over-- to cross the gap between two worlds,
255   and towards that goal, to ensure that this forum on Internet governance should have a particular (*scientific*) unit. This (*scientific*) unit should also report in the simplest possible language to everyone who is not an expert, in

other words, all the stakeholders, governments, civil society, and small businesses. So they should be aware of the problems before the problems

260 arrive, and that it should be a tool to lead to a constructive and inclusive debate at the world level. In addition, it is unrealistic for complex subjects to be evaluated in only three days. So these three days of events are events which summarize these discussions and the dialogue, both among the experts and among the public. And, in addition, **it would be pointless for**

265 **this meeting not to end in recommendations at the political and technical levels, because, otherwise, if it's simply to have a summary of the discussions, it's difficult to see how useful this forum would be**.

>>FEDERATION FOR FREE INFORMATION: ../.. Also, all decision-making

270 processes must have genuine transparency. That is also an essential element of integrity. On the other hand, if we claim that this forum is democratic, then we have higher standards to be met, which involve that, for example, every controversial decision could be challenged to a voting. And then you have to have a voting procedure which is really representative of

275 the wide variety of stakeholder interests so that you don't have rich companies sending just 100 delegates to get 100 votes. **An alternative to this difficult thing of democracy would be what Australia has proposed in their written proposal, that ISOC could be entrusted with running the Internet Governance Forum.** I believe ISOC has earned this trust. But, of

280 course, ISOC would need to get funding for this work, for example, from the United Nations budget or from other donors which would not attach any strings to the money. So my conclusion is, either let's have genuine democracy or some other way of ensuring at least integrity. Any steering group or Secretariat should be lightweight enough so that you can observe

285 its decision-making processes to make sure that they are at least with a reasonable standard of integrity. ../..

>> Danish institute for human rights:../..My name is Rikke Frank Jorgensen.../.. **How do we transform them into concrete policy**

290 **recommendations which protect and uphold and respect these standards? And this work should, of course, involve the relevant U.N. bodies, not least, the U.N. high commissioner for human rights.**
../.. To evaluate its compliance with human rights privacy standards and data protection guidelines. And this work would involve the global network of

295 privacy commissioners and could feed into the ongoing considerations in other fora for international legal standards in the privacy field.

>>MEDEF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Catherine Gabay speaking. I speak on behalf of MEDEF, it's a French business confederation.../.. I wanted to
300 emphasize on the need for the IGF to be fully multistakeholder and to emphasize, of course, on the fact that businesses must have their own place in this process. **MEDEF also thinks that links to the U.N. should be kept at minimum for the IGF.** As we can only dedicate limited resources, businesses can only dedicate limited resources to all the different
305 organizations and forums on ICT, we would favor only meeting per year two to three days at most.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me first briefly introduce myself. My name is Roelof Meijer. I am the CEO of **SIDN,** the registry for .NL. We have 1.8
310 million registered domain names. We are the fourth ranking ccTLD in the world. We have about 2,000 registrars. And while I cannot say that I speak on behalf of all of them, I'm sure I speak on behalf of quite a few of them. ../.. **The IGF should have a structure that is lightweight, flexible, consists of professionals, and thereby is effective and efficient**. The rules under
315 which the IGF should operate should accommodate those two points I made before. And therefore **I think that the applicability of U.N. rules is questionable, to say the least.** I feel the IGF should not contemplate technical issues, but should focus on end user issues, topics, thereby, that merit coordinated global attention. ../.. but in fact the **main objective should**
320 **be clear-cut proposals and recommendations for improvement or further development of the Internet in general and Internet Governance in particular**.

325 >>IRAN: ../.. I have a very specific question which I think answering to that question might be informative, too. I see in paragraph 75 of the Tunis outcome that U.N. secretary-general, I think in this case it would be through you, would report to you and member states periodically on the operation of the forum. And then at the end, in 76, we ask ==the U.N. secretary-general to==
330 ==examine the desirability of the continuation of the forum in formal consultation== ==with forum participants within five years== of its creation and **to make**

recommendation to the U.N. membership in this regard. I would like to ask clarification. I think **this is very important to know that who is this membership, U.N. membership. Is this general assembly to which we**

335 **would give our input? Do we get any feedback from them**, or it is only a forum for being a forum, for the sake of a forum? **If we think that it's only a forum for the sake of a forum, then I think we are just engaging in a, let's say, no matter we are pro choice or pro life, but we are engaging in an abortive process. At the end of the day, i think we would be left with no**

340 **decision and no, let's say, decisive and conclusive decision and outcome.** So this is very important how we construe and interpret these two paragraphs. That U.N. membership to which you would report and to which you will ask or recommend desirability, who is this U.N. recommendation? and on the basis of your recommendation, they are supposed to decide. So at

345 the end of the day and at the end of the tunnel we are seeing the U.N. membership as the one who will decide. So I think these can, in a way, interpret what kind of roles governments will play in this forum, specifically with regard to what I said as developing countries are concerned. Their concerns have already been partly reflected in the statement of G77. ../..

350

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. On your last point which has been raised for the first time, my understanding of that would be that the -- **there is a reporting process specified for the whole summit to the ECOSOC** and the G.A. For the whole summit, there is a reporting process which has been

355 specified. And I resume what you are referring to in paragraphs 75, 76 would follow the same structure. That's my understanding of that particular provision.

>>BRET FAUSETT: ../..You also asked should the IGF have a perpetual

360 virtual meeting online and what sorts of virtual forums should the IGF create to enable   participation?   Yes, the IGF should always be open for contributions and always be open for discussion of the issues affecting Internet users. Interested persons should able to contribute on their own time and in their own language. To manage this process, **I would like to**

365 **recommend that you appoint Internet rapporteurs or list managers to manage and steer the online discussions so they   move forward productively. Unmanaged, open forums unread by the leadership of the IGF can quickly become black holes for public comment, creating the**

illusion of participation while providing no meaningful access to the IGF. These rapporteurs who would work with the Secretariat would participate in the online forums and help define areas of consensus and highlight areas of disagreement for further work or discussion. ../..

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: ../.. I would like to focus on the recently held international conference on Internet Governance. It was held in malta between 10 and 12 of February, attended by 80 participants representing various stakeholders. ../.. One of the important element in Malta discussion was that procedural solution and organization solution should be very flexible. One procedural solution cannot fit all needs and issues. Therefore, it was stressed that procedures and working matters should be adjusted to concrete issues as much as it is possible, as organizational structure allows. ../.. It was mentioned that we can learn a lot from OECD, global knowledge partnership, IETF, and other initiatives in the field of international cooperation. ../.. **But there is a considerable difference between availability of online tools and their integration in working procedures.** There is a gap that should be bridged in order to have proper integration of those online tools. It was obvious that, for example, civil society is much more familiar than other stakeholders in using online tools, and we are not referring here purely to the skills how to use WIKI or discussion forum. The skill level is almost established by all stakeholders and participants. The main challenge will be, and probably the main inhibition by other stakeholders, like government representatives, is to create the proper working environment for the -- considering online contributions. **It includes the question of the status of online contributions and follow-up to each online contribution.** ../..

>>CHINA: ../.. China will look at paragraph 29 to 82, together, in the Tunis Agenda, because especially there's enhanced cooperation and the forum, we think there is some kind of interlinkage between these two very important aspects of Internet governance, enhanced cooperation and the forum. But as we are talking about the forum here today, we will look at paragraph 72 to 82 together, because paragraph 72 to 82 give us a clear picture that the summit asked the secretary general to set up a forum. Of course, the forum automatically will report to the secretary general. Or the outcome of the forum will come to the secretary general's office. Then the secretary general will report to the member states of the U.N. ../.. For the first mea

now we have a Secretariat, there is an interim Secretariat, headed by -- I suppose, by Mr. Kummer. And now we have a host, which is our generous offer by the Greek government. But there is still something lacking, that is, the bureau, which also in the Tunis Agenda. And I think that we should start right away the   organization of this forum. Of course, we have a lot of valuable points this morning and this afternoon. But I really would like to listen more about the   practical arrangement for the forum. Because all of these substantive – spam, cybercrime, security, I think these will be discussed by the forum rather than here in these informal consultations. So at the moment, I think we should focus on the arrangement of the structure or organizational work of this forum. And to me, I think at this moment, **the bureau or the steering committee is something very essential, because wg et**