Consultations on the convening of the IGF

19 May 2006

F.Muguet V0.1 18 March 2007

Corrected for typos and minor errors.
*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 Consultations on the Convening of the Internet Governance Forum, in Geneva on 19 May 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 record.

>>DAVID WOOD: George, you -- we were talking earlier about using the means of the Internet to make the conference work smoothly. And our chairman mentioned that he'd been at a meeting in London where delegates were able to add contributions to a blog, and people outside were able to add their blogs. There is actually an even more powerful tool than that called a **WIKI,** W-I-K-I, which allows comments on a document. So, I mean, I don't know what the -- what it would be like if there were 800 comments on a document, one would have to think about that. There are tools out there that would help to make this not just a discussion about Internet, but using it.
../..
>>WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Wolfgang Kleinwaechter. I am a professor from the University of Aarhus and I speak here on behalf of the civil society Internet Governance Caucus. ../.. As you remember, the Tunis summit has decided that the IGF should continue at least until 2010. As you have said this morning, Mr. Chairman, the whole IGF

process is an experiment. We are entering new territory. This is a chance to invent something which is really new and can produce extra innovative value. The first forum is indeed of special importance because the way the first
40   forum is organized will determine to a high degree how we process from essence to real into the forthcoming forums until 2010. As I said already, the Internet Governance Caucus sees the IGF as a process. We have the annual forums are highlights, but **a lot of work has to be done also between the forums.**
45   ../.. And fifth, we want to see also some outcomes. The IGF has, as we know, no decision-making capacity, but **it should be more than a talking shop**. **If good ideas and strong arguments are produced** during the forum and will find its **way into recommendations, relevant bodies will take this into consideration when they make decisions.** And through the process
50   stimulated by the IGF, will have a concrete and pratical effect. Furthermore, the detailed preparation of the IGF itself is of crucial importance. The IGF advisory group will have on Monday and Tuesday two days to discuss it. The Internet Governance Caucus proposes that the advisory group should consider methods like open call for papers or **building expert groups** to
55   prepare in details be, individual plenaries and workshops. Good preparation will decide to a high degree **whether the Athens meeting will become a success or an outstanding success**. Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me inform you also about an initiative a large number of members of the international research and academic community has undertaken in the last month. There is
60   a project now under discussion to form a **<u>global Internet Governance academic network</u>. The acronym would be GIGANET, to bring researchers from all over the world together into a process of enhanced communication.** So far, more than 40 academic institutions from all over the world are included in this initiative. **The GIGANET could become a partner**
65   **of the IGF.** ../..

>>INDIA: ../.. the IGF must also be a platform to foster capacity building. Can we think of keeping this institutional platform within the site of our mandate? That, as my worthy predecessor speaker, when you said that it will ensure
70   outcomes, this will be a way to attract the universities and our Indian institutions to be present in Athens. Judging from the way Greece has been making preparations, I thought that this would be an opportunity to **also offer for the <u>2008 Internet Governance Forum India's</u> position** so we can start

preparing for that.

75 >> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Are you **proposing to host the 2008**?

>>INDIA: **Yes**, Mr. Chairman. [Applause]

>>FRANCIS MUGUET: ../.. So for the IGF, we will recommend that in the first phase there will be mapping of the governance issue and also of the relevant

80 governance bodies. It is important to have both. Second, it will be interesting to **map and to identify the emerging issues, because considering emerging issues, the IGF may make a recommendation. Concerning** what could be identified as **current issues, we suggest that the IGF, with inspiration from the best practice of existing Internet Governances, to**

85 **use the format of** request for comments **as a way to formalize and gather in in fact the different advices on different issues**. ../..

>>ABDULLAH DAFTARDAR: (Saudi Arabia) : ../.. the IGF is a forum for multistakeholder policy dialogue. With this understanding, **the forum will**

90 **generate recommendations to issues related to Internet Governance**. And as you indicated, **these recommendations will be taken forward and followed up by specialized entities or interest groups. Public policy Internet Governance related issues need to be handled by the enhanced cooperation process to be started by the U.N. secretary-general** as

95 stated in the Tunis Agenda and as indicated by the distinguished delegate from Brazil. **It is very important that the enhanced cooperation will proceed as a parallel process in the IGF preparation.** The second point is with regards to the coming – to coming with concrete proposals out of the IGF, **it would be practically not possible to both discuss topics and**

100 **come to reasonable conclusions in the same meeting. We therefore recommend that the topics be put forward for discussion prior to the meeting itself, and a mechanism be established to allow initial discussions to prepare for the meeting. The results of these discussions should be published electronically for everybody's preparation.** The IGF

105 meeting will be used to present the various views, further discussions and conclusions on these issues. Topics put forward need to be classified in related areas, as suggested by the Russian delegations.

>>HONDURAS: ../.. Concerning the theme here, let me remind you that in

3

110 previous months the Greek delegation exchanged opinions with the heads of G77 in different meetings, and at that time, in order to have this orientation for development and the participatory elements here emphasized, they agreed to set up the appropriate machinery. At that time, **the Greek delegation talked about looking at innovative financial mechanisms that would provide an**
115 **opportunity for participation of experts from developing countries, especially those that have been following this process from the outset here in Geneva**. This was one of the issues that we emphasized should be reflected in the documents. That is, that this process be seen as an inclusive one, open to all. Now, I don't know if I heard incorrectly, but up to now, we
120 haven't heard talk of any new financial mechanism here. This is something that was mentioned but hasn't been concretely discussed, and I think it's high time to do so. Because if we want this process in IGF to be successful, we need the participation of all. So let me make a direct question to the Greek delegation on this aspect of things, because at one time, they did mention
125 this, but we haven't heard talk of this innovative financial mechanism since then.

>>AUSTRIA: ../.. Several participants made reference to the so-called process towards enhanced cooperation during our debate. The E.U. attaches
130 great importance towards enhanced cooperation. We have recently written a letter to you, Mr. Chairman, on this issue, inviting you to explain how you intend to start the process. Let me recall, and this has been stated by several participants, that **the IGF is one track of implementation of the Tunis Agenda**, whereas **the process towards enhanced cooperation**
135 **constitutes another track, and should thus be treated separately.**

>>BRAZIL: ../.. When Brazil made an intervention this morning about the **enhanced cooperation,** our idea is very similar to the one the E.U. just introduced. We think that **we have two tracks, and that they are separate**.
140 And one is going on right now. The second one we are waiting for the secretary general for the United Nations to give the start. ../.. . The first one, the one on behave of the civil society made by Mr. Kleinwaechter – I never know how to pronounce exactly your name. Yes, Kleinwachter. Yes. I would like to support on behalf of the Brazilian delegation **each and every word**
145 **said by the representative of the civil society**. That is exactly what we think about and we would like **to support wholeheartedly this intervention.**

On the second point, on Honduras, the intervention from Honduras is very similar to what the Latin American group thinks. And maybe -- I'm going to give an idea, because if it works, we can use also in Brazil and now in India

150 as we are going from her to New Delhi. We could think about that **the Greek government could set up a trust fund**, you open a bank account, and then we receive donations from various entities. With these donations, and you have the list of participants asking to be there, there could be a committee deciding which one will get the committee, the ticket, the per diem to go there.

155 If it works, we can transfer trust fund to Brazil for one year and then transfer it to India the next year. And then we keep -- we have a sort of fund, trust fund, to receive donations. And then we can help developing countries to do that. I can say that from Brazil, we are not going to ask money from this trust fund. Our government is going to pay the tickets and per diem for a representative

160 of the government, and **we have our own trust fund to pay for civil society in Brazil**.

>>EGYPT: ../.. And it seems that when we approach this issue, we almost look at it as if the structure is a neutral -- is a neutral dimension or a neutral

165 aspect. It is not necessarily so. For example, if we choose to have parallel working groups in the IGF meeting itself in Athens, that, superficially, looks to be a neutral decision, a neutral criteria. It's just an architecture, a structure. Whereas in reality, it means that it immediately favors those delegations that have the capacity and the capability to have more than one representative,

170 and therefore to participate in more than one meeting at the same time. Now, I'm putting this as a challenge, I'm not putting it as an implicitly or intrinsically negative point, but any structure we adopt we must take into consideration that some delegations and some countries never going to be able to be there with the level of participation and the number of participants that would allow

175 it to contribute at least equally to all mechanisms. And hence we really need to avoid parallelism, if there's such a term, **we need to avoid overcrowded agenda as much as possible in order to allow developing countries to participate meaningfully.**../..Our understanding, in a totally, I think, clear manner, was that many -- and you referred to that, Mr. Chairman, in the last

180 consultations, that many of the positive U.N. practices are going to be transported into the U.N. Internet Governance. ../..

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: ../.. So I would urge you to remember that we are not

discussing another U.N. meeting where we can talk of a budget, we can talk
185 of U.N. rules of procedure, et cetera. We have to find ways ../.. Because this
is not something which has been given any sort of budget in the U.N. system.
And it is not a U.N. meeting in that sense. So one of the things we will have to
discuss is, how do we use -- in a sense, we are being given these facilities
because they're available.

190

>>EGYPT: ../.. Mr. Chairman, I just meant to clarify what I said. When I
mentioned the U.N. IGF, it's basically because the letterhead that Mr.
Kummer corresponds to us says United Nations, and down there IGF. I do not
mean it's a U.N. meeting. I was simply being accurate to quote the letterhead
195 that we do receive from the secretariat. ../..

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: ../.. Just a contribution based on the fact
that all actors, more or less, seem to agree on the fact that the IGF itself is a
process. ../.. One of the fears in terms of capacity building is for who actors
200 not familiar with some issue to be deluged with a lot of very interesting
contributions but that are very long to read. The item is to provide a
substantive secretarial function that can be distributed, as John
Mathiason and the IG project suggested, so that a few basic papers could
help people get faster into the subject so no time is wasted at the beginning in
205 lengthy presentations ../.. **One of the main question of the IGF is how it
will help organize the work afterwards on the given set of issues.** In this
respect, there are **differing possibilities**. The outcome can be that simply
**the actors who already are working separately on this just meet again
on their own basis. Or** it can be that a **special working group is formed
210 on a given issue. Or** it can be that **the <u>discussion over drafting of a
recommendation is being prepared.</u>** On each of the four themes the
outcomes might be different, and in that respect, the discussion at the IGF
should probably more focus on how to move forward in terms of process than
on dealing with the nitty-gritty details of each substantive issue which could
215 last for a long time. And the last point is, as a consequence, according to the
mandates of the IGF itself, which is paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, **the
IGF has <u>several roles depending on the different issues</u>. It <u>can make
recommendations for emerging issues</u>. It can facilitate dialogue with
different actors.** And the consequence is that the outcome of the IGF in
220 Athens will probably be different on the four main themes that might emerge,

or three to five main themes that might emerge. ../..

>>FRANCIS MUGUET: Yes, I would like to add some comments after the eloquent speech by Egypt and also the remark of Bertrand De La Chapelle. I think that there should be at least **two groups**, **one related to emerging issues**, because there is possibility to make recommendations, and **one related to current issues where I propose to make RFCs**. One more thing I would like to add, we have r**ecommendations on our own Web site called FreeW3.org,** and we welcome the fact that the W3C is involved in the advisory group. And we will be glad if the free software community will be facilitated better within the Internet Governance Forum.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Okay. Let me just respond to a question which is not related to IGF but which has been raised by two or three delegations, and that is the second process, which is the process on **enhanced cooperation**. If you go back to both the Tunis outcome as well as the general assembly resolution, **there is a substantial difference between the language of dealing with IGF and the language on enhanced cooperation. In the case of IGF, it's very clear it's a decision that there should be a meeting, that the secretary-general should call a meeting,** and the idea really then was to work out how and to what the meeting -- which is what we have been doing. In some ways, **when you talk about enhanced cooperation, you are a stage further behind. It is a very general statement asking the secretary-general to launch a process on enhanced cooperation.**
And in some sense, **you could say that <u>to some extent he has launched a process by, at the end of March, by asking to you start talking to people.</u> The point is that there is, at the moment, substantial difference in what people understand by the word "process" there.**
What I propose to do and what I am doing now is to meet as many people as I can in order to canvass their views on what they see, what is the meaning they attach to this work process which is there. Second, since what we are talking about in that case is really the decision-making part on the management of the Internet, what are the priorities? Because there are many different parts where decisions are taken on the management of Internet resources. What would be the -- what are the priorities in terms of areas

7

where they feel something has to be addressed. Now, rather than guessing these myself what I'm proposing, and what I am doing, is using my time here to meet with as many people as I can, canvassing their views, finding out what their views are. And I just want to make an open offer to everybody here, you please do feel free to send these views to me, either through my e-mail, which is very easy, Desai--@--un.org, but as a measure of abundant precaution, please mark it also to Markus Kummer, so that there is one place where everything does come together. Second, I am available for meeting one on one with people. ../.. And I hope that by the middle of June, I will have had a fairly wide range of consultations. So then let's see if some sort of light shines at the end of a tunnel. Somebody did say if there's a light shining at the end of the tunnel, there may be a train coming the other way../..

260

265

270

275

280

285