Internet Governance Forum Input Statement

by members of the Multistakeholder Modalities Working Group (MMWG)

28 February 2006

2

3 4

Dear Mr. Kummer,

9 10

The Multistakeholder Modalities Working Group (MMWG) isa discussion group that was initiated by members of the WSIS civil society Internet Governance Caucus, with the mandate to:develop and propose generalizable modalities for the conduct of post-WSIS multistakeholder follow-up and implementation activities, including in the field of Internet governance; and

acilitate discussion and interaction among individuals from governments, private sector and civil society on these matters.

... 12 13

11

Members of the MMWG would like to offer the following input into the preparations of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), in accordance with your request for comments following the 16-17 February 2006 Consultations on the Establishment of the IGF:

14

[NB: The above seems cleaner in terms of language. I am not clear though whether we are submitting this as "the MMWG" or as some members of the MMWG, since a) many people on the list don't participate, and b) probably not all of those who do participate will have weighed in pro or con before it is submitted. If the consensus is that we can here speak for the MMWG per se then delete 'members of' above. See also my last point below]

16 17

1. [?] Members of the MMWG strongly believe that the IGF should be an ongoing process of dialogue, analysis, and capacity building in which the annual Forum events are embedded, rather than as the annual events alone. As the WGIG report has stated, there is "a vacuum" in the global discussion process with regard to Internet governance, and this cannot be filled solely by a three or four day meeting held once per year.

18 19

2. The institutional framework for the IGF should be developed on a bottom up basis with the full participation of governments, the private sector, and civil society. Formal institutional arrangements typical of other United Nations activities should be kept to the minimum required to make the IGF a success. We oppose the establishment of potentially "heavy" top-down structures like a "Bureau" or a "Council", as these could bureaucratize the IGF process and reduce its flexibility and efficiency. The development and operation of any such arrangements should be fully compliant with the WSIS principles.

20 21

•••

3. [?] Members of the MMG believe that a light weight Programme Committee would be sufficient to kick-start the process. Based on the experience to date in the preparatatory phase, the IGF itself should discuss and decide whether an additional body might be needed to facilitate the process of discussion and the interaction among stakeholders between the annual forums. Such a "Facilitation Group" should be also as flexible as possible and avoid any bureaucratic structures.

22

[NB: I wasn't clear that we'd agreed on this two-body proposal? I suspect it would be regarded by some as promoting the very bureaucratization we say we oppose. Personally, I would have preferred that a single Coordination Committee be responsible for both a) facilitating ongoing dialogue before and after annual meetings and b) the annual meetings themselves. This would make for more efficient and integrated planning. Two bodies would require extra coordination and, inevitably, negotiation. Moreover, the PC is described below as doing precisely what it sounds like the Facilitation Group would do anyway!]

24

- 25 The members of the Programme Committee should be appointed by the UN Secretary-General, based on input by the three stakeholder groups. [NB: moved from below] The composition of the Programme Committee, like any other body or activitity related to the IGF process, should reflect evenly balanced multistakeholder participation. extent possible, it should also reflect the principles of geographical, cultural and language diversity and gender balance. Hence, the Committee should comprise not more than 15 (maximum 30) members, three (maximum six) from each of the five UN regions, equally representing governments, private sector and civil society . Programme Committee members should participate on an equal, peer-level basis.
  - 5. A priori, it may be advisable to replenish the Programme Committee with new members on an annual basis. [NB: this could be labor intensive] Working with the Secretariat, the Committee could devise a procedure for this task, to be approved by the annual meeting.

[NB: redundant]

26

27

28 29

30 31 32

33

34

35

41

42 43 44

- 6. Acting in close consultation with the IGF Secretariat and individual experts, the Program Committee should publish as soon as possible a "Call for Proposals" (CFP) soliciting input on priority issues to be considered at the first annual meeting in Greece. The Programme Committee should establish transparent procedures for the consideration of these inputs, as well as criteria for the selection of topics, speakers, and so on. The Committee would then be responsible for making the final decision on these matters in accordance with the agreed procedures and criteria.
- The Programme Committee should also establish transparent procedures and criteria for the formation and recognition of any sub-groups or initiatives stakeholders may wish to organize on relevant topics. All stakeholders should be able to propose sub-groups on a bottom-up basis. These could take a number of forms, e.g. virtual working groups on a specific topic, ongoing study groups or research networks focusing on broader themes, etc. Any such groupings should be self-financing (if funds are necessary), open to all stakeholders that may wish to participate, and based primarily on virtual collaboration. They could engage in a range of activities, e.g. inclusive dialogue, monitoring and analysis of trends, conducting studies, and developing recommendations for action. Program Committee should also define transparent procedures and criteria according to which they could propose any results of their activities as possible inputs for consideration in the annual meetings.

The MMWG discussed the question of whether "technical and academic" people should be treated as an independent, fourth stakeholder group in the IGF, and the Internet Society's related proposal that the "Internet community" be designated a "principal stakeholder." While the majority of the participants in the MMWG remain unconvinced about the logic and necessity of such proposals, while they also agreed that technical and the academic experts play vitally important roles in Internet governance and should be fully engaged in the IGF process. As such, we urge the UN Secretary-General to ensure that technical and academic experts are sufficiently represented in the Program Committee.

[NB: Reasons: 1) the paragraph seemed convoluted to me, this is more straightforward. 2) We have never discussed an Advisory Panel, and it's a little late to do so now. alternative proposal seems sufficient to the task. The PC is the only entity with

untitled text 2 Page 3 of 3 Printed: Monday, February 27, 2006 9:10:45 AM

45... appointed positions, everything else in the IGF is open to anyone, including T&A, just as

the WSIS process was.]

46 9. The MMWG will continue its discussion with regard to the second call of the IGF
Secretariat related to content and substantial issues. We will provide another input

before the dateline of March, 30, 2006.

48 Jacqueline Morris, MMWG Co-Chair

49 Wolfgang Kleinwächter, MMWG Co-Chair

[in light of my question at the outset about in whose name does this document speak, ... wouldn't it make sense for people who support the statement to individually opt in and be

listed? Nobody else knows who the MMWG is anyway, names would make it real]

51 | 52 | February, 28, 2006

52 February, 28, 20 53

47

