

Input to the second questionnaire on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Marilia Maciel - Center for Technology and Society of Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV) - Brazil (www.diretorio.fgv.br/cts). Member of the IGF Remote Participation Working Group (www.igfremote.info)

1 – Review of the IGF vis-à-vis Tunis Agenda (paragraphs 72 – 80)

It is useful to start by commenting on Agenda items in which the IGF worked well - points that should also be encompassed in the final report of the IGF WG - and then focus on the ones that need improvement.

The most positive aspect that needs to be mentioned is the **openness of the IGF**. Openness can be understood here in a broad sense, which encompasses:

- a) **Low barriers for participation.** There is no need for accreditation and any interested person or organization can attend the meetings
- b) **Multistakeholder space for policy-dialogue.** The IGF is a unique environment in which all the sectors involved with internet governance can share their views and concerns, and exchange best practices (**TA, par 72, d; par 73, a**). The benefits of multistakeholder dialogue have been widely recognized by the IGF community, such as: the rich content of the debates, the ability to leave behind entrenched viewpoints and engage in true dialogue, strengthening internet governance regime by developing a common culture, a common terminology and guiding principles.
- c) **The high level of transparency of the IGF, vis-à-vis other organizations.** Webcast and captioning is available in all meetings (IGF and preparatory meetings). Videos and transcripts are archived in IGF website for future reference (**par 72, l**)
- d) **Openness to innovation and flexibility.** This was fundamental to allow the emergence of bottom-up initiatives, fostered by the community, such as the creation of dynamic coalitions, remote participation and the emergence of regional and national meetings (**par 80**)

Nonetheless, there are some points encompassed in the mandate in which there is **room for improvement**. They are commented in detail below:

If we take into account the mandate set forth in **par 72 a** and examine the programs of the IGF meetings during the past five years, it is possible to notice that a considerable number of relevant issues have been addressed. Topics that were at first considered too sensitive, such as the Management of Critical Internet Resources, were gradually included in the agenda.

Nevertheless, the report of the WGIG¹ has enumerated a number of public policy issues that are relevant to Internet Governance and some of these issues still need to be mainstreamed in the Forum, such as: interconnection costs, meaningful participation in global policy development, intellectual property rights and consumers' rights.

Although the programme of the IGF has been decided in an open manner by the IGF community along the years, during open consultations and MAG meetings, the obstacles to include developing countries in the process of agenda-setting have lead to an unbalanced participation on the discussions. This may help to explain why some of these public policy issues – which are key to development – have been overlooked.

This leads us to the need to strengthen and enhance the engagement of developing countries in Internet governance mechanisms in order to fulfill the mandate set forth in **paragraph 72 d**. Some ways to enhance the participation of developing countries will be discussed below, such as: improving remote participation, conducting more meetings online throughout the year, providing fellowships to attend the IGF, strengthening capacity building (**par 72, h**) and outreach.

If it is true that the IGF has been a valuable space for policy dialogue of many internet governance issues, as mandated by par 72 a, it is also necessary to acknowledge that this space has been insulated from other bodies in the Internet governance ecosystem. The IGF has not interfaced appropriately with intergovernmental organizations and other institutions, as mandated in **paragraph 72 c and paragraph 77**, nor has it consistently facilitated the discourse between bodies dealing with cross-cutting international public policy issues regarding the Internet, as mandated in **paragraph 72 b**.

It should be acknowledged that, on the one hand, the **lack of clear outcomes** from the discussions that take place in the IGF render the task of establishing dialogue with other bodies more difficult, and have made it impossible to fulfill **paragraphs 72, items e, g and k**. On the other hand, it is important to stress that other bodies in the IG regime, particularly in the UN system, have not been proactively involved in the IGF discussions and have not provided enough support, which could have been valuable to improve several aspects, such as capacity building.

Regarding the institutional aspect, it is important to notice that although **paragraphs 73 b** (put in place a lightweight structure for the Secretariat) and **78 b** (establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau) have been implemented, it is necessary to evaluate if the human and

¹ Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance. June, 2005. Available at <<http://www.wgig.org/docs/WGIGREPORT.pdf>>

financial resources available to date are sufficient to carry out the tasks of the Forum, particularly after implementing the improvements under discussion by the Working Group.

WSIS principles:

When it comes to an assessment of the embodiment WSIS principles in Internet governance processes (**par 72, i**), the result is mixed. First of all, the Geneva Declaration does not state clearly what the WSIS principles are. Chapter B named “An Information society for all: key principles” is more dedicated to establishing goals in several areas (ex: infrastructure, access to knowledge, etc). Some general principles could be inferred from the text, such as “29. Each person should have the opportunity to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge in order to understand, participate actively in, and benefit fully from, the Information Society and the knowledge economy”. In addition to that, it is not clear how the IGF would have resources to assess the embodiment of these general principles in other Internet governance processes.

It should be mentioned that most of the IGF community has understood that the WSIS principles are the ones embodied in article 48 of the Geneva declaration (which corresponds to article 29 of the Tunis Agenda) and in article 31 of the Tunis Agenda.² Paragraph 29 reads:

“(…) The international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations. It should ensure an equitable distribution of resources, facilitate access for all and ensure a stable and secure functioning of the Internet, taking into account multilingualism.”

Paragraph 31 reads:

"We recognize that Internet governance, carried out accordingly to the Geneva Principles, is an essential element for people-centered, inclusive development-oriented and nondiscriminatory Information Society. Furthermore, we commit ourselves to the stability and security of the Internet as a global facility and to ensuring the requisite legitimacy of its governance based on the full participation of all stakeholders, both from developed and developing countries within their respective roles and responsibilities."

Paragraph 29 enumerates several important principles, which have been well advanced in the IGF, such as transparency, multistakeholder participation and democracy. Important discussions have been also advanced about how to foster access and multilingualism.

² This was the approach followed during the session “Internet Governance in the light of the WSIS principles”, which took place in IGF Egypt, in 17 November 2009. The transcripts are available in <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/2009/sharm_el_Sheikh/Transcripts/Sharm%20E1%20Sheikh%2017%20November%202009%20IG%20in%20Light%20of%20WSIS.pdf>

When it comes to paragraph 31, more needs to be done to integrate the IGF in the effort to build a people-centered and development oriented Information Society, and to include developing countries in the Internet governance ecosystem.

In addition to that, we believe that these principles are not immutable. There should be continuous discussion about defining the “WSIS principles”, which can change or be enlarged throughout the years, by a more comprehensive reading of the guiding WSIS Documents, and by a careful examination of the dynamics of the IGF. Principles that may have emerged during the last five years need to be captured, summarized and publicized in a concise document, such as a chart of principles.

Bottom-up initiatives such as the attempt to develop a “code of good practice on information, participation, and transparency in Internet governance”³ and national models, such as the Brazilian “principles for the governance and use of the Internet”⁴ should be carefully examined, as they may help to shed some light on how to make the WSIS principles more concretely embodied in the IG processes. The development of a chart of principles was also supported in the IGF 2010 in Vilnius.

To sum up, we believe **the measures taken to improve the IGF should be based on three fundamental goals:**

- 1) To allow the IGF to be an important and integral part of the process of public policy making regarding Internet issues, since “the main function of the Forum is to discuss publicly policy issues relating to key elements of Internet Governance”⁵
- 2) The urgent need to increase the participation of developing countries and key-players who have not been involved in the IGF process so far and to mainstream development concerns in the agenda
- 3) The need to see the IGF as a process, that should take place constantly throughout thin year, in face-to-face meetings or online

³ The code states, among other things, that: “all information which is relevant to Internet governance and decision-making should be open and publicly available; that Internet governance entities should broadly publicize opportunities participation in the work and policy-making of their organizations, and that the development and administration of Internet policy and standards generally be open, transparent, and inclusive”. <http://www.apc.org/pt-br/projects/code-good-practice-information-participation-and-t>

⁴ Available at < <http://www.cgi.br/english/regulations/resolution2009-003.htm>>

⁵ Note by the Secretary-general on the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. A/65/78-E/2010/68, paragraph 4.

2. Improving the IGF with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance as directed by the UN General Assembly Resolution on “Information and communications technologies for development” (adopted on 24 November 2010)

The IGF and the debates carried out therein remain considerably insulated from the context of WSIS implementation. If the main role of the IGF is to discuss public policy and regulation concerning the Internet⁶, it is fundamental that its participants have access to comprehensive information about the broad picture of the policy and regulation that are being developed on the global and regional levels.

Linking the IGF to the broader dialogue on global Internet Governance requires a two-pronged approach: the IGF should receive inputs from other fora and should provide them more concrete outputs that embody the discussions that take place in the Forum.

Regarding the **inputs to the IGF**, the Forum should acknowledge, summarize and publicize information received from other global bodies that have a role in WSIS follow-up, as well as from fora on the regional and national levels, with emphasis on:

- a) Reports from relevant organizations in the UN system, with special attention to the annual report of the Secretary-general on the progress made on the implementation and follow-up of to the outcomes of WSIS. The report identifies key trends to the development of the Information Society and provides valuable information that the IGF community should take into account when planning the meeting and identifying topics of interest.
- b) Information about regional action plans, such as the African Information Society Initiative (AISI), eLAC in Latin America and the Caribbean, and the initiatives by UNECE in Europe. The action plans are fundamental to the process of “translation” of general public policy guidelines into public action. The links between the IGF and these regional action plans, as well as between the regional and national IGFs and these initiatives have been very weak so far.
- c) Information about the debates that take place in regional and national IGFs. Regional and national meeting organizers should be encouraged to contribute to the agenda-setting of the IGF in a timely manner.
- d) Remote participation should be improved and the Secretariat and the MAG should use online tools throughout the year to remain in close consultation with the community.

Regarding the **outputs of the IGF**, important changes should be introduced.

- a) The IGF is a forum for policy dialogue that should produce outcomes that express

⁶ Note by the Secretary-general on the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. A/65/78-E/2010/68, paragraph 4.

consensus as well as divergent policy options. One of the main goals of the IGF process is to contribute with policy development, specially on the global level. For that, it is important that the IGF produces more concrete and objective outcomes that could serve as input for the development of policies by other bodies. Some of the changes that could help achieve this goal are suggested under question 4.

- b) Strengthen the link between the IGF and the work carried out by CSTD. The communication between the two bodies should be enhanced. The discussions that take place in the CSTD should find a way into the IGF and vice-versa. The outcomes of the IGF should be forwarded to CSTD, so they can be included in the Commission's report.

Both organizations could also exchange good practices. As CSTD is in charge of assisting ECOSOC with the system-wide follow-up of WSIS, including the IGF, the CSTD and its Secretariat could adopt some of the effective practices of the IGF and its Secretariat, such as reinforcing multistakeholder participation, remote participation and real time transcripts.

3. How to enhance the contribution of IGF to socio-economic development and towards IADGs including enhancing participation of developing countries

The UN General Assembly Resolution on Information and communication technologies for development clearly expresses in paragraph 19 (a) that the CSTD IGF working group should introduce improvements to the Forum so that “the representation and voices of developing countries should be increased and the development issues should be placed as the first priority”.

To achieve the mainstreaming of development issues and to enhance the participation of developing countries, some changes need to be introduced:

- a) Development should be mainstreamed as a theme in the IGF. Special support should be given to the discussion about the interplay between Internet Governance and development. Workshops and main sessions were organized about this theme in the IGF 2010, but IG4D should become one of the permanent main sessions in the schedule. It is also fundamental that funding is available to bring speakers from developing countries to these sessions, and the Secretariat and other bodies should be actively involved in the preparation of this discussion, together with the session organizers.
- b) More clear outcomes of IGF debates should be produced and forwarded to pertinent organizations, as discussed in question 4.
- c) Funding to increase the participation of developing countries in the IGF should be provided, as recommended on the note by the Secretary-General on the continuation of the

IGF. Additional funding should be employed in capacity building, remote participation and on increasing physical attendance, as discussed under question 6.

4. Shaping the outcome of IGF meetings

The IGF should be regarded as a process that lasts throughout the year. All the steps in the preparation of the IGF are important to generate meaningful outcomes, such as: an open and early discussion of key-themes, the definition of clear questions that will structure IGF sessions, and an inclusive process of agenda-setting. Thematic groups coordinated by MAG members can be created to plan the sessions, identify speakers, contact organizers of feeder workshops and summarize discussions.

During the IGF, some changes could help in the process of producing more clear outcomes, such :

- a) IGF workshops need to be better documented with main positions (specially policy positions) being identified by a rapporteur and forwarded to main sessions for further and wider debate.
- b) The MAG or some multistakeholder thematic commissions could analyze the summaries of IGF discussions - both what has been pointed out by workshops rapporteurs and discussed in main sessions - and translate this valuable but rough material into messages about policy proposals to be shared with relevant decision-making bodies.
- c) IGF messages could be fed into relevant fora dealing with Internet governance issues, especially CSTD
- d) A dynamic online repository of Best Practices discussed at the IGF (regarding public policy and regulation) should be created and constantly updated. Best practices can serve as model for local policy development.

5. Outreach to and cooperation with other organisations and fora dealing with IG issues

Enhanced cooperation

It is fundamental to stress that if enhanced cooperation is indeed implemented, the relation between the IGF and enhanced cooperation needs to be better defined. Multistakeholder participation on shaping policy issues should be preserved not only as a principle, but as a necessity in the field of Internet governance. On very simple terms, better policies can be developed if the diversity of views is taken into account.

One possible way to understand this "complementary" between the IGF and enhanced cooperation is that the initial demand for policy development should emerge from bottom-up and be put forth in the IGF. The IGF is a Forum in which ideas can be examined by a multistakeholder group of participants and submitted to qualified debate and scrutiny. The outcome of the debates in the IGF should identify the need for policy making in a particular field and point out the range of policy options available. Then they could trigger the actual policy-making in an "enhanced cooperation institutional framework".

Outreach with organizations and fora currently dealing with IG issues

In order to cooperate with other organizations in substantial policy matters, the IGF needs to produce clear outcomes from its discussions, as suggested in the comments made to question 4. In parallel to this exercise:

- a) The MAG should map the constellation of organizations and fora that have an impact on IG, map the current issues they are discussing and inform the IGF community about it.
- b) The MAG should make sure that the policy messages from the IGF reach the organizations mentioned above. It should follow-up the actions that are taken by these organizations in response to IGF input.
- c) Opportunity should be given for other organizations to present contributions to the open consultations, including on the discussion about priorities for the next IGF.

6. Inclusiveness of the IGF process and of participation at the IGF meetings (in particular with regard to stakeholders from developing countries)

Capacity building

- a) Focus should be placed on institutional capacity building (governments - with emphasis on policy makers - and civil society organizations), rather than on individual capacity. There are capacity building organizations that focus on individuals.
- b) The secretary-general recommended that IGF produces and offers to member states useful capacity building outputs, such as offline and online training and toolkits aiming at greater awareness and better understanding of issues related to Internet Governance.⁷ It also recommended members states and relevant UN system organizations to make a concerted effort to promote capacity building.⁸ For instance, the IGF could take advantage of the

⁷ Note by the Secretary-general on the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum. A/65/78-E/2010/68, paragraph, 35.

⁸ Paragraph 49.

expertise of the Division for Public Administration and development (DESA) for capacity building, both online and offline

Increasing physical participation

- a) An outreach strategy should be developed by the MAG and the secretariat to bring to the IGF process key-groups that have not yet been included. In parallel, communication should be established with outsiders to understand the real barriers for participation in the IGF process.
- b) Travel funding should be available to people from developing countries (with special emphasis on developing country policy makers), taking into account clear criteria, such as, for instance, age, gender and whether a particular group works with the marginalized key-groups that need to be included in the IGF process.
- c) Open opportunity to apply for funding, widely announced among interested people, specially the ones from developing countries. Transparent and timely decisions regarding the funding is important

Remote attendance

Remote participation has been a very important way to increase the involvement of people that otherwise could not follow the IGF meetings, due to several reasons, such as lack of financial and human resources, time constraints or mobility issues.

During IGF interested people are able to take part in discussions individually, from home or office, or they can gather in IGF hubs. The hubs are local meetings where the participants are able not only to watch the webcast of the IGF but also to interact with those physically present in the IGF. Also, and more importantly, participants are able to discuss the themes covered by the IGF from a local perspective with others from their own region. The Forum serves as a stimulus or a starting point for the debate of local issues and implications and for the development of a network of interested people in every region.

According to statistics about the IGF Vilnius, made available by the IGF secretariat, 1299 people participated remotely and 81% among them were from developing countries.⁹

Due to its importance, remote participation should be regarded as an integral part of the IGF. In addition to that, it should be made available in the IGF process as a whole, not only in the meetings per se.

⁹ IGF Secretariat. Vilnius meeting participation figures, 2010. Available at <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/2010/Stats.2010.pdf>

- a) In all IGF meetings, MAG meetings and open consultations, webcast, recording and captioning should continue to be available, as well as options for remote participation
- b) Remote participation should be formally recognized as an integral part of the IGF. Due to the importance that remote participation has gained in IGF meetings, the secretariat should not rely only on volunteers to provide remote participation. Technical, financial and human resources to put in place remote participation should be provided.
- c) Tools and techniques should be used to enhance remote participation, giving participants the opportunity to effectively influence agenda-setting and IGF debates. Some innovative ideas are being put in place in EuroDIG this year, with the support of fellows from DiploFoundation.
- d) The participation of remote speakers should be encouraged. In IGF Vilnius, representatives from civil society as well as parliamentarians were able to deliver their presentations online. This contributes to the diversity of stakeholder and regional views on the panels.

7. Working methods of the IGF, in particular improving the preparation process modalities

7.1. Current modalities: open consultation and MAG

The IGF should be a process, not a yearly event. The bottom-up creation of regional and national IGFs was an important step to give more continuity to the debate throughout the year, but IGF working methods and communication mechanisms could be enhanced to allow more openness, diversity and participation.

Open consultations

Planning meetings, such as the open consultations, are very important, as they decisively shape the agenda on the next IGF. Several documents that present an evaluation of the IGF, such as the note by the Secretary-general, mention that the agenda of the meeting needs to be more socially and development oriented. It is easy to understand why developmental issues are not so mainstreamed, if one takes a look at the participants of open consultations. There is a great majority of people from developed countries, who put forward their own legitimate concerns, which may not coincide with the issues faced in developing countries. The fact that all the meetings take place in Geneva and that developing country representatives have to deal with scarce resources are also obstacles.

- a) At least one of the open consultations should take place as an online meeting. Online meetings are not only eco-friendly, but can also foster more equal participation among regions. One example of the inclusive potential of remote participation may be illustrative. Last IGF, only 5% of the people who physically attended were from South America. But 25%

of the remote participants were from the same region, showing that lack of resources is more significant than lack of interest when it comes to participation in IGF process.

- b) The actual dynamics of remote participation should continue to be improved, so remote participants will have more impact on discussions and equal chance to intervene and make their voices heard.
- c) Early each year, in Open Consultations, participants should identify key global policy areas that require attention. Thematic commissions coordinated by MAG members could be created around these areas. They could share background material and discuss them in thematic sessions that could be carried out online throughout the year, with the aim to prepare for more in depth discussion at the IGF.
- d) Organizations that are part of the IG ecosystem could be invited to share their suggestions on specific thematic issues. This will improve the inputs that go into the IGF

The MAG

The MAG needs to be more than a committee to discuss the program and the infra-structure for the next IGF. The competences of the MAG should be enlarged, its legitimacy should be strengthened and its internal dynamics should be rendered more efficient.

- a) The election of non-governmental members for the MAG needs to be more transparent to guarantee that a wide range of interests are indeed represented. It is worth to analyze and drive lessons from successful methods for electing non-governmental members of Multistakeholder bodies, such as the one put forth by the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee.
- b) The periodicity of the rotation of MAG members needs to be further discussed. Good suggestions have been advanced about it in the MAG questionnaire and need to be reviewed.
- c) The members of the MAG should approve an annual working plan and implementation strategy on the beginning of every year, right after the first round of open consultations.
- d) Sub-committees could be created in the MAG. These committees could have an administrative nature, such as a coordinating committee, or deal with more substantive themes that are agreed to be priority in the beginning of the year, integrating the thematic committees mentioned above
- e) MAG should have an important role in the process of helping to identify policy messages from the IGF. The valuable but rough summaries of workshops discussions and main sessions need to be translated into a language and format that could serve as input for policy

development in other fora. Thematic groups coordinated by MAG members could perform this role

Regional and national IGFs

- a) Seek the inputs from national and regional IGFs especially on agenda-setting, to make sure that issues that were regarded as important on the regional and local level are included in the agenda of the meeting. The MAG could establish a close dialogue with regional and national IGF organizers, to make sure that a feedback relation is created and that information flows on both ways - from regional to the global level and from the IGF to regional meetings.
- b) Foster periodical meetings (that can be carried out online) with the participation of the organizers of national and regional IGFs.

Communication

It is important to notice that very positive actions were taken by at the secretariat in order to improve communication with the IGF community, such as reforming the website and using social media, such as Facebook and YouTube. Nevertheless, a more coherent strategy for communication should be put in place, if outreach is an important goal to be achieved on the next years.

Particularly, there should be improvement of IGF website. Three points to be taken into account on this regard are: i) A section could be created for the national and regional IGFs, where they would be able to share news and reports; ii) an easy online way to seek input from stakeholders regarding specific matters, such as the agenda of the meeting; iii) The website could encompass a section in which people from different constituencies could talk among themselves and reach a more round understanding of issues in-between the open consultation meetings. These discussions could take place throughout the year, with the possibility of meaningful participation of people who cannot make it to the Open Consultations in Geneva

7.2 IGF Secretariat

The Secretariat of the IGF and the former chair have done a remarkable work during the past few years, with the necessary openness to receive inputs from stakeholders, and also with the ability and experience to moderate debates in such a diverse group of participants.

- a) The secretariat should continue to preserve its ability to innovate and the political space it currently has to act in a more flexible way, if compared to the secretariat of other UN bodies. Openness to innovation and flexibility are necessary to constructively deal with the Multistakeholder culture of the IGF.

b) The secretariat should reinforce its political independence from stakeholder groups. One important way to achieve that is to secure public UN funding to cover the expenses with personnel working for the IGF Secretariat.

8. Format of the IGF meetings

The IGF represents an innovation when it comes to fostering openness and participation in meetings with global scope. This worked very well for the discussions of internet governance issues. Innovative principles have become rules of procedure among participants that are worth preserving and reinforcing in the future, such as the ones commented in question 1:

Having said that, there is room for improvement in IGF proceedings, in order to rend the discussions more efficient and to optimize the schedule of the meeting:

a) Although the efforts of people who volunteer to organize IGF workshops should be recognized and valued, there has to be a stricter evaluation of workshops proposals, which takes into account the following points, among others: i) the need to reduce the average number of workshops; ii) presence of representatives from all stakeholder groups, who really work with the topics under discussions. Artificial multistakeholderism in workshops (when representatives from stakeholder groups are only invited to comply with a formality) should be avoided; iii) taking into account the time allocated for the workshop, evaluate if the number of speakers would allow meaningful debate; iv) check if workshop organizers have complied with the requests from the secretariat in a timely manner (ex: if they appointed the name of a rapporteur and of a moderator for remote participation).

b) A template for workshop proposals should be developed, in a way that proposals are presented in a more uniform manner, which would render evaluation easier.

c) All workshop organizers should appoint a remote moderator for their session.¹⁰

d) Participants (both in situ and remote participants) should be able to give feedback and evaluate online the workshops they have attended, leaving comments and suggestions for workshop organizers. That would help to improve the quality of workshops.

e) Workshop organizers should appoint rapporteurs that would be responsible to summarize the main positions advanced in the workshop with a special focus positions that could be translated into different policy options.

¹⁰ In order to allow remote participation in all IGF sessions it is necessary to have someone in the room that will receive the questions and comments sent online by remote participants and voice them in the session. This person needs to receive some basic instructions in advance that will allow him/her to use the platform for interaction with remote participants. The Remote Participation Working Group (www.igfremote.info) has volunteered to provide information and training, but the names and contacts of remote moderators need to be made available by workshop organizers in a timely manner.

- f) Wrap-up workshops that would congregate rapporteurs from workshops with thematic affinity should be held in order to discuss and organize the inputs that will be forwarded into the main sessions.
- g) A more detailed and comprehensive report on the workshops should be made available online by workshop organizers, in accordance with a template developed by the secretariat. Failure to comply with this requirement in due time should be taken into account if the workshop organizers present another workshop proposal on the next year.
- h) The connection between workshops and main sessions needs to be improved. Workshops and main sessions have distinct roles. While the workshops are usually forums for more focused and in depth debate of specific issues, main sessions could be an important forum to allow workshop rapporteurs to share with others the positions summarized by them, and to allow experts on the field to debate co-relations between issues that may have been debated in different workshops, such as, for instance, network neutrality and access to knowledge.
- i) Assistance to cover travel costs should be able for experts from developing and less developed countries, so they can be panelists in main sessions. This would help to ensure a more balanced regional representation in main sessions. These speakers could also take part in workshops, if organizers want to invite them, contributing to diversity in workshops as well.

9. Financing the Forum (exploring further options for financing)

9.1. Review of the current situation

There is a considerable lack of transparency regarding the funding of the IGF. The website of the Forum only displays a list of the donors to the Trust Fund, without any further information about the amount of donations or even an indication about when the last update to the list was performed. There are currently no guidelines for donors and no information about expenditures. It is a basic principle of transparency and accountability to publicize balance sheets of spending.

In addition, current financial and human resources are overstretched and will certainly be insufficient in the face of what can be expected from an improved IGF.

9.2. Options for ensuring predictability, transparency and accountability in financing IGF

First and foremost, the funding of the IGF should be transparent and should not hinder the independence of its Secretariat. It is important to consider the following, among other suggestions:

- a) Assigning public UN funds that should cover at least the expenses with salaries of the personnel. Additional funding for the development of studies, especially on the interplay between Internet Governance and development, should also be available, since they can be relevant for other UN bodies as well.
- b) Encouraging private voluntary donations to the IGF from all stakeholders, since they are made in a transparent manner. A sub-commission from the MAG could assist on fund raising.
- c) The Secretariat should present periodic reports of funds received and their expenditure
- d) Consider the possibility that private organizations in the IG ecosystem, such as ICANN, contribute with a small percentage of their budgets to fund the IGF.