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**Eight proposals for an enhanced role of the IGF**
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1. **Observatory:** The IGF is an ideal place to "observe" the broad range of Internet developments, globally and locally. It could be the place where all information about new Internet applications and problems, national and international Internet public policies and other Internet related facts and figures can be collected and made available to the broader Internet community.

*Recommendation:*

The IGF secretariat should produce an “Annual Internet Development Report” (AIDR) which summarizes facts and figures, including legislation, about main activities and processes with regard to Internet development (globally, regionally and – if possible – on a country-by-country basis) from the previous year. The report could include also a more analytical part where main trends and main themes are analyzed by recognized experts. Additionally there should be brief reports from the various organizations of the global Internet ecosystem about their activities. In an Annex, statistical data about Internet development could be provided. The AIDR could constitute a growing database which is accessible to everybody and would allow in forthcoming years more serious comparative analysis and research.

1. **Messenger:** The IGF is not a negotiation body and does not produce legally binding international instruments. However, participants expect a more concrete output. The various workshops and plenaries send a lot of messages to governments and non-governmental stakeholders what they should do and how. A systematic collection of those messages would produce a set of guidelines which would help all stakeholders to maneuver through he still unknown territory of the cyberspace.

*Recommendation*

Each Plenary and workshop organizer/convener should nominate an independent neutral rapporteur who would try to summarize the debate in two or three key messages. Those messages would not be the subject of negotiations and could reflect also controversial approaches (one side says so and the other side says so). The messages should be no longer than four or five lines (like a SMS) and could be numbered (IGF2011-Message xx). All messages together would constitute something like a readable final document (IGF Messages from Nairobi) which would be no longer than six to ten pages and include about 150 individual messages, easy to read and easy to understand. There is no need t constitute a drafting group. The secretariat would just collect the messages and compile them. The diversity of the rapporteurs and the decentralized “production procedure” of the messages would avoid capture or a one side presentation of a certain issue. Delegates and observers would have something which they can take home and outsiders had material to analyze. The “messages” would be complementary to the online transcripts and the published proceedings so that experts who want to dig deeper, can use the “messages” as a first orientation for further research.

1. **School:** The IGF is a space where people can come to learn and to get all the knowledge they need to understand Internet governance. It is like a "global school" where participants learn from each other and can listen to high-level experts and share best practices. It is interesting to note that the GIGANET has decided to have its annual symposium always at the eve of the IGF. And also the emerging Summer Schools of Internet Governance are linked closely to the IGF.

*Recommendation:*

The IGF should promote an outreach and educational program for the next generation of Internet Governance leaders. At the eve of each global IGF there should be a “Summer School type” four-day-training course for newcomers from all stakeholder groups (governments, private sector, civil society, technical and academic community) where the various key elements of Internet Governance are presented and discussed in form of lectures by key experts from all over the world which would enable the IGF participants not only to follow more intensively the proceedings of the IGF, but also to make more own contributions to the deliberations. Such a multistakeholder training activity would also strengthen the collaboration among the various stakeholders so that people from business and civil society and technical community will understand better the role of governments and vice versa.

1. **Laboratory:** The IGF is a unique place to test and figure out what works and what not in Internet governance. The workshops create platforms where good and bad examples can be discussed, and where stakeholders can learn from each other and get the needed inspiration to translate the global experiences into national and local public policies.

*Recommendation*

The IGF should promote experiments for new ways to develop public policies related to the Internet in a multistakeholder environment. Based on first experiences of the so-called dynamic coalitions, new forms of interaction among governments, private sector, civil society and the academic-technical community from developed and developing countries in developing political principles, guidelines and norms could be tested out in smaller thematic groups. Such efforts could produce new knowledge how to meet the public policy challenges of the new Internet Governance complexity in a way that the legitimate interests of all stakeholders – in particular also from developing countries - are represented in a balanced way in future political arrangements for Internet related public policy issues taking into account the principles of international law, human rights and the free flow of communication. This could lead to the adoption - on a voluntary basis – of a series of “Frameworks of Commitments” (FoCs) which could be formally signed both by governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and would contribute to the emergence of something like a “Web of Internet Governance Principles” which would enhance the security, stability and further sustainable development of the Internet and enable individual and institutional end users to continue to create new applications and services and to “innovate without permission”.

1. **Clearinghouse:** The dialogue among various governmental and non-governmental organizations and institutions can clear the air with regard to the question who has to do what. It could lead to a more enhanced and developed division of labor where institution can spin a web of interactions, which also can be formalized in informal Memorandum of Understandings (MoU), Letter of Intent (LOI), Affimation of Commitments (AoC), Statements of Interests (SOI) and others.

*Recommendation:*

The IGF should promote the process of enhanced cooperation among the various partners of the global Internet Governance ecosystem by bringing them together in a collaborative dialogue which would include an annual reporting about their activities, an identification of overlapping issues and a discussion about new forms of coordination and cooperation (enhanced communication, coordination and collaboration/EC³). Such a collaborative dialogue could lead to new forms of bi-lateral arrangements among the various partners of the global Internet Governance ecosystem. By formalizing EC³ and a division of labor (if needed) the stability of a sustainable Internet development would be enhanced.

1. **Scout:** The IGF is a great place to look into latest Internet developments and to find out what may be the next issues. It is a place where the future can be explored, where creative thinking is stimulated by looking into the “crystal ball” what the next generation networks will provide.

*Recommendation:*

The IGF should encourage all kinds of exploration into future Internet development trends to find out what the next “big thing” will be. External experts and independent thinkers, also from other constituencies than the “usual suspects” from the established Internet Governance groups, should be invited and encouraged to give their outside views to stimulate debate about the future of the Internet. This could go beyond the “Emerging Issues Plenary” and lead to a special event called “Ten Years from Now: How the Internet will look like?” Such a brainstorming session would help to open eyes, to encourage to “think the unthinkable” and to stimulate further innovation and growth.

1. **Early Warning System:** The IGF should function as an early warning system. New problems, threats and risks which come with new Internet applications, services and next generation technologies, should envisaged and become the subject of discussion to help to identify emerging problems social, political or economic problems as early as possible.

*Recommendation:*

The IGF should provide a room for a SWOT analysis (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) of ongoing trends of the Internet development. Such a SWOT would help to build something like an “early warning system” for the future Internet development and new Internet related public policy challenges.

1. **Watchdog:** Stakeholders have an opportunity to raise their critical points. If a government or an Internet user has concerns about ICANN, IETF, ITU or UNESCO, or with policies executed by national governments and global Internet companies, the IGF is a good place to raise the issue and to enter into a dialogue to get the point recognized.

*Recommendation.*

There should be an annual review system of the activities both of the IGF itself and of the various global, regional and national institutions of the Internet Governance Ecosystem. Such a review process could be organized by building small “Multistakeholder IGF Review Teams”. The review teams would publish an open “Request for Comment” to invite the broader public to send critical remarks and proposals for IGF improvement and the performance of the various actors in the global Internet Governance ecosystem. The review teams could than produce an annual “Internet Governance Review Report” (IGR) which could include concrete recommendations how to enhance and improve both strategic orientation and day to day work of the various actors. The report should constitute the basis for an open public critical discussion at the annual IGF.
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