

Background:

1. On 19 July 2010, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) adopted by consensus resolution 2010/2 on the “Assessment of the progress made in the implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society”. By this resolution, ECOSOC “*invites the Chair of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) to establish, in an open and inclusive manner, a working group which would seek, compile and review inputs from all Member States and all other stakeholders on improvements to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), in line with the mandate set out in the Tunis Agenda, and which would report to the Commission at its fourteenth session in 2011 with recommendation, as appropriate. This report is to constitute an input from the Commission to the General Assembly, through ECOSOC, should the mandate of the IGF be extended.*”
2. In its Resolution “Information and communications technologies for development” (November 2010), the General Assembly decided to extend the mandate of the IGF. In the same Resolution, the General Assembly also underlined the need to improve the IGF “with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance”¹ and that particular consideration should be given to “inter alia, enhancing participation from developing countries, exploring further voluntary options for financing the Forum and improving the preparation process modalities, and the work and functioning of the Forum’s secretariat.”²
3. The Working Group was composed ... (to be complemented)
4. It held ... consultations, meetings, etc. (to be complemented)

Mandate and characteristics of the Internet Governance Forum of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (TAIS)

5. The members of the Working Group recognize and reaffirm the mandate of the IGF as a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue which should be convened in an open and inclusive process as laid out in TAIS § 72:
 - a) Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet;
 - b) Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body;
 - c) Interface with appropriate inter-governmental organisations and other institutions on matters under their purview;

¹ General Assembly Resolution “Information and communications technologies for development”, paragraph 17

² Ibid. paragraph 19

- d) Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities;
 - e) Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world;
 - f) Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet Governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries;
 - g) Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations;
 - h) Contribute to capacity-building for Internet Governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise;
 - i) Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet Governance processes;
 - j) Discuss, *inter alia*, issues relating to critical Internet resources;
 - k) Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users;
 - l) Publish its proceedings.
6. The Group also recalls and reaffirms TAIS § 73 which states that the IGF in its working and function, will be multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent.
7. The Group further recalls and reaffirms the principles laid out in TAIS § 77 which states that the IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organisations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process. It would have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet.

“Outcomes” of the IGF meetings

8. The members of the Working Group recognize and reaffirm the mandate of the IGF as a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue which should be convened in an open and inclusive process as laid out in TAIS § 72:
9. [a paragraph about the achievements of the IGF in creating output in form of dialogue and indirect impact by action taken by participants in their home constituencies as a result of IGF meetings]
10. The Working Group considered that it would now be important for the IGF to place a greater emphasis on improving the visibility of the “outcomes” of the dialogue taking place at the IGF and also to pay more attention to its impact and how this impact could be improved.
11. In order to increase the visibility of the IGF dialogue, new ways should be found to extract the outcomes of discussions at the IGF, for example, in the

form of messages. These messages could map out diverging opinions or consensus on a given theme, and capture the range of policy options available.

12. These messages could be based on: an overall chairman's report; discussions in each session; "take-aways", for example by the dynamic coalitions, that capture the key issues discussed; or a repository of best practices discussed at the IGF. How to create messages? by MAG, secretariat, and/or WGs?

会津 泉 11/3/25 18:07
書式変更: 蛍光ペン

13. To focus discussions, it might also be useful to set questions and objectives at the beginning of each IGF. The Forum can then ask to what extent these questions have been answered or need further elaboration and interaction amongst the participants between sessions or at the next IGF event so that the dialogue maintains a coherent momentum with sight of some end-results and even in some cases closure.

14. In addition, a questionnaire inviting all participants to the IGF to evaluate the meeting, in particular if and how they feel they have benefitted from the meeting, could also help to give more information on the impact of the meeting.

15. To guarantee the impact of these messages, the IGF has to ensure that they are transmitted to the relevant stakeholders. This includes strengthening the IGF's communication strategy. A better use of the IGF website would be a first step in this direction. Clear information material would help also to engage stakeholders.

16. Thematic IGFs (yet to be created) or regional and national IGFs are also a very good way of communicating messages from the IGF and reaching and involving new stakeholders.

17. To improve the outreach and cooperation with other organizations and fora dealing with Internet governance issues, it is important to ensure that messages are transmitted to these organizations and fora through appropriate mechanisms. The MAG could create an overview of these organizations and fora as well as the issues that they are dealing with. For example, the link between the IGF and the CSTD could be strengthened. The CSTD should take into account inputs from the IGF when drafting annual resolutions. [The MAG could then follow-up on what has been done in response to IGF input.]

会津 泉 11/3/25 18:09
削除: the

Enhancing inclusiveness and participation (in particular of developing countries)

18. [paragraph on the ability of past IGF meetings to attract a large variety of stakeholders and the attention paid to date to the issue of development and IG and efforts undertaken to involve participants from developing countries].

19. The Working Group considered it important to further broaden the range of stakeholders involved in the IGF. Steps need to be undertaken to allow the participation of new stakeholders (in particular from developing countries). More efforts in identifying and approaching these new stakeholders should be made. Ways need to be found to involve them actively not just in the meeting but also in the preparatory process, in particular to ensure that their interests are reflected in the IGF's agenda.

会津 泉 11/3/25 18:11
書式変更: 蛍光ペン

20. Representatives from developing countries might be more interested and more likely to participate in the IGF if the agenda reflects their concerns better. The IGF could focus more specifically on addressing issues related to development and Internet governance, including discussions on structural issues of exclusion and marginalization. A better understanding of development as a cross-cutting issue that should be discussed as part of many different Internet governance themes, might help to better address problems faced by developing countries.
21. The IGF also needs to reach out to new stakeholders, which should be involved in discussions on IG but which so far have not participated in the IGF. Internet governance has an impact on many different social, economic and human processes and affects many different groups in society. Those representing these causes or groups should also be involved in discussions on Internet governance. The IGF should develop an outreach strategy to include, for example, representatives of marginalized groups, development, small and medium sized companies, decision-makers, parliamentarians and youth.
22. Regional and national IGF processes already help representatives from developing countries as well as groups that have not traditionally been involved in discussion on IG, to get involved in the global IGF. These processes should therefore be further encouraged and links, especially to the IGF preparatory work, should be enhanced. (See also below for the involvement of new stakeholders in the IGF preparatory process and agenda setting.)
23. Effective remote participation is a key element for engaging those which cannot physically attend meetings. The IGF has already provided great opportunities of linking people remotely not just to the annual meeting but also the preparatory process. More can be done to improve the quality and ability of these services. Especially, more funds should be made available to finance these services, which so far have relied mainly on the generous help of volunteers.
24. Capacity building is important to better engage newcomers to the IGF and to create an environment where their participation becomes as useful as possible for them and other participants.
25. Special funding and other support for developing country participants should be increased, if possible. A transparent funding mechanism, with clear criteria, should be established to allow the participation of both participants and expert speakers from developing countries. One of the criteria for selecting candidates for funding could be to ensure that they represent, in particular, the interests of marginalized groups.
26. An easy way to strengthen inclusiveness of the IGF is also to improve the IGFs communication strategy, in particular by presenting outcomes clearly (e.g. with an improved website).

Preparatory process

27. [paragraph on how the IGF preparatory process as managed to increase transparency and inclusiveness in the past years].
28. The Working Group considered that the preparatory process should allow for a greater inclusiveness, especially of stakeholders which so far have not been involved in the IGF. Greater care should also be taken to make (parts of) the meeting more focused, to make its aims and “outcomes” clearer and therefore attract a greater number of new stakeholders.
29. To increase the efficiency of the meetings and to allow even more people to get involved in the open consultations, at least one of the annual open consultations could be held virtually. Greater efforts could also be made to better reflect the opinions of those groups which have so far not been involved in the IGF, such as marginalized groups in this process. By asking regional and national IGFs and representatives of these groups as well as groups that are part of the Internet governance ecosystem to provide inputs to the open consultations, it might be easier to reflect the opinion of many of the local actors in the agenda.
30. The IGF should try to limit the number of topics covered during the main sessions. The choice of topics for workshops should continue to be open. Feeder workshops, workshops that report into main sessions, were a welcome innovation at the 2010 IGF meeting in Vilnius. This format should be maintained.
31. The MAG could also be given a greater role in setting the agenda, trying to make it more relevant and ensuring that it includes themes of interest to all groups. The MAG could hold open consultations with a wide range of IGF stakeholders that would identify the most critical and relevant Internet governance issues for this given year.

Composition and working methods of the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)

32. The Working Group discussed a number of proposals about how to improve the working methods of the MAG.
33. The working methods of the MAG should be made more clear, e.g. through the development of Terms of Reference, and its functioning should be more transparent. Potential MAG members should be made aware of the key role of the MAG for the functioning of the IGF and the time they need to invest in this work.
34. The MAG should represent the whole internet community and its membership should be balanced as regards stakeholders, geographic and cultural diversity and gender.
35. The MAG’s structure and the process of selection of its members must be transparent, inclusive and predictable.
36. The rotation system which had been introduced by the MAG should be further developed in order to allow for a constant renewal of the MAG and to

guarantee its openness to new stakeholders. The rules of rotation should be clear and enforceable.

37. The selection of non-governmental representatives in the MAG should represent all sections of society, including vulnerable groups. This might mean having to increase the number of non-governmental representatives, to include not only those working primarily on Internet governance issues but also those representing groups that are affected by Internet governance.
38. Governmental representatives, especially from the developing world, should be encouraged to more actively participate in the work of in the MAG.
39. It should be envisaged that the chair is elected by the MAG members.