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

Openness, as admirably achieved by the IGF, is just the first condition of inclusiveness. It requires further specific measures to ensure that openness does indeed lead to equitable participation. In this regard, we find that the IGF still has much to achieve. It is obvious that any process where anyone can come and be part of, will get crowded by those with most resources to attend. This skews the very identity and thus legitimacy of the concerned forum, because it is perhaps more important for those people and groups to attend policy forums who are least likely to have resources to do so. Any open process thus requires countervailing measures of 'protective discrimination', whereby those sections that are identified to be under-represented are provided special enabling measures as well as incentives to participate.

Recommendation: (i) Adequate funds and other forms of support should therefore be made available for participants from developing countries. It must also be recognised that even within developing countries there are various socio-economic divides and other kinds of marginalisations. Special proactive funding and other support for developing country participants should expressly target these groups that represent marginalised interests. While providing support, within all categories of stakeholders from developing countries, it is important to recognise the claims of groups that are more marginalised like those associated with women's rights and those working with various kinds of disadvantaged communities. Making linkages with groups that actually work with, and represent, marginalised sections of the society in the developing world, is an important requirement that the IGF process should address itself to. Multi-stakeholderism is not fulfilled by getting one representative each from governments, civil society, private sector and the technical community. This is only a nominal and insufficient representation of the diversity of views and interests related to internet policies. It is important to have representatives from various under-represented groups from the developing countries. An active attention to these imperatives throughout the IGF process is required to ensure inclusiveness.

(ii) Inclusion, however, does not stop at ensuring attendance. It means much more - from consciously taking up issues on the agenda that relate to the interests of the marginalised groups;

getting representatives of these groups on the MAG and other committees; getting them on panels of the Plenary as well as workshop sessions; and ensuring that policy related outcomes specifically focus on the interests of these groups. It should be ensured that for every plenary session and every workshop, there is at least one person on the panel specifically representing the interests of marginalised groups.

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

7.1. Current modalities: open consultation and MAG

A large part of our response to this question is already covered in the earlier sections. The MAG clearly needs to be much more than just a program committee; it should be focussed on the outcomes of the upcoming annual IGF. As explained earlier, this can be done through meaningful contribution on key Internet policy issues to relevant policy making forums. It has been 5 years now and the IGF needs to urgently address itself to the number of very pressing global Internet policy issues that await resolution, and regarding which the IGF has not yet been able to achieve much in terms of direct and concrete contributions.

Recommendation: (i) The MAG has to get functionally more differentiated, with different sub-groups taking the responsibility of IGF preparations around each key plenary theme; liaising with different Internet policy institutions; and perhaps also for key internal/administrative functions.

(ii) The selection of non-government representatives to the MAG has to be made more transparent and democratic/representative to better represent different sections of the society, more so the marginalised. Efforts have to be made to obtain as globally representative a group as possible. At present, there are no specific processes to ensure these imperatives, and the selection process is largely *ad hoc* and mediated by some key global stakeholder bodies, without due transparency about the process followed to ensure that the diversity of interests and views in that particular stakeholder group are duly represented.

We recommend an accountable, transparent and diversified stakeholder selection process for stakeholder representatives. Such

a process should demonstrate its connectedness to the full range of diversity within each stakeholder group, especially those from developing countries, and otherwise less represented groups. Each stakeholder group while selecting its representatives should describe the process used in making the selection, and also specifically mention what steps were taken to include a full diversity of views and interests, and less represented groups, including those from developing counties. To get the selection process right is very important for the success of the unique multi-stakeholder experiment in global governance that the IGF represents.

(iii) One way of ensuring that specific interests are kept out of MAG is by stipulating that the business sector members should not be representatives of specific private companies, but represent different trade associations like in the areas of telecom, software companies etc. The technical community members could similarly include representatives from key technical and academic institutions. The selection process for civil society members could be made similarly democratic, with representatives selected by a network of NGOs working in areas associated with Internet policies, thus representing a really broad spectrum of civil society.