**Categorization of proposals based on the Chairman’s summary of the meeting**

**A – Outcomes of the IGF**

Paragraph proposed by Portugal. Summarizes most points listed as “main points of agreement”.

**Portugal:**

1. The IGF should continue to produce its current reports, including the Chairman’s report, the sessions’ transcripts, the workshops reports and the overall proceedings, to which additional more focused documentation should be added to improve communication and the impact of the results of IGF discussions.

2. New ways should be found to extract the outcomes of discussions at the IGF, for example, in the form of concrete messages. These messages could map out consensus or diverging opinions on a given theme, and capture the range of policy options available.

3. To focus discussions, the preparation process of each IGF should formulate a set of questions and objectives to be considered at the IGF, as part of the overall discussions. The results of the debates on these questions should be specifically stated in an outcome document to be prepared by pre-assigned *rapporteurs* to be identified by the MAG. They may be consensual answers to questions or the expression of the different views presented when consensus does not emerge.

4. To guarantee the impact of the IGF the resulting documentation must be transmitted to the relevant stakeholders. This includes strengthening the IGF 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.

5. 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 together with the IGF Secretariat could create an overview of these organizations and *fora* as well as the issues that they are dealing with. The link between the IGF and the CSTD could be strengthened by taking into account inputs from the IGF when drafting annual resolutions at CSTD.

Obs: Other suggestions under this topic (ex: website) have been allocated in subsequent sessions

Obs: Anriette’s text seemed more like a step by step explanation about how to implement what has been suggested in Portugal’s text above, so it was moved to section B, working modalities

B – **Working modalities including open consultations, MAG, and Secretariat**

B.I – Open consultations and planning the IGF

**Broad agreement on enhancing the bottom-up, open, and inclusive nature of the preparatory process of the IGF**

**Broad agreement that the use of remote participation tools and resources should be strengthened.**

* IGF has two dimensions: open and exploratory on the one hand, and, on the other, focused on themes and specific policy challenges.
* Overall modalities of the IGF remains the same: main sessions, feeder workshops, workshops, round tables, open forums.
* With regard to main sessions, the IGF Secretariat and MAG invites the IGF community to identify pertinent key policy questions. ~~There is precedent for this. This is more or less how the IGF has been organised in the past. Key policy questions were identified for each main theme for the 2011 IGF~~
* Main sessions are structured around these key questions.
* In response to each main session a report captures the following, in response to the key policy questions: - points of convergence - points of divergence - points that stood out as requiring further exploration
* ~~When finalising the reporting of each IGF, the MAG and secretariat would discuss these reports, and communicate them to other policy-making institutions.~~
* ~~This report, focused on the main policy questions that were discussed, will not replace the chairman's summary or the proceedings of the IGF.~~ (already covered by Portugal’s text)
* Invite global governance institutions to engage with the IGF on some of these questions, e.g. by convening forums, workshops, etc.
* Inclusion of representation of disadvantaged groups in preparatory process (disadvantaged refers to the following groups: living in rural areas without connectivity, etc.).
* Encourages rotation of members of panels, MCs of working groups, etc
* Consider improving the nature of the agenda and its drafting process. Agenda framing should include relevant and additional concerns of other specific stakeholders to attract them.
* ~~Diverse agenda to encourage diverse participation~~ (covered on the previous item)
* [consider] Purposiveness of the process, whether feeds into real policy-making process.
* More deliberate mechanisms developed to reach out to international organizations, intergovernmental organizations, and other stakeholder groups to seek comment on actions and program papers, such as sending letters that specifically invite these entities to submit comment
* ~~IGF to accept inputs from other organisations and events and distribute outcomes back to these organisations.~~ (covered on the previous topic)
* IGF secretariat facilitating bilateral meetings (>40 bilateral meetings) in terms of logistics (room booking). More transparency of this service and option available for bilateral meetings

B.II – MAG

**Broad agreement on the need to rotate MAG members regularly, keep MAG meetings transparent**

* Broad agreement on the openness and transparency of MAG meetings
* The MAG should open its meeting to observers and make its proceedings available in the form of a live text streaming. This verbatim record is available on the IGF Web site. This proceeding is recommended for future meetings in order to enhance the openness and transparency of its work.
* Rotation of the MAG members, with one third rotated every year, should be preserved, with a three-year limit to each member’s term in order to provide opportunities to all interested participants and to ensure fair representation

**Broad agreement that the constitution of the MAG should be done in a transparent and documented fashion**

* Broad agreement on the transparency of the self-management by each stakeholder group
* In light of transparency, stakeholder groups should publicise their selection process and should identify the process that works best for their own culture and methods of engagement
* Selection of any stakeholder group may not be confined to be mediated through any one particular body.
* The selection would be based on proposed candidate lists made by the three non-governmental stakeholder groups. The stakeholder groups are encouraged to nominate a sufficiently large slate of candidates to provide some flexibility in selection of MAG members and are asked to ensure appropriate gender balance
* One possibility mentioned by the MAG group itself last November:
	+ A form of 'triage' that would be used to ensure appropriate geographical balance among MAG members. This 'triage' could be carried out by a trusted group of former non-governmental MAG members, perhaps including some MAG members who are being rotated out. This trusted group would work in active consultation with the respective stakeholder groups.
	+ The recommendation would then be submitted to the Secretary-General for approval. One proposal was that the list of all MAG nominees to be submitted to the Secretary-General should be published on the IGF website.
* Another selection process was mentioned capturing the essence of the NomCom idea, or we better call it "selection committee" to avoid confusion with existing systems in other organizations.
	+ The selection Committee members, appointed by the IGF Chair, should be drawn fairly from representatives of stakeholders across the different regions and constituencies.
	+ Preferably, the Selection Committee would include experts with wide-ranging knowledge of Internet governance, previous experience of program preparation and strong links to various stakeholder groups.
	+ This Selection Committee would select candidates for the MAG ensuring balanced representation of geographical distribution, gender and the wide range of stakeholders. The final selection of candidates should be submitted to the UN Secretary-General for final approval.
* ~~Open and transparent selection process and working process~~ (already covered)

**Broad agreement that the MAG needs a clear Terms of Reference. ~~(and that the constitution of the MAG should be done in a transparent and documented fashion).~~ Obs:** this last part has been split and covered above

Requirements for MAG members:

* Potential stakeholder representatives should represent groups’ or constituencies’ interest and not private interests.
* [selected members should present] Proven ability to work as a team member
* [selected members should present] Active participation in the IGF process
* [selected members should present] Extensive linkages within one's own stakeholder group and, if possible, to other stakeholder groups
* [selected members should present] Experience and expertise in Internet governance issues

Responsibilities of MAG members:

* [MAG members should] Attend three meetings in Geneva per year; Participate in the yearly global meeting;
* [MAG members should] Participate in inter-sessional work;
* [MAG members should] Make outreach to wider community, including national and regional IGF type initiatives and bring other networks into the MAG;
* [MAG members should] Bring in comments from the community;
* [MAG members should] Explain recommendations to the community.
* [selected members should present] Willingness to commit to work and follow through

Responsibilities of the MAG as a whole:

* [develop] guidelines on actual tour of duty (length of service, rotations, performance criteria such as removal/replacement of MAG members that do not participate)
* Develop the detailed programme including the identification of issues of concern;
* Selecting workshops and other meetings;
* Defining how best to plan and organize the meetings;
* Organizing main sessions and where necessary participate in dedicated thematic working groups;
* Establishing linkages between workshops and main sessions;
* Facilitating the organization of workshops;
* Coordinating panels and supporting panellists, moderators and speakers at the annual meeting;
* Liaising with their respective communities;
* Publishing reports.
* Additional outreach with other organizations and in conjunction with secretariat

Miscellaneous:

* Giving idea of MAG selection process, keep it a dynamic committee.
* Consider the role of the MAG in the context of an evolving IGF and in the context of IGF improvements and the recommendations for IGF improvements.
* Consider relationships between the MAG and secretariat--roles and responsibilities
* Consider the role of the MAG in context of IGF no longer being just a single event but rather having evolved into a process.
* Consider mechanisms to enable the MAG to be more efficient.
* Importance of open consultations and role of MAG as facilitator and listener of what happens in consultations, important input into the process

B.III – Secretariat

**Broad agreement to have the secretariat [remain independent and] based in Geneva**

**Broad agreement to strengthen/expand the IGF Secretariat**

* Secretariat capacity to adequately support and participate in national and regional IGFs and liaise with national and regional IGFs.

**C – Funding**

**Broad agreement that additional voluntary funding should be sought, accepted, and encouraged**

**Broad agreement that funding should be stable, predictable, and independent.**

* An increased transparency and availability of information about IGF income, expenditure, and to be made available in the public domain.
* Make available background documents like the trust fund requirements and the pledge form (trust fund documents).
* Transparency--who funds, guidelines should flow down from regional to national

**D. Broadening participation**

**Broad agreement that the preparatory process needs to be made more visible and for more stakeholders to participate in it**

**Broad agreement on need to reach out to new stakeholders**

**Broad agreement on need to enhance remote participation**

**Broad agreement to increase and support participation from all stakeholder groups from developing countries in IGF and its preparatory process, increase Internet governance for development (IG4D) topics in IGF, continue to rotate location of IGF annually to enable different regions to have easy access to IGF**

**D. I – Improving the online presence of the IGF and accessibility**

* Encourage the establishment of an IG observatory.
* Enhance Web site.
* Encourage stakeholder initiatives to document IGF and link to them on the IGF Web site.
* Provide space on the IGF Web site to document best practices.
* Set up voluntary on-demand system for dissemination of documents.
* Web site just for parliamentarians
* Make host country Web site visible and accessible to all groups.
* Improve accessibility of outputs (for example, include Web 2.0 functionality on Web site).
* Reference to people with disabilities including age-related disabilities who constitute ~ 1/7 world population according to WHO survey.
* Improve accessibility of outcome documents with additional translations (language)
* Breakout groups should also be linguistically accommodating.
* Facility must be adjusted/accessible, workshops for government representatives to ensure accessibility (?)

D.II – Supporting and improving physical participation

* Transparent mechanism for financial support of people from all stakeholder groups who are currently not able to participate with their own resources.
* Better transparency on funding process, where money originates from, like if Canada funds participation through ITU: Procedure. Space in trust fund for IGF for funding participation, make it more impersonal. Rules of procedure.
* Fellowship programs supported by participating organisations should also be encouraged.
* Encourage different organisations with their own funding programmes and central independent corpus administered at central level to support participation (merge with previous?)
* Funding newcomers as opposed to repeat participants
* Funding of IGF participation fund
* Secretariat should be empowered to solicit funding from all UN member States without regards to whether for civil society or business
* Enabling conditions: proactive outreach, approaching different organisations and groups, proactive support to people who can’t otherwise attend IGF meetings--given at each level, selecting plenary speakers, workshop selections, funding participants.
* Formal financial mechanism for funding speakers and moderators, as well as people who cannot come to the IGF on their own resources. Available to all stakeholder groups who request support. Perhaps MAG subcommittee for oversight. (merge with previous)
* Promote the secretariat’s experience in broadening participation within its report.
* IGF related events in Geneva. Swiss Foreign Office and Swiss embassies attend to visa requests on UN and IGF events without need to seek appointment dates to participate in these meetings. Need more details in terms of dates for next meetings (?)
* Host governments need to be attentive to those with insufficient funding like making low-cost accommodations available and posting on Web site.
* Emphasis on all stakeholders reaching out to new participants and potential new participants. Outreach is the responsibility of the IGF as well as IGF community and all stakeholders
* Broaden interaction between government and other stakeholders.

D.III – capacity building

* Organise a special session during the IGF for parliamentarians and have a broad strategy to encourage attendance of parliamentarians, including possibly having a special corner
* Making use of linked events or pre-events that address specific constituencies.
* Recommendation on use of capacity-building activities or processes linked to the IGF in order to broaden participation.
* Encourage intra-national IGFs, in developing countries in particular

D.IV – remote participation

* Remote participation at the IGF has evolved satisfactorily and needs to be seen as an integral part of the IGF process. It is necessary to strengthen remote participation mechanisms due to its potential contribution for increased inclusiveness
* Captioning of events including workshops to assist remote participants and people with language barriers, investigate the possibility of machine translation such as via Google Translate.
* Both captioning and providing real-time text are important.