





1. What is your name?

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	0

2. How long have you subscribed to the IGC?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Since Inception		44.8%	13
More than 1 year but not since Inception		41.4%	12
Less than 1 year		6.9%	2
Less than 6 months		6.9%	2
Not a member		0.0%	0
		answered question	29
		skipped question	0

3. How would you describe your participation?

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	0

4. Objective: 1 Inform Civil Society and other Progressive Groups/actors on significant developments impacting on Internet governance policies.

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	0

5. Objective: 2 Providing Context for Open Online Interaction and Debate open on line and, wherever and whenever possible, face-to-face debate on the range of issues related to Internet governance policies from a civil society perspective.

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	0

6. Objective: 3 Develop On-going and Outcome Oriented Structure, create informal relationships with various CS groups and individuals with a direct interest in Internet governance policies, including those involved in human rights, ICT4D, intellectual property, international trade and global electronic commerce, access to knowledge, and security.

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	0

7. Objective: 4 Provide Outreach to other CS groups who have an interest or a stake in some aspect of Internet governance policies. Act as the representative of itself, and other CS constituencies with similar interests, generally or on specific issues, at various forums involved with Internet governance policies.

**Response
Count**

29

answered question 29

skipped question 0

8. Objective: 5 Develop common positions on issues relating to Internet Governance Policies - For the sake of the above, as well as for more general purposes, develop common positions on issues relating to Internet governance policies, and make outreach efforts both for informing and for creating broad-based support among other CS groups and individuals for such positions.

**Response
Count**

29

answered question 29

skipped question 0

9. Objective: 6 Emerging Issues: Anticipate, identify and address emerging issues in the areas of Internet governance and help shape issues and perspectives in a manner that is informed by the stated vision of the IGC.

**Response
Count**

29

answered question 29

skipped question 0

10. Objective: 7 Collaboration with other stakeholders in the implementation of agreed projects and policies towards better Internet governance.

	Response Count
	29
answered question	29
skipped question	0

Q1. What is your name?

1	Parminder Jeet Singh	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	Wolfgang Benedek	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	Olivier Crépin-Leblond	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	Walid Al-Saqaf	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	Fahd A. Batayneh	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	Shahzad Ahmad	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	Louis Pouzin	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	Oksana Prykhodko	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	Lara Pace	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Anriette Esterhuysen	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	Stefano Trumpy	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	William Drake	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Shaila Rao Mistry	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	Sonigitu Ekpe	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Mohamed Zahran	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	Norbert Bollow	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	Cheryl Langdon-Orr	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Why is this required	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	Magaly Pazello	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM
20	Ginger Paque	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	avri doria	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	Thomas Lowenhaupt	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	Charity Gamboa-Embley	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	AbouDEM Bavou Clement Martial	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	Ian Peter	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro aka Sala	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	Alejandro Pisanty	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	Adam Peake	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Jeremy Malcolm	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q3. How would you describe your participation?

1	Active	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	following discourse, occasional contributions	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	I read most messages and am interested in most discussions. I rarely post except when something really important comes up.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	Minimal, only when there is something I wish to raise for discussion. But I do read most entries.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	Quite active	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	Occasionally active but mostly an observer only	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	Active or observer, depending on the caucus Mlist topics	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	I try to follow e-mail discussion and write comments, especially on Ukraine related topics.	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I would say that I am a recipient on the list and not a contributor.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Dependent on time. Active at times but not consistently.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	I am mainly an interested reader	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	Decreasing as discussion focus drifts from original purposes	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Active. Attended several IGF'S . Served on Committees .	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	Effective	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	my participation is low	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	active	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	Passive list lurker with occasional interjection and regular interventions at IGF's, ISOC, ICANN and in other related local and Regional fora	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Active	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	I was more active in the past, in the last years I decrease a lot my participation indeed I am very silent in the list. However I follow all tracks and discussions as well I discuss with colleagues in Brazil about what is going on in the list.	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM
20	somewhat active, always read, occasionally comment	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Mostly active with periods when I am less so.	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	I read most emails. Comment on some. Volunteer for administrative duties.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	as an Internet user, advocacy and policy influence	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	My participation to this forum, is to bring my experience and expertise to enhance the usage of norms, rules on Internet usage, especially in Security field. I believe Internet is a powerful tools that need to be used to promote development.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM

Q3. How would you describe your participation?

25	active on issues that interest me	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	I am an active participant on the list both in responding and initiating discussions	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	An attempt to ground discussion on fact and reason.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	I read the list, contribute occasionally	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Former coordinator, occasional poster	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q4. Objective: 1 Inform Civil Society and other Progressive Groups/actors on significant developments impacting on Internet governance policies.

1	Links with progressive groups/ actors, especially in allied areas remains very poor. No work done for systematic outreach and inclusion (which is more than just inviting, but also aligning with larger progressive politics, which IGC has largely failed to do	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	this is happening, but could be done more systematically	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	It is doing very well on that. The mailing list is a treasure trove of information and if it were not for the IGC, I do not know how Civil Society & Progressive Groups would coordinate.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	I think that is evident. I find that many members use the channel to benefit civil society.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	This is being achieved as the discussions are quite diverse and rich in content.	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	Good work	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	pretty good, a bit short on long term	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	Information, which I receive from e-mail list, I use at IGF-UA and IG activity in Ukraine.	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I think the list does meet this objective and provides excellent resources by way of articles, reports and resources. Some participants on the list also provide meaningful explanations to technical implications of changes in policy which as a non expert I find quite useful.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Mostly met but with too much focus on ICANN.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	I appreciate that very much and I convey the positions in other lists like the ISOC Italy	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	This survey should not have been unilaterally created. Which is not unconnected to the caucus' general torpor internally and invisibility externally	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	We need to move from POWER-OVER to POWER-WITH, from domination and control to inclusive collaboration. Our tools for that should include collaborative technologies, productive dialogue, networks, social capital, gifting and sharing, empathic practices, story sharing, and more.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Done in perfect way	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	Subscribers of the mailing list get informed. As far as I know, the Caucus otherwise does little in this regard.	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	we inform each other but how far does the outreach ACTUALLY go?? are there some best practice models we can aim for here//	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	The list is very alive indeed. The information shared is useful and interesting. A good resource because it is made by the people who are following the IG debate in different arenas. However IG is still a restricted field I mean it is	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM

Q4. Objective: 1 Inform Civil Society and other Progressive Groups/actors on significant developments impacting on Internet governance policies.

	difficult to follow the related issues because the technical language and the especialized language required to understanding the debate. I think the IGC could make efforts to change this by delivering information in a more sistematic way using online tools for people/groups/stakeholders that don't have enough knowledge about. I mean the IGC could develop a kind of guidance for newbies as well the veterans who need to find the information shared in the list, something like a repository of documents and links by theme.	
20	Not sure we have outreach to other groups.	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Doing a bit	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	I see little evidence of participation with other civil society groups. That is, it's not evident on the list. Perhaps at MAG time. But as I don't attend many of the f2f meetings, it's somewhat outside my purview.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	I am an educator so my participation has been inclined more on IG issues affecting education in general. I have seen a lot of discussions mostly on public policy but less discussions in my field of expertise. I wanted to see more discussions on how education has changed with the onset of IG issues.	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	The Civil Society and all actors need to be aware of Internet governance policies. it is important for each to understand rules and principles, the good and bad side, to know the Internet is not an open boulevard where everyone can do what he want.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	good source of information for those involved but little or no outreach	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	Yes, we have done this on occasion but there is a need for a more strategic and focused and sustainable means of doing this effectively.	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	Barely achieved. Mostly preaching to the choir. Discussions are repellent to most of the rational actors. IGC is mostly a circus to be followed with certain masochism.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	The IGC is increasingly doing a poor job informing on anything. Dominated by a few long-winded individuals.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Good but more outreach needed	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q5. Objective: 2 Providing Context for Open Online Interaction and Debate open on line and, wherever and whenever possible, face-to-face debate on the range of issues related to Internet governance policies from a civil society perspective.

1	It has successfully done so, while of course without funding f2f opportunities do not exist except annual at the IGF, which meeting is also not well attended	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	takes place	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	Yes definitely. But a better Web site plus resources (Wiki perhaps?) would help for long standing documents.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	Yes, I see that some times. But what I think is more important is to engage in a discussion on what impact does civil society have on the decision-level.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	Fully agree	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	It has become too noisy and chaotic recently	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	??	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	I share links from this list on Facebook.	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I don't know enough to comment on this objective, but it is usually the same contributors that participate in a discussion. Sometimes, I feel that the discussion that does take place via the list is not useful to all recipients but should be better placed off the list.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Not great. too much aggression and domination by few individuals. But good content and ideas at times.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	I appreciate that	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	Yes it is a context	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	We need to move from ELITE POWER to CITIZEN POWER, from the authority of "the best people" to authority of "we the people". Our tools for that include random selection, direct democracy, grassroots organization, strategic nonviolence, civil liberties, and more.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Done in perfect way	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	This is happening, but should be improved, for example by more actively nudging discussion participants in directions that are likely to lead to constructive, actionable discussion outcomes.	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	more could be done here lists are fine but... ..	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	It should be improved in my view.	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM
20	Not sure why face-to-face is stated that way. I think direct debate is important, and is carried out. I don't think it is done face-to-face in the traditional sense, nor do I think that is important.	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Not really doing anything	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM

Q5. Objective: 2 Providing Context for Open Online Interaction and Debate open on line and, wherever and whenever possible, face-to-face debate on the range of issues related to Internet governance policies from a civil society perspective.

22	I don't see it an much of an initiator. The list, because of the level of moderation, enables petty squabbling with the fruits nearly invisible.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	I think the IGC has met during the IGG meeting. I was at Sharm meeting last 2009 so I know there was one I was supposed to attend but missed because of my flight schedule.	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	it is important to have online debate, and also better at time to time to meet face to face to make decision, and adopt strategies for the future. My point of view is that, forum help change idea, but for decision making, it is nescessary to meet face to face	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	good open forum	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	There is alot of open online interaction and we have yet to have face-to face debates on the range of issues	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	This is not only NOT achieved; the IGC contributes negatively.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	Weak. Discussion is poor, rarely leads to an outcome.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Good but more outreach needed	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q6. Objective: 3 Develop On-going and Outcome Oriented Structure, create informal relationships with various CS groups and individuals with a direct interest in Internet governance policies, including those involved in human rights, ICT4D, intellectual property, international trade and global electro...

1	See response to 4 above. Since this objective is kind of repeated, it was considered by charter framers to be very important. However, IGC is not able to talk the language of other progressive groups, and thus not able to connect... serious introspection is needed in this regard.	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	appears to take place only to a certain extent	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	I think that it has succeeded in doing so very well.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	I've not sensed enough of this. There are many great ideas floating now and then but they are not invested sufficiently to create more connections between the different groups.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	Best Bits is a good example.	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	Successful to some extent but lot more needs to be done	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	rather limited	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	It is very difficult for me to understand who is who on this list (beyond my personal contacts). .	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I don't think I know enough to comment on this objective.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Not achieved.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	I appreciate that	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	don't see this happening	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	We need to move from MANIPULATED / GROUPTHINK POWER to COLLECTIVE INTELLIGENCE POWER and ultimately to PUBLIC WISDOM POWER, from the "manufacture of consent" and distracted partisan co-stupidity to collective discernment of sensible paths for our whole community and society. Our tools for that include informed deliberation, choice-creating, systems thinking, freedom of information, iterative public process, civic journalism, multiple intelligences, and more.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	not as expected	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	I don't see this as happening in any significant way.	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	moderate success here I believe	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	I am not able to map it, I mean I don't have enough knowledge about the interactions/relationships are being developed within/through the IGC. Which organization could do this map? I think it is a valuable information for us.	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM
20	I think we need more outreach and alliances with other groups	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Not really doing anything	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM

Q6. Objective: 3 Develop On-going and Outcome Oriented Structure, create informal relationships with various CS groups and individuals with a direct interest in Internet governance policies, including those involved in human rights, ICT4D, intellectual property, international trade and global electro...

22	Very little activity, or visible success, in this area.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	Can you define "informal relationships" within the context of IGC? Most of us here in the IGC know each other and have met in person. One way or the other we have worked on papers or collaborated.	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	All those cited here above (human rights, ICT4D, intellectual property, international trade and global electronic commerce, access to knowledge, and security.) are essential in Internet governance process, each one playing his role. so the forum and the head to head debate must have those on panel to avoid missing the target.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	outreach is not good and some major players are not involved	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	We are lacking in this regards and have been responding to situations as and when the threats occur such as the activism against SOPA/PIPA. When we took a proactive role, other groups were able to join us and us them. There are instances such as the UN Human Rights Council which we should take an active role in but did not except for publish a Statement and generate discussion. There are other areas that need strategic focus as well.	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	Some informal relationships may happen to be built. Most of the target audience avoids the IGC like a fatal disease.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	What outcome? Nolonger produces anything except hot air.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Fair to poor, difficulty in achieving consensus appears to have limited the willingness to seek such outcomes	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q7. Objective: 4 Provide Outreach to other CS groups who have an interest or a stake in some aspect of Internet governance policies. Act as the representative of itself, and other CS constituencies with similar interests, generally or on specific issues, at various forums involved with Internet govern...

1	Agains, same/ similar as above and 4..... Need to really do something about this, starting perhaps with a discussion on the subject on the IGC list	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	visible for IGC positions, outreach don't know	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	Perhaps that has been the weakest part so far. Outreach is hard to do without a real budget. I am also fully conscious that IGF coordinators need to find their own funding to go to Geneva for WSIS and IGF preparation work. I think it is sick that no funding is available from any foundation out there, for the extremely helpful work the IGC is doing.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	I do see that once in a while. But there should be more.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	Some communication via e-mails has shown so.	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	Not sure	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	at times	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	no	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	In so far as my interactions with the IGC membership think this objective has been met. I have found support in the people on the list both as resource persons for workshops, promotion, and also as contributors to my line of work. I think the IGC list does provide a go-to place for representation of Civil Society.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Some success e.g. CSTD Working Group on IGF IMPROVEMENTS.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	Precious objective ; I am an active participant in IGFs, ICANN and ISOC	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	don't see this happening	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	The Internet has been built on specifications adopted voluntarily across the globe. By valuing running code, interoperability and deployment above formal status, the Internet has democratized the development of standards, enabling specifications originally developed outside of standards organizations to gain recognition based on their technical merit and adoption, contributing to the creation of global communities benefiting humanity.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Done in perfect way	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	This is happening to some degree, but not effectively enough.	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	this is done better in some fora than in others	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	With which indicators/tools we can evaluate the IGC impact in terms of the Objective 4? How to evaluate it? Is the IGC really acting in other fora beyond IGF?	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM
20	I think we need more outreach and alliances with other groups	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM

Q7. Objective: 4 Provide Outreach to other CS groups who have an interest or a stake in some aspect of Internet governance policies. Act as the representative of itself, and other CS constituencies with similar interests, generally or on specific issues, at various forums involved with Internet govern...

21	Not really doing anything	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	See *6.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	There was an outreach working group/committee I thought I volunteered for but it never materialized for some reason. This should be really established.	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	For me i strongly believe each of those acting in Internet governance field are ambassador at their local or regional level. All the community can attend forum and international conference, those attending (very few) have the high responsibility to train those at the local/regional.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	outreach is not good and some major players are not involved	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	The networks exist but we really should manage these relationships better.	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	A laugh.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	I haven't noticed any recent outreach to other CS groups.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Good but more outreach needed	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q8. Objective: 5 Develop common positions on issues relating to Internet Governance Policies - For the sake of the above, as well as for more general purposes, develop common positions on issues relating to Internet governance policies, and make outreach efforts both for informing and for creating ...

1	IGC is doing much much less on this than it once used to do... Develeoping common positions require painstaking work of long deliberations, forming negotiated positions, etc.... this should be taken up with greater vigour than is happening now	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	takes place to some, limited extent, depending on human resources available, should be strengthened	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	It's been somehow chaotic but it's getting better at it. With Sala coordinating, I think she should be able to apply some of the experience she's had in consensus building while on ICANN's ALAC.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	This is perhaps the most evident objective that I can see happening quite often.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	I agree	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	Consensus building has been a bit too difficult here.	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	the broader, the thinner, it works better when issues are quite general	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	no	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I don't know enough to comment on this one.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Not bad within limitations presented by diversity in group. but facilitation needs to be better e.g. by summarising long debates.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	Optimum	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	don't see this happening	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	We need to move from CONCENTRATED POWER to DISTRIBUTED, PARTICIPATORY POWER, from the current dynamics of centralization / fragmentation to the self-organized competence of many minds, hearts and hands. Our tools for that include networking, crowdsourcing, subsidiarity, direct democracy, local economics, electoral reform, and more.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Done in perfect way	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	Not much happening in this area. Also I'm not sure of the wisdom of investing much effort into this, as opposed to jumping directly into *multistakeholder* dialogue aimed at clarifying the extent of consensus and the set of reasonable policy options for those questions where there is no consensus. (See my ECTF proposal.)	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	This needs a LOT more work sure we talk on lists but then... ..	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	It is challenge in my view. The wealth of the IGC is its heterogeneity and sometimes it is not possible to have a strong position exactly because this. But in my perception the most of the times the IGC has reached a good positions and acted when it was required. Which lessons we have learned	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM

Q8. Objective: 5 Develop common positions on issues relating to Internet Governance Policies - For the sake of the above, as well as for more general purposes, develop common positions on issues relating to Internet governance policies, and make outreach efforts both for informing and for creating ...

	along side the IGC existance?	
20	I think we need more outreach and alliances with other groups	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Doing a bit	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	We respond more than initiate these days I believe.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	That's why working groups should be formed? Identify working groups where people can sign up for discussions	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	It is very important to have a common position as far as Internet policy is concerned, common position in country/Region and worldly is a key. this simply make sure same rules, norms and policy are applied everywhere, that people act or will act in the same way.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	there seems to be less effort on this now than there was in the past. i see very few common statements i last few years	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	We have developed some positions as per the Statements released by the IGC but there needs to be targeted and dedicated substantial work done in this regard.	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	Barely and only among a very small subset of individuals.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	Again, IGC hasn't developed an original common position on an IG issue for years. Can't even make substantive contributions to the IGF prep process.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	A good record of this but slowly lately?	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q9. Objective: 6 Emerging Issues: Anticipate, identify and address emerging issues in the areas of Internet governance and help shape issues and perspectives in a manner that is informed by the stated vision of the IGC.

1	Not being done... for instance, the issue of new tlds is a big one... not identified as worthy of discussing and forming a common position ... if we even seek to attempt a position (whether we succeed or not) a good discussion ensues... also other issues like the forthcoming ITU meeting, the enhanced cooperation meeting in MAy etc	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	need to do more	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	The open nature of the online dialogue actually makes it very responsive indeed. Issues come on the table as quickly as it take a tweet to propagate. I do however have one concern: the multiplication of issues, all discussed on a single coordination list, tends to cause some lesser issues to be lost in the flood of email. I have a feeling that the IGC might start thinking of having offshoot groups. For example, a WCIT offshoot. People interested in all issues can subscribed to the various mailing lists, but at least they will also be able to use filters in their mailboxes for the various issues. Information overload is always a problem.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	Yes, similarly, this is quite frequent.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	This is happening	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	-Not very successful in this regard-	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	Issues including some technical content do not fly. A lot of dialectics goes on around ICANN, ITU, UN and governments hypothetical roles.	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	only try to do it	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I don't know enough to comment on this one,	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Tough objective. not sure we did much of this.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	Optimum	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	sometimes discussions introduce new items	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	We need to move from CORRUPT POWER to TRUSTWORTHY POWER, from empowering narrow special interests with modern economic and political systems to empowering the whole society with leadership that serves the general welfare. Our tools for that include random selection, term limits, transparency, citizen oversight, systems of legal accountability, and more.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Done in perfect way	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	This is happening to some degree, but not effectively enough.	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	the List discussions serve this objective reasonably well IMO	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	It depends on the readiness of the IGC members and the community.	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM

Q9. Objective: 6 Emerging Issues: Anticipate, identify and address emerging issues in the areas of Internet governance and help shape issues and perspectives in a manner that is informed by the stated vision of the IGC.

20	I think we address this well as members bring up issues that are important to them.	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Doing some	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	We do a decent job here. But a list is a poor tool for its effective achievement.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	IGC should reflect on IGF meeting venues.	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	IT field is a fast growing field, and emerging issues are there daily. so with this in regard it is important to put in place a system to identify threat, and anticipate with a quick response.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	very little effort in this area and i see no real emphasis on emerging issues	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	To a large extent this occurs through discussion in the mailing list/forum but there needs to be a more substantive and organised form of picking it up for advocacy purposes. Whilst members and subscribers are to a large extent heavily involved in strategic policy areas as an IGC combined, we do not yet have the systems in place to field positions in critical forums as the IGC	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	Used to happen a bit. Not any more.	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	Reacts, never leads. Rehashes issues. Never builds on past agreement.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Relatively poor, we have not taken leadership, US groups are doing much better	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM

Q10. Objective: 7 Collaboration with other stakeholders in the implementation of agreed projects and policies towards better Internet governance.

1	Lack of progress on this is understandable bec there are no funds and other resources to actually take up projects... this is still mostly aspirational, but we may thnk of it sometime in the future	Sep 17, 2012 10:09 PM
2	could be enhanced	Sep 15, 2012 8:06 AM
3	the IGC was not doing well in the past. It's improved. A lot. Perhaps does it need more recognition? Perhaps the IGF as a whole needs more recognition. One thing is sure: the IGC is a force. Use it.	Sep 14, 2012 8:27 AM
4	Not sufficiently. More needs to be worked on that, especially when collaborating between regional IGFs such as the Arab IGF, whose MAG I am a member of.	Sep 14, 2012 7:50 AM
5	I have never experienced this during my time on the mailing list, but I am sure that with the current array of expertise, this is easily achievable.	Sep 14, 2012 1:15 AM
6	We have seen little collaboration. Lot more need to be done.	Sep 13, 2012 10:37 PM
7	None that I know of. OTOH very effective revamping (by Jeremy Malcolm) of some communication tools used by IGC members.	Sep 13, 2012 11:08 AM
8	yes	Sep 12, 2012 9:29 PM
9	I don't have the knowledge to comment on this objective either.	Sep 12, 2012 12:17 AM
10	Good in CSTD.	Sep 11, 2012 10:31 PM
11	Multistakeholder principle is fundamental for the future of the Internet ecosystem	Sep 11, 2012 10:01 AM
12	don't see this happening. Unclear what the point of this exercise was.	Sep 10, 2012 4:34 AM
13	Agree	Sep 10, 2012 2:45 AM
14	I suggest that all of them are weakened by failure to team up around a strategic vision such as this, and that all of them - and all of us - would be empowered beyond our wildest dreams if we engaged and succeeded in such collaboration.	Sep 10, 2012 2:33 AM
15	Done in perfect way	Sep 10, 2012 12:11 AM
16	I don't think that we have any significant "agreed projects and policies towards better Internet governance" besides the vary basic "at all Internet governance events, public interest representatives must have the freedom to participate in the discussion". Even regarding this point, I don't see a lot of "collaboration with other stakeholders".	Sep 9, 2012 10:37 PM
17	this needs greater work and perhaps a dedicated and well understood/publicized project plan...	Sep 9, 2012 8:27 PM
18	Poorly	Sep 9, 2012 7:14 PM
19	I think it has been made along side the IGC activities but I would like to see the IGC in a more leadership position what depends the readiness and energy of its members. I like to see new people getting involved it is good to accomplish objective 7.	Sep 9, 2012 3:54 PM

Q10. Objective: 7 Collaboration with other stakeholders in the implementation of agreed projects and policies towards better Internet governance.

20	I think we need more outreach and alliances with other groups	Sep 9, 2012 2:52 PM
21	Not really doing anything	Sep 9, 2012 12:25 PM
22	MAG / IGF but little beyond, again IMHO.	Sep 9, 2012 12:08 PM
23	We are collaborating.	Sep 7, 2012 9:18 PM
24	It is good to make policies during head to head meeting, and may be have protocols signed, but it is important to have those policies implemented. And the implementation as well as policies cannot be done by one or couple of person, it should be a collaborative action.	Sep 7, 2012 10:35 AM
25	this seems to work fairly well	Sep 6, 2012 2:01 PM
26	This needs to be strengthened	Sep 6, 2012 1:36 PM
27	Why? Projects?	Sep 6, 2012 7:40 AM
28	IGC tends to antagonize other stakeholders. Most vocal members have no interest in discussion; just preaching.	Sep 6, 2012 4:52 AM
29	Not achieved at all, opportunities exist here.	Sep 6, 2012 4:15 AM