

[<< Back](#)

No. 212 Exploring the Dimensions of Multistakeholderism

George Sadowsky
ICANN

Workshop



Theme Principles of Multi-stakeholder Cooperation

Starting with the present focus on Internet governance, the multistakeholder approach is emerging as a new organizational structure that shows great promise for enhancing inclusivity in governance and in furthering democratic participation.

Yet there is not one fixed multistakeholder model for the multiplicity of possible applications of the approach. There are many existing organizations that are either governed by multistakeholder approaches or whose governance comes sufficiently close to be an object of interest for study.

The purpose of the discussion will be to shed light on the multiple dimensions of the multistakeholder approach, to understand its advantages and problems, and to develop an understanding of the conditions that permit the best exploitation of the approach. While attention will be given to specific application to Internet governance, its primary purpose will be to expose the more general phenomenon of multistakeholderism in a broader context.

The questions specifically address the dimensions of multistakeholderism and explore the various issues that such an approach needs to consider. Given a specific candidate area for a multistakeholder approach, examples of relevant questions include:

How are the stakeholder groups decided upon? How many shall there be, and how are their claims to legitimate interest adjudicated. Are there tests that can confirm or question both the adequacy and the composition of the stakeholder groups? How does voting interact with multi-stakeholder organizations, and how does one avoid the "tyranny of the majority?"

Are there sets of circumstances that lead to an apparent need to rebalance the stakeholder groups in terms of number, composition and interests? If so, how can this be done in a way that is accepted by the organization before the change. Are there tests that can be defined in advance that provide signals that the composition of the process should be re-examined.

How is the adjudication of differences among stakeholders handled? What are the

options? Is there an appeal to an ultimate decision mechanism, and if so, how and when must it be defined and implemented? In the absence of a decision mechanism, what issues arise from a decision not to decide?

Do processes exist that assist stakeholders in coming together? Can they be defined in advance, or are they only identifiable on the basis of their particular experience? Are there limits to the transparency of the process or the accountability of participants? If so, under what circumstances, if any, are they justified?

Such an examination of the more general aspects of the multistakeholder approach may yield useful lessons for its more specific application to the INternet governance space.

Has the proponent organised a workshop with a similar subject during past IGF meetings?

No

Background Paper *No background paper provided*

Session Type Panel

Organisation



Co-organisers

[Mr. George Sadowsky, ICANN](#), Technical Community, UNITED STATES, Western Europe and Others Group - WEOG

[Mr. William Drake, University of Zurich](#), Civil Society, SWITZERLAND, Western Europe and Others Group - WEOG

Have the Proponent or any of the co-organisers organised an IGF workshop before?

Yes

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/chronocontact/?chronofromname=Workshops2011View&wspid=162#report>

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/chronocontact/?chronofromname=Workshops2011View&wspid=178#report>

The link(s) to the workshop report(s)

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/chronocontact/?chronofrmname=WSProposalsReports2010View&wspid=165>

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/component/chronocontact/?chronofrmname=Workshopsreports2009View&curr=1&wr=84>

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/2008-igf-hyderabad/event-reports/72-workshops/373-a-development-agenda-for-internet-governance-from-principle-to-practice>

http://intgovforum.org/Rio_event_report.php?mem=29

Panellists and Moderator



✓ = panellist or organisation has been confirmed

Please click on *Biography* to view the biography of panellist

Invited panellists, individuals and organisations

✓ William Drake, Professor, Media Change and Innovation, Institute of Mass Communication and Media Research, University of Zurich, Male, Civil Society, SWITZERLAND, Western Europe and Others Group - WEOG *Biography*

✓ Peter Major, ex-Government of Hungary, and ex-Chair, UNCSTD Task Force on Improvements to the IGF to the IGF, Male, Government, HUNGARY, Eastern European Group *Biography*

✓ Jimson Olufuwe, Chair, African ICT Alliance, Male, Private Sector, NIGERIA, African Group *Biography*

✓ Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Managing Director, Compass Rose Sdn Bhd, Female, Private Sector, MALAYSIA, Asia-Pacific Group *Biography*

✓ Samantha Dickinson, Internet Governance Specialist, APNIC, Female, Technical Community, AUSTRALIA, Western Europe and Others Group - WEOG *Biography*

Moderator George Sadowsky, Male, ICANN, Technical Community, United States

Remote Moderator Not yet chosen, will be selected based upon the manner of remote participation to be implemented.

Agenda



Discussion among panelists followed by discussion among attendees.

Inclusiveness of the Session



Given the interest in multistakeholder approaches in the large, in addition to implications of their implementation in the specific instance of Internet governance, we believe that the session will attract a significant number of people with quite varying points of view. Issues in this workshop have been both the direct and indirect targets of recent posts in listservs focusing on Internet governance, and we expect that active participants in those discussions will participate in IGF in Bali.

The size of the panel is deliberately small, so that both panelists and audience will have opportunities to speak sufficiently to make their points and yet leave sufficient time for others to do so also. All sectors are represented on the panel. The moderator will specifically target responses not only to panel members' presentations, but also to the various policy questions that the topic raises. We will attempt to assess the degree of convergence of opinion (or lack of it) and articulate this during the session.

Suitability for Remote Participation



This is quite suitable for interaction with remote participants. I have never set up a remote participation facility before, but there is now a critical mass of experience available to do so. Between now and Bali I'll investigate the ways of doing this and will be looking into setting up some form of remote interaction.

Questions or Comments



No question or comment provided

Tip: Please click each title to view the details.