Oct 31, 2016

Dear IGF Secretariat,

We are pleased to submit this contribution for your public consultation on the IGF retreat retreat on behalf of the Internet Governance Civil Society Co­ordination Group (CSCG). CSCG exists solely to ensure a coordinated civil society response and conduit when it comes to making civil society appointments to outside bodies. It comprises representatives of the coalition members of the Association for Progressive Communications, Best Bits, Internet Governance Caucus, Just Net Coalition, and Non­-Commercial Stakeholders Group of ICANN. Together the reach of these groups extends to many hundreds of non-governmental organisations, as well as a much greater number of individuals.These comments are made to p. 37, 39 and 40 of the Review Platform, therefore, we do replicate the text in all paragraphs.

In line with our mandate, this submission concentrates specifically on improving the nomination process and make­up of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG). In order to follow the key actions taken so far, we take this opportunity to bring attention to the prior steps related to MAG nominations:

1. In New York, from 14 to 16 July 2016, the IGF Retreat took place. The result of this meeting, is a public document[[1]](#footnote-2)**open to public consultation until 31October 2016.** With regard to MAG, the paragraphs 37 to 49 address different points related to its work, and its selection process. Relevantinformationiscopiedbelow:

*¶37 Improving the nomination process and make-up of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG), and the MAG Chair*

*¶ 39*

*There was general agreement that there is a need for a more transparent selection process across the different stakeholders groups and clearer criteria and priorities to enable more consistent candidate selection processes across the different stakeholder communities. At the same time, many expressed that it should ultimately be the prerogative of the UN Secretary-General to exercise his or her final judgement in selecting MAG representatives having flexibility to ensure appropriate diversity.*

*¶ 40*

*A need was also expressed to have greater awareness and transparency in the selection processes used by the different stakeholder groups. Some felt there should be a set of specific criteria and priorities for nominations. Others felt that it is difficult for the communities to identify, target and come up with adequate candidates with insufficient information on what the UN Secretary-General is looking for.*

2. On 18th October 2016, The eighth IGF Virtual MAG Meeting of the 2016 IGF preparatory cycle took place. Ms. Lynn St. Amour moderated the meeting as Chair of the MAG and Mr.ChengetaiMasango represented the IGF Secretariat.

The Summary Report: IGF Virtual Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG9 Meeting VIII - 18 October 2016, states on p. 8):

*“Finally, the IGF Secretariat noted that the MAG renewal process would get started in the coming weeks, to try and ensure that the 2017 MAG was in place as early as possible.* ***There was also a short discussion about whether or not names of MAG nominations should be made public or not.***

***The Secretariat was asked to bring this question to the MAG list for discussion among the stakeholder groups as this is an important and quite nuanced point****.*

***Another suggestion that was made in regards to the MAG renewal process was that the Secretariat could update public information on the MAG, specifically the amount of years that each MAG member have served, their stakeholder group and geographical region, etc.***

***Further information on updates to the MAG renewal process will be circulated to the MAG and wider community in the coming weeks, and the Secretariat, together with UNDESA, will make every effort to be as transparent as possible in regards to the nomination and selection process.*** *The next MAG virtual meeting is scheduled for 8 November at 14:00 UTC.[[2]](#footnote-3) “*

3. The recording of this session was made public[[3]](#footnote-4). Even though sometimes is it is very difficult to listen with clarity and it was not always clear who was the speaker since the webex screen was not recorded, from minute 49.30 the discussion about the MAG selection process was raised by Chengetai, as an A.O.B. item. Specifically he pointed out that in the past, the names of the nominees for consideration of the MAG have not been public and he addressed the question to the MAG if it should be like this (non public) for the next MAG renewal. **Until minute 1.06.23 no decision was made and a request for written updates on this discussion sent to the list was made so as to gather feedback, highlighting the importance of transparency (minute 52.06)**

After reading both the IGF Retreat document and the MAG summary along with the recording of the virtual session it is still unclear how transparent the selection of MAG members and mostly, civil society stakeholders, will be. In this sense, the CSCG contributes to **the public consultation on the IGF retreat addressing its attentions on the specific points related to MAG renewal. We stress the importance of transparency in civil society selection as MAG stakeholders and , in this sense, we take this opportunity to reiterate our availability to and willingness contribute and collaborate in the process of selection of MAG members.**

**The selection process of MAG members should be inclusive, predictable, transparent and fully documented. More transparency is needed**. We believe that, in the interests of transparency, names and application details of all candidates for MAG selection should be publicly known. Whether this should be at the close of applications, or at the close of assessments, needs to be discussed further in the light of detailed procedures.

**Stakeholder procedures for making selections should also be publicly available** (CSCG’s current procedures can be found at <http://www.internetgov­cs.org/procedures>)

We recommend that **in the interests of transparency, names and application details of all**

**candidates for MAG selection should be publicly known.** This requirement should also be

included when stakeholder groups provide their own processes, and also if a more centralized process is run via IGF Secretariat.

These comments are based on the best practice we have observed with other

organizations in selecting multistakeholder representatives. We offer the above suggestions in the spirit of co­operation, as we also want to see the best possible representation of stakeholders. And again, we offer our services to work with you and other stakeholder groups to refine procedures to ensure more acceptable, transparent and representative results.

**Analía Aspis - Richard Hill**

**Chairs, Internet Governance Civil Society Coordination Group**
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