

The Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Synthesis Paper

[Revised on 19 February 2009]

Prepared by the IGF Secretariat

Open Consultations

Geneva
23-24 February 2009

The Forum is modest in its means but not in its aspirations. Its hallmark is multi-stakeholder collaboration, based on the exchange of information and the sharing of best practices. This new form of international cooperation is both inclusive and egalitarian. And it presents governments, the private sector and civil society, including academic and technical communities, with the opportunity to work together towards a sustainable, robust, secure and stable Internet, as envisioned by the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society.

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon

I	Introduction.....	3
II	Taking stock of the Hyderabad Meeting.....	3
	A. General Comments.....	3
	B. Responses to the Questionnaire.....	3
	C. Comments specific to the Meeting Themes	12
	D. Comments related to Emerging Issues	13
III.	The Role and Functioning of the IGF	13
	A. General Comments.....	13
	B. The Annual Meeting.....	13
	C. The Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG).....	14
IV.	Preparing the IGF Review Process	14
	Annex I Contributors	17
	Annex II Glossary of Internet Governance Terms	19

I Introduction

1. The IGF Secretariat put out a call after the Hyderabad meeting, soliciting comments on the proposed agenda for the Open Consultations to be held in Geneva on 23-24 February 2009. The main agenda items are as follows:

- Taking Stock of the Hyderabad Meeting and suggest improvements for the 2009 Meeting to be held in Sharm El Sheikh;
- Preparing the IGF Review Process.

2. Additionally, a questionnaire was released asking specific questions about the programme in Hyderabad, the processes of the IGF and the way forward in responding to the Tunis Agenda call for the Secretary-General “to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and to make recommendations to the UN membership in the regard.”

3. The IGF Secretariat received three written responses from two organizations, two from dynamic coalitions and twenty-six questionnaire responses.¹

4. This report attempts to synthesize the comments received. As with all synthesis documents, this leaves out some of the richness of the original comments and does not delve into examples and explanations as deeply as the original viewpoints expressed in the comments themselves. Interested readers are advised to read the original contributions for their full depth.

II Taking stock of the Hyderabad Meeting

A. General Comments

5. Many of the comments included notes of gratitude to the Indian government for the organization and the work effort and time necessary to create a successful event. The IGF Secretariat was also singled out for thanks.

B. Responses to the Questionnaire

6. In some cases, the answers to the questions were provided in written contributions instead of directly to the online questionnaire. In the specific cases where a written comment pertains directly to a question included in the questionnaire, the comment has been included below under the appropriate heading.

Question 1: Did the meeting meet your expectations?

7. Generally, the respondents felt that the meeting did meet their expectations and several reported that it gets better each year.

8. Some others felt that it met or exceeded their expectations, but indicated they had relatively low expectations.

9. One writer indicated that each year, the IGF built up expectations for innovation, but that each year these expectations were scaled back due to conservative voices in favour of a programme that maintained the status quo.

¹ Only responses with valid contact information were considered for this paper.

10. One of the respondents commented favourably on the increase of informational content at the expense of diatribe. Several comments mentioned that the main sessions were better than in previous years.
11. One comment by a new participant indicated that there had been an anticipation of big players trying to promote their views. However, this did not happen and they were pleased with the participation and interaction of diverse stakeholders. Several comments were made about fewer people taking static and pre-determined positions than in the past.
12. One set of comments indicated that relationships had matured and that participants were thinking of themselves as participating in an established forum in which there was trust.
13. One comment referred to a workshop that had been rescheduled but that many of the participants did not know this initially. The people who came to the workshop started up a spontaneous discussion. This was seen by the writer as a good indicator of the interest and engagement of the participants.
14. Some wrote that this IGF served the purpose for which it was best suited, as a forum for general discussion of Internet themes, which thereby facilitated discussion in other contexts.
15. One writer was disappointed that there had not been more sharing of knowledge and experiences. This writer indicated that the workshop "Around the world in 80 ccTLDs was superb."
16. A concern was voiced about the outreach to new participants being insufficient.
17. Several comments mentioned being relieved that the events in Mumbai had not seriously affected the participation in the meeting and many gave strong praise to the Government of India.
18. One writer found it extremely difficult to watch the meeting remotely. This author also mentioned that it was difficult to find information on the audio only channels.

Question 2: What worked well?

19. The forum was considered well planned and executed by several writers and the new format was generally appreciated.
20. Several writers noted that merging workshops into main sessions worked well and one participant wrote the open dialogue sessions worked especially well. One set of comments expressed satisfaction with the increase in discussion of best practices.
21. The venue was praised for its layout and for the ability it gave attendees to network. A separate lunch period with no competing sessions was generally appreciated. There was praise for the helpfulness of the Indian staff.
22. One comment indicated that the quality of the catering improved at every meeting. Another noted that serving lunch at several locations in the venue was very helpful in terms of allowing participants to keep their focus on the meeting.
23. Several commentators appreciated the real-time transcription.
24. The workshops were seen as working very well by several commentators, especially the workshops that brought together many stakeholders. Several workshops were singled out as being especially good in terms of allowing multiple views to be expressed, something which was seen as progress from previous years.
25. There was appreciation of the rescheduling that was done to balance in the light of participants who had not been able to attend because of the Mumbai events.

26. One comment praised the quality of the moderators.
27. One writer wrote that there was a visible absence of hierarchy and an atmosphere of apparent equality. This was seen as an encouraging sign of the multistakeholder approach.
28. It was noted that remote participation was improved over previous years. One contribution noted that over 500 people had been able to participate remotely in some part of the meeting. It was also noted that a total of nine hubs in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Serbia, India, Pakistan and Spain (three hubs) were registered for the IGF. The remote hubs were reported to have allowed for parallel sessions that enabled the remote participants to view, participate and discuss the proceedings in Hyderabad. The IGF Secretariat, together with the Remote Participation Working Group (RPWG) and Dimdim (www.dimdim.com) were credited for this effort.

Question 3: What worked less well?

29. Several comments indicated that moderation could be improved. One comment indicated that the practice of using journalists to chair the main sessions should be reviewed. The comment indicated that while their ability to entertain the audience was superior, their understanding of the political dimensions of the issues seemed lacking. Other comments indicated a preference for knowledgeable subject matter specialists as moderators.
30. A comment wrote of the lack of emphasis on integration of new participants. This writer also included comment on what he considered a paucity of opportunities for non-formal collaborations and for the integration of divergent perspectives.
31. One writer suggested that having some time dedicated to giving case studies that showed some of the issues would have been helpful.
32. One comment remarked on the lack of gender and age balance among speakers.
33. There was a comment that too many sessions started late.
34. The absence of real-time transcription in workshops, especially in support of deaf and the hard of hearing was seen as a problem by one commentator.
35. There were comments on the difficulty of attending all the workshops of interest because of the many meetings being held in parallel. Some of those who wrote did not understand why more merging of workshops had not occurred while others wrote that merging workshops that expressed opposing views would have improved the overall quality of the workshops.
36. There were several comments about problems with the wireless network at the first day of the meeting.
37. Several comments noted technical problems with remote participation and indicated that resources needed to be directed toward solving these problems. There were also comments on the difficulty finding out how to participate remotely in sessions.
38. One concrete suggestion was that more focus be put on providing audiocast for the workshops with perhaps a few web pictures as opposed to trying for broadcast of video and audio for all events.
39. A concern was expressed that Dynamic Coalitions were neither dynamic nor coalitions but rather static and generally populated by people with a single point of view. The comment went on to suggest that the IGF needed to accommodate real ongoing debates and questioned whether the Dynamic Coalitions were the appropriate mechanism.

40. A concern was expressed there was a lot of duplication in sessions from previous IGF meetings.

41. One writer felt that the publicity for the event was not successful and that outreach to those who were not already interested was limited. Several comments remarked on the fact that participation seemed to be mainly by what was termed “the usual suspects”.

42. One comment received indicated that the improved quality of the main sessions pulled participation away from the workshops.

43. One writer wrote about the lack of translations of workshop documents into multiple languages.

44. Several contributors noted that it was difficult to find power outlets to recharge laptops. Others wrote of the difficulty in getting files printed or copies made.

45. One comment noted that workshops were still not very interactive and that the model of talking heads still prevailed.

Question 4: What did you think of the new format with main session panels and the open dialogue sessions?

46. Generally the new format was well received and there was broad support of allowing more dialogue.

47. One commentator appreciated the new structure. This comment went to say that the “morning panel discussions were extremely interesting, while the afternoon open discussions were very interactive.”

Question 5: Did the other workshops and other meetings you attended meet your expectations? Was there sufficient room for interaction with participants?

48. Many of the comments indicated that the workshops and other meetings did provide good opportunities for interaction.

49. Some comments indicated that more time for interaction, especially given the complexity of some of the issues, would have been good.

50. One comment indicated that there was not enough opportunity for opposing points of view to be expressed in some of the formats. The comment went on to state that this was not a request for unifying the format and that sometimes planned debate of different views might be preferable to interaction.

51. One writer felt that while there had been interaction, there was too little synthesis and that for many of the workshops there was too little time for response. One recommendation was that some of the dialogues could begin before the meeting through online techniques.

52. One comment indicated that many of the workshops were not well attended and that in some of those the participants seemed tired and were not very engaged.

53. One contribution wrote that most participants were familiar with the topics of Internet governance and that what was most interesting was interacting with people at the local level.

54. A contribution indicated that some of the workshops had reached a maturity where perhaps they could be provided with the opportunity to transform into some form of working group.

55. One commentator wrote that the schedule was too busy to allow time for interaction with other participants.

56. One comment pointed out that IGF workshops should presume that those who came to the IGF were already engaged and should start from that basis. The comment went on to point out that in the future workshops needs to be “deliberately focused on the ‘work’ part -- avoiding talking head sessions, and encouraging interaction and focused participation.”

Question 6: How did you see the linkages between the different types of meetings? Is there room for improvement?

57. Some comments indicate that this was improving but that it still needed further improvement – the more the linkages could be shown between workshops and main session, the better, especially if the workshops provided input into the main sessions.

58. Some commented that it was difficult to find the linkage between sessions and between workshops and the main sessions. It was recommended that more needed to be done to show the linkages.

59. One person commented that a risk with trying to make sure that everything was linked was that some of the less common or mainstream viewpoints might be lost.

60. One comment indicated that linkages did not appear to be very important and that what counted were the individual topics. This comment did not believe that people organized their participation according to topical threads.

61. Some comments indicated that allowing the main sessions to be developed from the workshops submissions worked well.

62. One commentator wrote that the meeting was more like a formal conference than a forum.

63. One writer indicated that there was need for multilingual support for workshops.

64. One comment indicated that there was room for improvement in linking the contributions of separate workshops.

65. One suggestion was for greater feedback from the various sessions to provide greater linkage.

66. One writer suggested that holding some cross platform discussion would help bring out the linkages. This writer also suggested that longer sessions would have been helpful.

67. One of the comments praised the structure used to schedule the themes but did note that on some occasions meetings in the same theme were held at the same time forcing people to choose.

Question 7: Should all the different types of events be maintained on the programme of the fourth IGF meeting in Sharm El Sheikh?

68. Several comments indicated that a similar mix of events should be maintained for future IGF meetings.

69. Many presented arguments for fewer sessions in parallel.

70. One comment recommended dropping the open dialogues in preferences of round table discussions (of approximately 10 speakers) with leaders to keep speakers on topic. One comment

recommends replacing the main session with moderated round table discussions.

71. One comment indicated that the programme needed to change each time in order to enhance the experimental nature of the IGF.

72. One writer indicated that new issues which required awareness and action should be on the agenda list and should be allocated more time for discussion.

73. One comment supported keeping the same structure especially because the experience of Hyderabad would help participants plan more efficiently for Sharm El Sheikh.

74. It was suggested that there should be more interaction with and among the remote hubs.

75. There was a suggestion that while all of the current types of events should be maintained, there should also be more free time.

76. One comment wrote that the format should be maintained but that more care should be taken to avoid duplication. Another commented that if changes are made, they should be modest and evolutionary.

77. One writer suggested that speed dialogues as proposed in 2007 be added to the schedule.

78. It was suggested that there should be greater interactivity on the IGF Web page forum with responses and feedback provided by the Secretariat.

Question 8: Are there any other kind of meeting structures that you think would be useful to consider?

79. One writer suggested relaxing the multistakeholder requirements in some cases to allow for in-depth substantive discussions on topics at the crossroads of technical and policy issues, e.g. spam.

80. It was suggested that meetings be developed for those who wanted to develop working groups. Some comments indicated it was time to develop a consensus based format for issues that were 'ripe', that is issues for which a developing rough consensus could be perceived.

81. One suggestion was presented for session that gave feedback from previous IGF meetings.

82. One contribution discussed the static nature of the IGF meetings and suggested that the addition of a meeting that discussed the process of policy creation that was occurring in the Internet. This author also offered a suggestion for a "Converged Meeting" structure to "allow the participants to electronically interact with the panellists and other participants while being physically present in the meeting room or being virtually present as remote participants." This writer also suggested Web interactions such as blogs, online chats and e-meetings.

83. A possibility offered in one of the questionnaires was the creation of open spaces where issues could emerge from the participants. This comment indicated that the current meeting is too structured and does not allow sufficient opportunity for spontaneity. Another comment indicated a desire for space to hold ad-hoc meetings.

84. One writer suggested a round table discussion of key representatives from each of the main sessions be considered.

85. One comment recommended consideration of expert panels where an issue could be explored in greater depth.

Question 9: Did the 'IGF Village' meet your expectations? If not, what can be improved for the next

IGF?

86. It was generally felt that it worked quite well in giving an opportunity to see what other organizations were doing.

87. One contributor would have liked to see more events held in the Village Square, and recommended setting up audio so that the meetings in the main hall could be heard as well as seen in the Village.

88. One participant commented that while he thought it was smaller than in years past, it was also more dynamic. This writer was very favourable on the set-up of the village square and of the table setup in the middle and indicated that if repeated in 2009, it would get far greater usage.

89. There were questions about how the space had been allocated.

90. One writer thought the village was important especially the booth that provided the ability for comment on the IGF channel of YouTube. This writer recommended that this be continued.

91. One commentator felt that it did not seem integrated with the rest of the forum.

92. One comment thought the village was much improved and had found its place in the IGF. This writer recommended that more organizations be brought into the village in the future.

93. One contributor who had a booth did not consider it worth the money or time because there were few relevant meetings at the stand.

94. One suggestion was for the provision of more computers for participant use. This contribution also included a suggestion for a coffee shop and perhaps even a "shop selling items such as Pen Drive, pens, paper for convenience."

Question 10: Was the discussion space in the 'IGF Village' useful?

95. While it was considered underutilized, it was also considered useful for small discussions.

96. Some wrote that they had not used it. Several wrote that they were not even aware of it, or not aware of it until the end of the forum.

97. One writer indicated that it was the only space for spontaneous debate and that it should be made available in the future.

Question 11: The Secretariat prepared a synthesis paper as the official meeting input document. The paper summarized all contributions received and was translated in all six UN languages. Was this paper useful? Should this practice be continued?

98. Many respondents considered it useful and in general there was support for continuing production of the synthesis paper. One writer indicated that it was used for regional preparation and used as a classroom aid.

99. One person who considered himself close to the process had not seen it and did not consider it useful or necessary. Another who had not used it, did consider it useful as a record.

100. One writer indicated a desire to see the Secretariat produce a document that discussed what occurred after the IGF meeting on each of the points discussed in the IGF.

101. One comment indicated it would have been useful if it had been released earlier. Another

commented that it should be used and referred to during the meeting.

102. One comment indicated that it was very useful and important and suggested that it be translated into languages beyond the six UN languages.

103. One commentator included the suggestion for a paper that could act as a guide to first-time participants. This suggestion also includes the production of an output paper by the Secretariat that included the conclusions and summations from the workshops.

104. One writer indicated that while the synthesis before the meeting was useful, a synthesis after the meeting would be more so, especially for those who could not attend. The writer conceded that this would be difficult to produce.

105. One comment wrote that while the synthesis paper was useful and interesting, it would be more helpful if it “set the scene” and included more background information as opposed to just reporting on comments. The background reports produced for the media were considered very useful and it was suggested that perhaps these be combined with the synthesis paper to produce a richer document.

Question 12: If you had one significant improvement to suggest for the next IGF, what would it be?

106. One comment wrote that the IGF “should develop in the direction of encouraging participants to take away what they have learned and apply it to real Internet governance situations in their home countries or regions.”

107. One comment wrote of the need for vastly improved publicity, starting early in the year.

108. Several contributions spoke of the need for more local and regional outreach.

109. Several contributions wrote of the need for earlier deadlines and earlier publication of plans and schedules.

110. Several contributions mentioned a need for more online participation and room for remote hubs to showcase their contributions to Internet governance. One contribution discussed the importance of creating a channel between the IGF Secretariat, the host country and the Remote Participation Working Group as part of the formal preparatory process.

111. One comment suggested that the meeting location and the proximity and quality of the hotels should be taken into account when planning future meetings.

112. One writer wrote that the IGF should be careful to not let itself be cast in the role of an organization that engaged in “discussions for the sake of discussions.” It was recommended that the forum continue to experiment with forms of dialogue that were output-oriented.

113. Several people recommended that the reliability of the audio and video streaming needed to be significantly improved.

114. One contribution mentioned a need for more electric outlets in the meeting rooms.

115. One writer wrote of the need to pay more attention to gender and age balance in speakers.

116. One contributor wrote of the need to get the next generation involved. The suggestion went on to say that the next generation was developing the social media and content and should not just be involved in the meeting but should be involved in planning. The suggestion went on to ask whether a “junior MAG” should be considered.

117. One suggestion included giving “special recognition for any session that had made key

contribution.”

118. One comment wrote that a broader set of issues should be covered.

119. One writer cautioned against organizing meetings to be held during weekends as half the potential audience had left on Friday afternoon.

120. One suggestion was for the production of a booklet containing the pictures and biographies of all speakers.

121. One writer suggested more emphasis on regional and remote participation.

122. One recommendation was made for publication of a newsletter, both during the preparations for the IGF, for example to coincide with the consultations, and daily during the meeting itself. It was suggested that this could be produced by interested participants working in cooperation with the IGF Secretariat and the MAG.

123. One contribution had the following suggestions for the 2009 IGF meeting:

- Special emphasis be placed on the cross cutting themes of human and institutional capacity building and development through special sessions devoted to these topics themselves.
- Deepen the discussion on the policy implications of multilingualism through discussion of informed policy choice and best practices
- Discuss access in the context of real capacity building and best practices.
- While continuing to supporting the importance of child protection look at other security issues as well.
- Discuss links between the current financial situation and access to information in global issues such as health and the environment.

Question 13: Other suggestions for improvement in view of the Sharm El Sheikh meeting?

124. Several contributions warned against letting the IGF evaluation dominate the Sharm El Sheikh meeting.

125. One suggestion included inviting workshops on specific themes as opposed to let the workshops determine the themes.

126. One writer suggested worrying less about ‘enhanced cooperation’ and focusing more on cooperation.

127. It was suggested that presentations be oriented “toward results that can be achieved, i.e. what can be accomplished” rather than towards norms.

128. One contribution suggested that more of the respected non managerial “Internet user figures” be invited, with facilitation provided, to the meetings to help with capacity building of the non-technical participants.

129. It was suggested that the plans for the meeting be finalized much earlier than they are. One set of comments indicated that the “rough programme and schedule (content/themes, format/framework of discussions, and timetable of the preparatory process) for the Egyptian meeting become available before the second open consultation in May and that they are finalized by September 2009”.

130. One writer suggested informal evening discussions, possibly in the form of hosted dinners.

Question 14: Any other comments or suggestions?

131. The transportation system between the venue and the hotels was praised with a recommendation that this practice be continued.

132. It was recommended that the technical specification for the forum include the correct types of microphones.

133. At least one author expressed thanks for the opportunity for comment provided by the questionnaire.

134. There was one request that the dates of the coming consultations be made known as soon as possible.

135. One comment spoke of a need to encourage greater African participation.

136. One set of comments included several logistical recommendations including:

- Badges could be improved to make names and organizations easier to read.
- More individual meeting rooms could be provided.
- Further improvements to the Web site were needed.

137. Several comments were made regarding media operation at the next IGF including:

- That transparency be increased in identifying the reasons for accreditation and non accreditation of media participants.
- That information be provided on the Web much earlier in the process.
- That information be sent out to all participants, not just journalists.
- That full schedules with details be published before the meeting.
- That earlier and better technical support for the listserv be provided.
- That coordination of video messages be improved.
- The same comment went on to thank the UN media staff for their friendly helpfulness and included praise for the access to the media room.

138. It was suggested that Facebook and LinkedIn could be used by different participants groups.

139. One writer indicated that the IGF Secretariat should make greater outreach to bloggers and those who create podcasts.

140. One comment indicated that it was the best IGF meeting ever and singled out the inclusion of Web 2.0 and the use of YouTube for special mention.

141. There were positive comments relating to the improvement of the IGF Web site, with hope for further improvement in making things easier to find.

C. Comments specific to the Meeting Themes

Reaching the Next Billion

142. One author felt that the session on multilingualism, did not work well because it did not present any new information.

143. There were comments indicating that the access discussions “have been a productive

example of bringing experience and options to stakeholders to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world, with a focus on the governance aspects of these issues”.

Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust

144. There was recognition of the many important sessions held on security including issues seen as important in relation to safety on the Internet.

145. It was also noted that several sessions took both the topic of security and privacy seriously to the advantage of the participants.

Managing Critical Internet Resources

146. It was noted that the sessions on critical Internet resources had been productive and informative.

Emerging Issues

147. One comment indicated that the inclusion of the topic “IT and sustainable growth” indicated the maturing process of the IGF.

148. A concern was expressed that the emerging issues was simply a vehicle for vested interests to claim the importance for their own vested interests. The comment went on to suggest that issues did emerge from the workshops during the meeting and also suggested that having a few of the workshop supporters speak of the emerging issues at the beginning of the week might be an interesting experiment to try.

149. Other comments indicated that the emerging issue sessions offered the opportunity to illuminate the policy issues that would face the community in the future.

III. The Role and Functioning of the IGF

A. General Comments

150. One set of written comments covered the first three years of the IGF and gave a favourable evaluation of the IGF’s performance as a unique forum. This description indicated that the IGF “has significant value as it brings together leaders from many technical groups and organizations (including governments, civil society, business) in a setting that is open to all interested parties with outreach through pre-meeting preparations, webcast, and real-time transcriptions, in a forum that is open to all topics and that has proven to be very frank and candid in its discussion of issues.” The comment went on to state a belief that the IGF was fulfilling its mandate as stated in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda.

B. The Annual Meeting

151. Both written comments and responses to questionnaire questions indicated an overall appreciation of the annual meeting.

152. There were reports of how new participants were coming into the process of Internet

governance at the national, regional and International level due to the IGF. The view was held that efforts to create the IGF at the regional level around the world were important.

153. Various comments mentioned a need for more activity between the annual meetings.

C. The Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)

154. One comment included the necessity of increasing the multistakeholder nature of the MAG including equal representation from civil society. It was also considered important that this selection be self-selected “rather than being chosen by the UN Secretary-General who has no mandate to represent them”.

155. One contribution suggested that Dynamic Coalitions be granted observer status in the MAG in order to mainstream their issues into the IGF.

IV. Preparing the IGF Review Process

156. Comments in this section are derived both from contributions and from the questionnaire. The questionnaire specifically asked:

The Tunis Agenda calls on the UN Secretary-General “to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and to make recommendations to the UN membership in the regard”. This consultation will have to take place at the Sharm El Sheikh meeting. How should it be prepared?

157. One view called for a very strict interpretation of the call in the Tunis Agenda and recommend that participants have a very focused discussion on the specific question in order to help with the preparation of a “clear recommendation that will allow the UN Secretary General to make a recommendation to the UN membership that is suitable for their decision making processes.”

158. Several views indicated that consultations needed to engage outside evaluation and analysis experts to prepare a report before the Sharm El Sheikh meeting. An alternate form of review, done by a WGIG type of panel, was also suggested.

159. There were different views on how to conduct the review process. While some commentators spoke out in favour of an independent review, others held the view that an external independent review would be inappropriate and proposed an internal review instead. However, some others thought that an internal review would be inappropriate.

160. Some comments spoke of the possible advisability of including both an internal and an independent external review process. One contribution pointed out that an external review “could improve / correct representativeness’ issues, cover the gap for those who do not participate in all IGFs and can see things with a fresh eye, without prejudice, or bias.” The recommendation went on to caution that any external review should have a carefully crafted set of methods. Caution was also recommended in deciding on who would do the evaluation and how the costs of that evaluation would be covered, even if based on a direct or in kind contribution.

161. It was commented that diverse input should be solicited, including inputs from outside the Internet community. It would be considered a mistake by one writer to only ask IGF participants.

162. One contributor wrote that all of the stakeholders who had participated since Athens should

be invited to submit an evaluation report to the IGF Secretariat.

163. One commentator indicated that there were several risks that needed to be understood:

- “Risk 1 here is that this will become a debate about the IGF as is, rather than about the value of an Internet meeting space in principle
- “Risk 2 that it will be seen by many participants as being about defending the IGF rather than considering what would be the best format for a forum on the Internet.”

164. There was a suggestion for beginning the process regionally.

165. Several comments suggested that there be at least one session on this topic at Sharm El Sheikh. Others commented that there should be at most one session dedicated to this topic in Sharm El Sheikh. One comment indicated a preference for one three hour session.

166. One writer suggested that a session be held on this topic at Sharm El Sheikh without any parallel sessions. It was further suggested that after this session, a vote be taken by participants on the continuation of the IGF and that a statement with the signatures of those who voted in favour of continuation be sent to the UN Secretary General.

167. Another contributor suggested that there be two sessions, with one focused on a general evaluation and another on the pros and cons of continuing the IGF.

168. One comment was made that the analysis should look at whether the mandate of the Tunis agenda was being met, and that consideration of extending the IGF should be dependent on its ability to fulfil its mandate.

169. One comment added that if anything was missing from the mandate of the IGF it was the ability to make decisions, and indicated that this should be added to the mandate.

170. One writer suggested that many different ways of collecting comments be utilized including handing out a questionnaire at the end of the Sharm El Sheikh meeting.

171. Several contributions wrote of beginning online consultations on this issue and of creating an online questionnaire on the subject.

172. One suggestion was for reviewing the IGF participation in terms of how representative it was of subgroups within the major government, business and civil society groupings.

173. One writer recommended appending a questionnaire on this issue to the registration form for the 2009 meeting. The recommendation went on to suggest that a multiple choice easy to fill out questionnaire be developed.

174. One suggestion was that the review should be prepared by the MAG and CSTD and that there should be high level consultations from various stakeholder organizations; both those who were supportive of the IGF and those who were sceptical of the IGF.

175. One suggestion recommended that the MAG deal with this process until the Sharm El Sheikh meeting and indicated that Article 76 was very clear in assigning responsibility for this process to the UN Secretary General.

176. Other comments pointed out that while the assignment of responsibility was clear, the method and process had been left open.

177. There was one comment indicating agreement with the schedule proposed by the IGF Secretariat for the review and support for a session dedicated to this topic at the end of the 2009 meeting. This comment went on to suggest some very specific steps for the IGF internal

evaluation including:

- The IGF Secretariat should put out a call after the February meeting for written contributions on the desirability of continuing the forum.
 - The IGF should also put out a, to some degree, structured questionnaire.
 - Additionally, interviews could be held during the May and September consultation to gather further input.
 - While the comment period would remain open until a month before the 2009 IGF meeting, the IGF Secretariat should produce a paper synthesizing the comments received in the written contributions as well as in the questionnaire.
 - The IGF Secretariat should then give a report on the results of this process in Sharm El Sheikh.
-

Annex I

Contributors

Written Contributions

European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association (ETNO)	Reflection Document on Taking stock of the Hyderabad meeting and the way forward, as well as on the Review of the IGf (RD29)
Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Climate Change	Statement on Internet and Climate Change
International Chamber of Commerce: Business Action to Support the Information Society (ICC BASIS)	IGF Review: ICC BASIS preliminary input
International Chamber of Commerce: Business Action to Support the Information Society (ICC BASIS)	Reflections on Internet Governance Forum (IGF) Hyderabad, India 3-6 December 2008
IGF Remote Participation Working Group	Contribution for Open Consultations and / or Synthesis Paper.

Questionnaire Responses

Arnoud van Wijk	Internet Society
Bill Graham	Internet Society
David Souter	University of Strathclyde, Glasgow Scotland UK
Deirdre Williams	Sir Arthur Lewis Community College/DiploFoundation
George Sadowsky	Global Internet Policy Initiative
Gilson Schwartz	University of São Paulo, City of Knowledge, Brazil
Godfred Ahuma	IT Enabled Services Secretariat - Ministry of Communications, Ghana
Hanane Boujemi	DiploFoundation
Ian Peter	Internet Governance Caucus
Jeanette Hofmann	London School of Economics
Jeremy Malcolm	Consumers International
Jonne Soininen	Nokia Siemens Networks
Karen Rose	Internet Society
Marília Ferreira Maciel	Federal University of Santa Maria - Brazil
Masanao Ueda	Nippon Keidanren (Japan Business Federation)
Michael Gurstein	Center for Community Informatics research, Development and Training (CCIRD)-Civil Society
Peter Van Roste	Council of European National Top Level Domain Registries (CENTR)
Roelof Meijer	Stichting Internet Domeinnaamregistratie Netherland (SIDN)
Schombe Baudouin	Centre Africain D'échange Culturel

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy	ISOC India, Chennai
Stephen K.M. Lau	MAG IGF
Syed Kazi	Digital Empowerment Foundation
Vincent Ngundi	Kenya Network Information Centre (KENIC)
Virginia (Ginger) Paque	ISOC Venezuela, DiploFoundation
Wolf gang Kleinwächter	University of Aarhus, Denmark
Yrjö Länsipuro	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Finland

Annex II

Glossary of Internet Governance Terms

AfriNIC	Regional Registry for Internet Number Resources for Africa (Member of NRO)
APC	Association for Progressive Communication
ASCII	American Standard Code for Information Interchange; seven-bit encoding of the Roman alphabet
ccTLD	Country code top-level domain, such as .gr (Greece), .br (Brazil) or .in (India)
CoE	Council of Europe
CSIRTs	Computer Security Incident Response Teams
DNS	Domain name system: translates domain names into IP addresses
DRM	Digital Rights Management
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
ETNO	European Telecommunications Networks Operators Association
F/OSS	Free and Open Source Software
GAC	Governmental Advisory Committee (to ICANN)
gTLD	Generic top-level domain, such as .com, .int, .net, .org, .info
IANA	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
ICANN	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICC/BASIS	ICC Business Action to Support the Information Society.
ICT	Information and communication technology
ICT4D	Information and communication technology for development
IDN	Internationalized domain names: Web addresses using a non-ASCII character set
IETF	Internet Engineering Task Force
IGF	Internet Governance Forum
IGOs	Intergovernmental organizations
IP	Internet Protocol
IP Address	Internet Protocol address: a unique identifier corresponding to each computer or device on an IP network. Currently there are two types of IP addresses in active use. IP version 4 (IPv4) and IP version 6 (IPv6). IPv4 (which uses 32 bit numbers) has been used since 1983 and is still the most commonly used version. Deployment of the IPv6 protocol began in 1999. IPv6 addresses are 128-bit numbers.
IPRs	Intellectual property rights

IPv4	Version 4 of the Internet Protocol
IPv6	Version 6 of the Internet Protocol
IRA	International Reference Alphabet
ISOC	Internet Society
ISP	Internet Service Provider
ITAA	Information Technology Association of America
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
IXPs	Internet exchange points
LACNIC	Latin American and Caribbean Internet Addresses Registry (Member of NRO)
MAG	Multistakeholder Advisory Group
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAPs	Network Access Points
NGN	Next Generation Network
NRO	Number Resource Organization, grouping all RIRs – see below
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Registrar	A body approved ('accredited') by a registry to sell/register domain names on its behalf.
Registry	A registry is a company or organization that maintains a centralized registry database for the TLDs or for IP address blocks (e.g. the RIRs — see below). Some registries operate without registrars at all and some operate with registrars but also allow direct registrations via the registry.
RIRs	Regional Internet registries. These not-for-profit organizations are responsible for distributing IP addresses on a regional level to Internet service providers and local registries.
Root servers	Servers that contain pointers to the authoritative name servers for all TLDs. In addition to the "original" 13 root servers carrying the IANA managed root zone file, there are now large number of Anycast servers that provide identical information and which have been deployed worldwide by some of the original 12 operators.
Root zone file	Master file containing pointers to name servers for all TLDs
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
TLD	Top-level domain (see also ccTLD and gTLD)
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WGIG	Working Group on Internet Governance
WHOIS	WHOIS is a transaction oriented query/response protocol that is widely used to provide information services to Internet users. While originally used by most (but not all) TLD Registry operators to

provide “white pages” services and information about registered domain names, current deployments cover a much broader range of information services, including RIR WHOIS look-ups for IP address allocation information.

- WSIS** World Summit on Information Society
- WITSA** World Information Technology and Services Alliance
- WTO** World Trade Organization