

Questionnaire on the Convening the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

This questionnaire addresses some issues that came up following the Tunis Summit. It is meant to stimulate the discussions in the open consultations on the convening of the IGF on 16 and 17 February and help clarify some open questions with regard to the functioning of the IGF. The questionnaire aims to provide an open framework for discussion – additional remarks, comments or questions are welcome and should be sent to wgig@unog.ch. You may write your comments on any of the questions directly into the form or submit more general comments separately. Please provide your full name, the entity which you represent and where you are based. If you are responding in your personal capacity please state so and describe your involvement in Internet Governance issues. Responses will be published on this website.*

These answers are submitted by JFC Morfin in his personal capacity. A French researcher and project manager involved in international public networking since 1977, he has experience in @large, ccTLD management, standardization, system development and multilingualisation.

- 1 The Tunis Agenda sets out various functions for the forum. Paragraph 72 (g) indicates that a possible outcome of its meetings could be recommendations («where appropriate»). Paragraph 72 (l) asks the IGF to produce a report («to publish its proceedings») as its output.

- (a) *What outcome would you expect from an IGF meeting?*
- (b) *Should there be any other output apart from the report?*

I expect the IGF to foster concerted dialog diversity.

I expect IGF meetings to permit this diversity to report its maturation.

- 2 The Tunis Agenda describes the IGF as «multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent» (para 73) and sets out many functions it should assume (see paras 72 and 77). However, it leaves open questions of participation as well as periodicity, duration and type of IGF meetings, including on-line aspects and virtual collaboration and participation. Several delegations endorsed the proposal contained in the WGIG Report, i.e. to create a Forum that should be modelled on the WGIG open consultations, where all stakeholders participated on an equal footing.

- (a) *Could the WGIG open consultations constitute a possible model for the IGF?*
- (b) *How often should the Forum meet?*
- (c) *How long should its meetings be?*
- (d) *Should meetings be considered subject to UN rules, such as accreditation, rules of procedure or languages?*
- (e) *how could the IGF make best possible use of ICTs and promote virtual interaction?*

The IGF should first be a concept with many different realities. It should not try to address itself para. 72, but to strive to make it eventually addressed. Addressed by

initiatives to blossom in the technical, political, economical, societal, global, local, cultural, etc. concerned areas.

It should start with an Internet Campus. As a place for Internet people and organisations to meet, to incorporate, to cross-pollinate, to hold technical shows, training, test beds. A place in the world (Geneva? Athens?) and a place in each country/region for face to face meetings.

It should sponsor an open source on-line intergovernance working tool aggregating mail, wiki, blogs, databases, consensus evaluation, CVS, etc. Mail is a proven solution, but we already wanted to improve it 25 years ago. Governance bodies all over the world need a common adapted tool. IGF is a unique place to implement, experiment and disseminate a new inter-relational working tool. It would be an IGF cultural harmonisation medium.

IGF must also respect Human Rights in the equal linguistic opportunity area and to permit a work by lingual groups. If English is to be its common working language, it should never be its unique reference language, so the IGF may benefits from bi- or multi-cultural QA.

- 3 The Tunis Agenda has a strong development focus. It raises questions related to access to the Internet (para 72(e)) as well as to developing country participation in Internet Governance mechanisms (para 72 (f)). It also emphasizes that the IGF needs «to contribute to capacity-building for Internet Governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise» (para 72 (h)).

- (a) *How should the IGF approach access issues («availability and affordability of the Internet»)?*
- (b) *Para 72 (f) indicates that special measures ought to be taken to facilitate developing country participation in the IGF itself. What should be done?*
- (c) *What should be the focus of capacity-building initiatives?*

The "IGF" should welcome every participant, project and proposition on an equal opportunity basis. This means the catalysis of ad-hoc solutions for equal access to travel, hosting, training, testing, working, proposing, etc. In a global network all the interests are commons.

Assistance to developing countries should be based upon cultural empowerment and lead to sustainable development. They only can foster the steady local growth and stability the rest of the users expect for a global service consistent continuity.

- 4 Para 78 (b) calls on the Secretary-General to «establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau to support the IGF, ensuring multi-stakeholder participation».

- (a) *Does this para refer to a bureau as it is normally used in an intergovernmental context, such as the WSIS bureau?*
- (b) *Would it be a bureau to deal with organizational issues and prepare agenda and programme of the IGF meetings?*
- (c) *If so, how should it be composed?*
- (d) *Alternatively, could it be a high-level senior advisory body to provide overall direction and shape to the IGF meetings?*
- (e) *If so, how should it be composed?*

I would suggest a rotating Chair supported by a light secretariat. The Chair would be from the country welcoming the next meeting - similar to the Olympic Games. This principle could be adopted by the various specialised entities sharing in the IGF when they meet.

5 Para 78 (b) can also be interpreted as referring to a secretariat function.

- (a) *Could this function be assumed by existing institutions, which could take turns in providing the secretariat for the IGF?*
- (b) *Alternatively, is there need for an independent secretariat?*
- (c) *If a secretariat is established,*
 - (i) *Where should it be based?*
 - (ii) *What should be its linkage to the United Nations Secretary-General?*

An ad-hoc specialised independent secretariat is necessary. It could be supervised by the ITU. It should be located at the Internet Campus.

6 Para 73 addresses aspects related to the structure of the IGF, which should be «lightweight and decentralised» and build on «existing structures of Internet governance, with special emphasis on the complementarity between all stakeholders involved in this process».

What does this mean in practice?

- (a) *Does the decentralized structure refer to a support structure (secretariat) or the Forum itself, or both?*

Both.

- (b) *Does it point to additional expert meetings and / or programme committees, which could report back to the IGF and help prepare its meetings? Should possible sub-structures be supported by organizations with the relevant expertise?*

Yes. But they should be totally independent. The target is to concert. There can be no other authority than convincing solutions. IGF Participants and network users can so easily go away and build an alternative consensus.

7 The Tunis Agenda does not elaborate on aspects related to the funding of the IGF.

How do you think the IGF should be financed?

The IGF should be self-financed with government and sponsors funding. This can be achieved by the secretariat managing the Internet Campus on grounds obtained for free from a welcoming country. Sponsors could assume the cost of its main tools:

- information
- databases and intergovernance tool
- directory

Government funding should be considered as part of regalian services to their citizens.

8 Para 74 mentions the «proven competencies of all stakeholders in Internet governance and the need to ensure their full involvement».

What steps should be taken to identify and engage all stakeholders

Competencies should be identified according to the practices in each area, and by cross-identification. For example: peers will mainly identify technicians, civil society be represented by NGOs, business by business organisations. But civil society must be able to identify its technicians, business to sponsor Foundations, etc.

and what needs to be done to make best possible use of their competencies?

If they are competent they will know and propose.

- 9 Para 74 also encourages the Secretary-General «to examine a range of options for the convening of the Forum».

Are there any other options not addressed in the questions above? What are these options as you understand them.

- 10 Paragraph 72 (a) of the Tunis Agenda gives the IGF the mandate to «discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet».

- (a) *What are these issues?*
- (b) *Are they all the issues mentioned in the Chapter on Internet Governance in the Tunis Agenda?*
- (c) *Which issues should be treated as priorities?*
- (d) *Could these issues constitute a work programme for the coming years?*

So far the Internet technology and the Internet usage have been closely associated. The IGF is going to change this. The IGF is to require things the Internet architecture will not be able at some stage to deliver. This limit may be related to quality, to load, to diversity. It will not be a clear to everyone nor easily accepted and addressed.

This will lead to different propositions. The main IGF issue will then be harmonisation.

Among the main requirements multilingualisation (local empowerment) may be a trigger. It calls for brain to brain interintelligibility over end to end interoperability. The resolution of the resulting constraints may have an innovative snowball effect, where privacy as opposed to various security, legal and most of all economical model may play a big role. This should emerge on a society of services extending the notion of information and its intergovernance.

- 11 The first meeting of the Internet Governance Forum should take place «no later than 2006»

- (a) *When would be the best time for the meeting?*

Suggestion November 2006

- (b) *What should be on its agenda?*

What will have emerged from the debate of the coming months.

- (c) *Should it focus on one or at the most two issues that would be dealt with in depth, or should it discuss a wide range of issues?*
- (d) *How should its programme be designed (time-management plan, organizational aspects)?*

For the first meeting, an approach copied on Tunis could be of interest.

12 Any other comments, suggestions or questions that should be addressed?

Please let us know your views on any other issues that ought to be addressed.

An "Information Operations Roadmap" was recently declassified by a large Defence Department. It says "we are to fight the net". This aspect cannot be forgot. National risk containment against DNS failure, foreign control, and intelligence leaks is certainly a priority for all the IGF will have to address.

** Please send all submissions in .rtf, text or .pdf via email.*