I. Introduction

1. This paper summarizes comments received in preparation of the sixth IGF meeting, which is to take place during 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya. This version of the paper takes into account comments received by the IGF Secretariat in response to its call for contributions by 9 February 2011. There were 11 contributions received in time for this report. Two of the contributions received were copies of the comments sent to the CSTD working group on the IGF.

2. As in the past years, the paper is defined as a work in progress and planned as a rolling document that will be updated regularly based on contributions, open consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) meetings. The paper will be updated in light of the discussions to be held at the Open Consultation on 23 February 2011 and the meeting of the MAG, on 24 February 2011. Additionally, after the February open consultations and the MAG meeting, a draft of the programme for Nairobi will be released for comment.

3. All of the contributions and open consultation transcripts will be posted on the IGF Web site throughout the preparatory process of the Nairobi meeting. The readers of this paper are encouraged to read those contributions and the open consultations transcripts for further details and in depth discussions.

4. The contributions touched on a great variety of issues. While some commented on the previous year’s meeting, others made specific recommendations for the 2011 meeting. There were comments on the themes of the IGF meeting and on the organization of workshops. Several contributions discussed changes in the modalities of the IGF and especially focused on ways in which the IGF could produce outcomes without becoming a decision making body.

II. General comments on the Vilnius meeting

5. Special gratitude was expressed for the participation of Her Excellency, Ms Dalia Grybauskaite, President of the Republic of Lithuania, as this was the first IGF where the host head of state contributed directly to the IGF meeting.

6. Among the specific aspects singled out for appreciation by the contributors were the following:

   • Appreciation for the hospitality of the Lithuanian hosts was mentioned by many of the comments;
   • Appreciation for the preparations done by the Secretariat and the Host Country in preparation for the fourth IGF meeting;
   • Appreciation for the Host Country website and the availability of computers, printers, and copiers;
   • Appreciation for an excellent registration experience where the staff processed delegates pleasantly, quickly and efficiently;
   • Appreciation for the good layout in the main session room for discussions;
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• Appreciation for video screens that made it possible to follow the main session
dialogue even when not in the room;
• Appreciation for the improved remote participation, for remote hubs and for remote
moderation;
• Appreciation for the workshop transcripts, summary reports, webcasts, audiocasts
and other records of the IGF meeting to be found on the IGF Web site.
• Appreciation for the frequent updating of the Web site during the meeting;
• Appreciation for the continued availability of IGF You Tube site.

7. In addition to appreciation, the contributions indicated that they would like to see the
2011 meeting build on these IGF features. Many of the contribution indicated that the IGF had
established a good basis in its first five years that should be maintained and build upon while
undergoing improvement.

8. There was great appreciation for the friendliness and helpfulness of the venue staff.

9. There was some criticism of aspects related to the 2010 meeting, such as:
• There was a lack of energy in many of the main sessions.
• There were too many main sessions.
• There were too many speakers in some of the meetings;
• There were still too many workshops and further efforts had to be made to cut down
the number of workshops;
• Too many workshops had overlapping or duplicated topics;
• The layout of the workshops rooms made listening difficult at times;
• The quality of the transcripts was lower than in previous meetings and this made it
difficult for remote participants, especially those for whom English was not their
native language;
• The distance of the venue from the hotels presented difficulties for some of the
delegates;
• There were difficulties encountered with obtaining meals and the practice where
previous meetings had found sponsors for catered lunches and coffee breaks was
recommended to future hosts.

10. Comments were received on the importance of having more access to press lists and
other press information in order to build appropriate communications and media attention for the
IGF.

III. General comments on the IGF and its functioning

11. Congratulations and gratitude were expressed for Mr. Nitin Desai, the Chair of the MAG,
and for Mr. Markus Kummer the Executive Coordinator of the IGF Secretariat for their leadership of
the IGF over the first five years of the IGF.

12. The adaptability of the IGF was noted in the improvements that had been made in 2010
based on comments made in regard to the 2009 IGF meeting.

13. Appreciation was mentioned for the Good Practice guide that the IGF Secretariat
published in 2010.

14. In one recommendation a suggestion was made that the IGF evolve away form being a
yearly event with multiple preparatory meetings, to a year round process that allowed
multistakeholder dialogue that informed policy makers and the institutions responsible for Internet
governance.

15. The importance of output messages from the main sessions as well as workshops was
recommended by several of the comments. It was also suggested that a diverse set of sources
could be used to collate, interpret and analyse the IGF discussions and thereby continue and deepen the debate.

16. It was recommended that ways be found to report on the capacity building outcomes in a consolidated way.

17. One contribution recommended that the Secretariat facilitate periodic meetings among the convenors of national and regional IGF meeting and provide avenues for the exchange of information among the various IGFs. It recommended that regional and nations IGF uphold the WSIS principles and that these regional and national IGFs produce reports that feed into the planning and themes of the IGF. It was also recommended that the regional and national discussions of topics be brought more fully into the general discussion of the IGF meeting and not be restricted to sessions focusing on reports from the regional and national meetings.

18. It was recommended that the IGF look into collocated meetings with stakeholder organizations.

19. Several comments indicate that the IGF itself should continue to discuss improvements to the IGF in the manner of previous years discussions on Taking Stock of Internet Governance and the Way Forward.

IV. Comments related to IGF themes

20. It was recommended that the Regional Perspectives session be continued, and enhanced. The recommendation suggested that the IGF look at the influence the IGF process had on local governance as well as the effect of regional and national IGF efforts on the global IGF itself.

21. It was recommended by several writers that the cross-cutting themes of development be strengthened in all main sessions through the use of good practice examples. Some felt that the topic was too broad to be treated as a single theme and that it would benefit from continued discussion in a workshop environment that would allow for in depth discussion.

22. While capacity building has been a cross-cutting theme since the start of the IGF, one comment recommended that it become a main session theme and that it showcase successful initiatives and projects worldwide. Some of the recommended discussion topics included:

- How to increase individual capacity and involve individuals worldwide to bring more interests and awareness of regional, sub regional and national concerns;
- How to empower professionals within their respective institutions and regions to raise the awareness of Internet governance institutions and processes;
- How to extend the working view of the institutions from their specific policy interest to include the wider context of policy concerns;
- How to build on efficient and cost-effective approaches to institutional capacity building;
- How to provide wider partnerships for institutional capacity building by combining the strengths of various global institutions in outreach, skills, expertise, funding, and methodology;
- How to enable top decision-makers to utilise the individual and institutional capacities for the work on future national and regional policies related to Internet governance.

23. Several suggestions where made regarding the themes of Security, Openness and Privacy that would build on the discussions of previous IGF meetings, including:

- "Internet openness and network evolution" should be discussed in the context of investment and infrastructure development.
- Highlight cross-border issues as major components of the privacy and security discussions.
- Continue discussion on way to balance the legal requirements of privacy with the needs of law enforcement, building on the work done by the OECD and the COE.
24. One suggestion for the Access and Diversity session included discussion on how Internet Exchange Points are reducing the costs for local content. Another topic concerned the governance issues involved in blocking websites.

25. Several comments remarked on the success of the emerging Issues session on cloud computing and supported continuing the practice of selecting a new emerging issue as a theme each year.

V. Suggested topics and themes for Nairobi

26. Accountability and Transparency: this was suggested as a subtheme for 2011 given its importance to all Internet governance organizations and institutions.

27. Access to infrastructure and knowledge: The recommendation was for discussion of topics such as spectrum allocation and digital migrations. There were several recommendations for discussion of intellectual property from a development perspective engaging WIPO in this discussion and focusing on technical, operational, political and policy realities. Additionally, it was mentioned that the topic include a discussion of what developing countries could do to attract private investment in broadband infrastructure deployment.

28. Human rights: It was recommended that the Internet key role in the realisation of a broad range of human rights be discussed. The rights mentioned included:
   - The rights to opinion, expression and assembly over the internet;
   - The right to access information on sexual health and pleasure;
   - The right to privacy including control over personal data and respecting its contextual integrity;
   - The right to safety and protection against sexual harassment and violence online.

29. Building an Innovation Economy: This would involve a discussion of entrepreneurship and business creation as a means of development.

30. During the 2010 meeting, there was a discussion of building on the work done in Brazil on the core values of Internet governance. Several recommendations mentioned that this should be included in the 2011 programme.

31. Several suggestions were made for the Critical Internet Issues theme:
   - How does the growth of Internet-enabled mobile in developing countries affect the understanding of the term Critical Internet Resources?
   - Best Practices for eliminating barriers to access to the Internet;
   - How does the coming depletion of IPv4 addresses affect developing countries?
   - IPv6 and the impact and opportunities for the developing world that may result from the transition to IPv6.
   - What is the effect of the deployment of multilingual domain names, i.e. IDN.IDN?
   - Issues of ICANN's naming policy and the impact of the new gTLDs and IDN gTLDs;
   - Technical issues such as DNS blocking and how such technical issues drive or impact policy;
   - An assessment of the progress made in stability and security of the Internet over the last year;
   - The impacts on freedom of expression by state actors actively denying access to the Internet or the Web and methods for mitigating these effects.

32. Cross border Issues: Many of the most difficult and pressing issues in Internet governance are described as concerning cross-border effects of national laws, policies, enforcement policies, and the actions of intermediaries on those who have no representation in the making of the laws or policies. It is recommended that there be a session that investigates formulations that might serve to resolve these issues.
33. **Development agenda:** This includes establishing dialogue between the Internet community and the development policy-makers on the issue of Internet policy’s impact on social, economic and human development. There was also a recommendation that the link between youth, Internet growth and development, and entrepreneurship issues be explored and emphasized.

34. **Open Internet - Network Neutrality on Wired and Mobile Networks:** The recommendation concerned an ideal where the Internet is open to the widest possible range of commercial and non-commercial content, applications and service. The topic would also look at how the ideal of an open Internet applies in the mobile space especially in developing countries.

35. It was recommended that the IGF remain open to emerging themes and that workshop submissions not be restricted to the main themes.

### VI. Comments on programme and logistics

36. There were some comments relating to the Opening and Closing sessions. While there was recognition of the formal importance of these sessions, it was also considered important to take into account the need to use the relatively small amount of time available for the IGF meetings in support of the multistakeholder goals of the IGF.

37. There was strong support for the method of organizing workshops to feed in to the main sessions producing a continuity that had not been present in previous IGF meetings.

38. In terms of non feeder workshops several contributions pointed to a conflict between workshops and the main sessions in the IGF’s traditional schedule. In a large part this has kept participants who were involved in the workshops away from the main sessions. This was considered an unfavourable situation by several contributors that needs to be changed in 2011.

39. It was noted that that remote hubs significantly lower barriers of participation for those in developing countries or remote regions. It was encouraged that data on the attendance on remote participants joining main sessions and workshops be published about the number of remote participants joining main sessions and workshops.

40. Several improvements to the main sessions were recommended including:
   - There needs to be a more discursive dialogue in the main session allowing for greater synthesis and dynamism in these sessions;
   - At least half of the session facilitators should be from developing countries;
   - A younger and more diverse group of speakers should be used in the main sessions;
   - Pre-events should be facilitated, by providing them with more logistical and other assistance. Contact persons should be appointed by the IGF secretarial and the Host country to provide this facilitation for pre-events.

41. Several improvements to the workshops were recommended including:
   - In all decisions related to workshops it was considered important to take the expected participants for those workshops into account;
   - The rules concerning multistakeholder format of workshops should be reviewed. Instead of a formula forcing a panel to include representatives from each stakeholder group, workshops might benefit from including speakers who are stakeholders in the specific topics being discussed;
   - Forcing diverse workshops to combine has, on several occasions, produced incoherent workshops. Instead of combining workshops, decisions should be made on the programs based on stricter criteria;
   - There was a recommendation that some workshops be designated as basic or fundamental to support capacity building for new attendees at the IGF;
   - For advance topic workshops, it was recommend that a white paper be produced related to the session. This could be produced either before a session to set the stage or after the session as a more in depth review than the required workshop
report. It was also suggested that the IGF publish these white papers.

- The Secretariat and MAG should limit the number of panellists in workshops. The template for workshops should be reorganized to reflect restrictions on the number of panellists and to encourage people to plan their workshops so that there is time for discussion.
- The Secretariat should produce an online form for participant review of workshops.

42. Several new formats for the overall meeting schedule were proposed:

- One format proposed structuring the schedule such that days 2-4 have workshops in the morning and main sessions in the afternoon. This proposal also dropped the Way Forward session from the schedule;
- One format proposed 2 days focused on workshops followed by two days focused on main session interspersed with round tables and best practice forums.

43. Several contributions commented on the need to increase inclusiveness in IGF participation. The recommendations included:

- The need to increase developing country participation;
- Broaden stakeholder group participation by using messages from the IGF as input to those involved in the policy community, particularly those involved in development policy, environmental policy, trade, access to knowledge, human rights and women's rights, and democratisation.
- Widen the inclusion of civil society actors beyond those of the Internet Governance Caucus (IGC) to include representatives from human right organizations, civil society organizations working with communication and development, civil society organisations working on economic development and trade justice, community radio activists, gender advocates, and academics from the south. It was also recommended that the IGF actively reach out to such groups and include them in the MAG.
- Make greater use of remote participation both for speakers at the main meetings and as part of the preparatory process. One recommendation included a proposal for holding at least one consultation per year as an online consultation.

44. One contribution emphasized the importance of discussions involving stakeholders with diverging views discussing concrete issues that require a solution.

45. Several comments acknowledged and supported the evolution of the IGF agenda over the years and indicated appreciation of the IGFs responsiveness to public comment and criticism.
46. Comment Sources

Comments included in this synthesis paper were received from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>auDA</td>
<td>Australian Domain Name Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Association for Progressive Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRA</td>
<td>Canadian Internet Registration Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplo</td>
<td>DiploFoundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC-Basis</td>
<td>International Chamber of Commerce, Business Action to Support the Information society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGC</td>
<td>Internet Governance Caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISOC</td>
<td>Internet Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRO</td>
<td>Number Resource Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-CSTD</td>
<td>Business representatives to CSTD Working Group on the IGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAC-CSTD</td>
<td>Internet Technical and Academic community representatives to CSTD Working Group on the IGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valzey</td>
<td>Minister Ed Valzey, Speech at UK Internet Governance Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>