Von:	"Schneider Thomas BAKOM"
An:	"Schneider Thomas BAKOM"
Gesendet am:	Fri, 8 Feb 2008 17:59:37 +0100
Betreff:	Internet Governance Forum: Schweizer Beitrag für die open consultations vom 26. Feb. 2008

Sehr geehrte IGF-Interessierte

Besten Dank für die vielen wertvollen Kommentare zu unserem Entwurf für einen Schweizer Beitrag für die Konsultationen zum IGF, welche am 26. Februar in Genf stattfinden werden.

Wir haben versucht, alle soweit möglich in unseren Beitrag einfliessen zu lassen.

Hier zu Ihrer Information noch den finalen Text, wie er an das IGF Sekretariat geschickt wurde: <<...>>

Freundliche Grüsse und ein schönes Wochenende

Thomas

Thomas Schneider
Koordinator internationale Informationsgesellschaft
Dienst Internationales

Eidgenössisches Departement für Umwelt,
Verkehr, Energie und Kommunikation UVEK

Bundesamt für Kommunikation BAKOM
Zukunftstrasse 44, CH 2501 Biel

Tel.   +41 32 327 56 35 (direkt)
Tel.   +41 32 327 55 11 (Zentrale)
Fax   +41 32 327 54 66
mailto:thomas.schneider@bakom.admin.ch
www.bakom.admin.ch

Swiss comments on the second IGF held in Rio de Janeiro in November 2007 and recommendations for future IGF events

First of all, we would like to thank the host country, the Co-Chairs, the IGF secretariat, the advisory group and everybody else involved in the preparation and realization of the second Internet Governance Forum held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 12 to 15 November 2007 for their efforts in making the IGF 2007 a successful event.

In Rio, we have experienced constructive and inspiring debates on a multitude of public policy issues related to internet governance. After a first promising IGF held in Athens in 2006, the 2007 event in Rio was a positive next step in establishing the IGF as a unique and relevant platform for the global discussion of internet governance issues.

Still, we believe that the IGF has not yet fully exploited its potential. We think that the IGF should build on its positive experience made in the last two years and – without fundamentally changing its settings – should try to improve and reform its structures to make the third IGF to be held in New Delhi at the end of this year an even more successful event.

Participation of all relevant stakeholders

- The *multistakeholder-approach* allowing all interested stakeholders to freely participate and discuss *at eyelevel* is *key to the success* of the IGF and *should be strengthened*. Efforts must be continued to *strengthen the participation of developing country stakeholders*. Also, the IGF should try to *enhance the participation of business representatives*, from big international market players as well as from innovative small and medium size enterprises from all around the world, but especially from developing countries. Knowing that this has already been tried and proven not to be easy, we still think that the IGF should again try to attract *those young people from around the world who are about to develop the internet of tomorrow* in order to involve them in the discussions.

- In order to make the IGF attractive for participation, it needs to be *organized and prepared in a very timely manner*. All relevant structures, participants, dates and schedules should be *decided and announced as early as possible*. We welcome the concrete proposals made by others in this regard and look forward to discuss them in more detail in the next consultations meeting at the end of this month in Geneva.

- Furthermore, we would welcome that, at the next IGF, there would be some s*pace for the announcement of initiatives, partnerships, etc*. We think this might make the IGF more attractive for leaders to participate and also for the media to report on it.

substantive discussion

- In our view, the IGF should help actors involved in public policy issues to *become aware of challenges and opportunities* that the internet and its governance bring to humanity. The IGF should also be a platform where participants can exchange views and ideas on how the internet can best continue to be a *sphere of innovation* that serves all people around the planet to progress in their economic, political, social and cultural development. It should help to *empower individuals and societies* to make the best possible use of the *public service value of the internet* and to build an inclusive information society which is *based on existing and agreed fundamental rights and freedoms*. We do not think there is a need for new rights and freedoms for the internet, but we think people need to be *assured that the existing ones are also applied to the virtual world*.

- The cross-cutting issues of *capacity building* and *development* are in our view fundamental and should therefore be strengthened. Since cross-cutting issues tend to be forgotten in the discussions on concrete themes, we would propose that they should explicitly be addressed in all events of the IGF. We also welcome the idea to work on a *development agenda for internet governance*. We support the idea of creating a *multi-stakeholder Working Group* made up of individuals with the necessary expertise which could develop recommendations to the IGF on how to strengthen the development agenda, identify the key issues from a development perspective in all 5 areas (CIR, Access, Openness, Diversity and Standards) and identify key question for discussion during the next IGF. Such recommendations would not be recommendations of the IGF but just of the

working group which would thereby help to prepare the next IGF meeting. We would encourage that the IGF contributes to the identification and sharing of best practices from internet governance at national or regional level that contribute to poverty reduction.

- We think that the IGF should help participants to explore how the *innovation potential of the internet and its governance can be better explored* by small and medium businesses, especially from the developing world.

- We support the inclusion of *sustainable development with a focus on climate change as another cross-cutting issue* and the identification of a few key questions that could be discussed in each of the workshops.

- As another fundamental issue, we would welcome that the question about how the *principles for internet governance*, as defined in Geneva Declaration of 2003, that the "international management of the Internet should be *multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations*" should be implemented in all fora involved in internet governance. We would propose to *add this as another cross-cutting issue* that should be at the core of all substantive discussions at the IGF. In this regard, we would be interested to hear more about the idea of *developing a code for public participation in internet regulation* as proposed at the last IGF.

- We also think that, generally speaking, the discussions in the IGF should not try to avoid critical issues, but they should be informal, open and free and should allow for divergence of views. The atmosphere of the discussions should be respectful but not too "nice" and "cosy".

Format of the different events at the IGF and interplay between them

- In the first two meetings of the IGF, we have seen a *vast number of workshops and other events* on specific issues grouped around the four respectively five main issues. We think that most of these events have been very useful and inspiring to the participants. However, in order not to overload the IGF with too many events, *organizers should be more vigorously forced to merge overlapping events*. In merging workshops, the principle of all kinds of diversities – geo-political, of special interests, of range of views, etc. – should of course be kept in mind.

- If the *wide range of different formats* should be kept (workshops, open forums, best practice forums, etc.), the *difference between them* and their concrete structure and participants *needs to be presented more clearly* so that people know better in advance what they are to expect from an individual event.
  Events that purely explain the functioning of processes organizations should be clearly marked as such. They can continue to take place during the IGF as a kind of educational information, but they *should be treated differently from the "discussion workshops"* – as a kind of side events with no particular reporting back.

- In our view, the *reporting sessions* on the events of the day before have been *very useful*. However, rapporteurs should be forced to *stick to a tight time limit* and to *reflect the whole range of views* expressed in their event rather than to advocate for one view. *Short summaries of the workshops* including the key issues, good practices and recommendations discussed should be completed, and *made available to the public* and the IGF Secretariat. As for the best practice workshops in particular, we support the establishment of a *databank on best practices*, including toolkits and good practices that are presented or emerge from the workshops. The databank would be accessible in the IGF website.

- With regard to the *main sessions*, we think that there is some room for improvement of their format. The main sessions should be focused on a *more in-dept discussion* of a limited number of specific issues *drawing on the outcomes (including recommendations) of the relevant workshops*. This could be done, by putting one participant of each workshop (e.g. its moderator) on the panel of the respective main session. The format of the main sessions should be *as attractive as possible*. It could be a TV-style format with good moderators, but they should allow more than 30seconds statements by the panelists and the audience and focus on the main ideas and recommendations emerging from the workshops, with a view to discuss and *identify possible ways forward to address the key issues*, including the relevant decision-making bodies where the issue should be addressed.
  Furthermore, there are *substantive links between the main themes* that should be referred to in the main sessions and also in the workshops (e.g. the links between security and openness and between access and diversity).

- Furthermore, we propose to make *true breaks at lunchtime* of at least one hour duration. This would in our view help people to clean their heads from the morning events and continue to concentrate on the afternoon events and it would also create more opportunities for informal networking.

outcome and outreach of the IGF

- In our view, the participants at the IGF would want to take something home that is an *added value* to them and that helps them to better perform in their daily businesses.
  We would not like the IGF to turn into a meeting of a group of friends that discuss among themselves, but we would like to see the *discussions to be continued in other fora* on global, regional and national levels.
  So we think that there should be an *outcome of the IGF that is more tangible and that better reflects the ideas and tendencies that have evolved in the IGF*. We think it is not enough to reflect the discussions of the main sessions in a summary paper. The *outcomes of the workshops* should also be made *more visible*.

- Like stated above, we believe the *IGF should remain a platform for open and free exchange* of views and ideas. We would therefore *oppose the elaboration of any negotiated outcome* which in our view would threaten to destroy the unique value of the IGF.

- However, we would propose that the IGF *develop a form of a paper outcome* that reflects the core views, initiatives and discussions of the IGF. In our view, there would be *no need for a consensus*, on the contrary, *diverging views should be reflected*. Such a paper could for instance contain a *list of "messages"* (some of them could be controversial) *and a list of projects, initiatives, etc.* that would be clustered according to the main issues. This would help to continue the dialogue in other fora at the global, regional and especially national level.
  The IGF should not be a place where decisions are taken, but its discussions should be heard in other fora where decisions are taken.

dynamic coalitions/ IGF working groups

- While we wish the IGF itself to remain a platform for discussion and exchange of experience, we *welcome the concept of the dynamic coalitions*, where actors can informally and on a voluntary basis get together to work on specific issues of their interest and experience.

- In order to strengthen these coalitions, we think they should have *more visibility during and also between the IGF meetings* and their work should also *better feed back into the meetings*.

- We think that the coalitions should take more profit from the IGF by presenting the work they have already done, by holding interactive meetings where they should try to *look forward and define the objectives of their work until the next meeting*.

- In order to clarify existing uncertainties with regard to the dynamic coalitions, we suggest that the *IGF develop more concrete rules under which these coalitions could work*, how their relation to the "core" IGF would be organized, what *rights and obligations* they have when they call themselves a dynamic coalition of the IGF.

- Furthermore, we have taken note of the proposals made by others to *create IGF working groups* inspired by the WGIG format of 2004 and 2005. As we understand this proposal, these working groups could address particular challenges and could develop *recommendations on these particular issues that would not have to be agreed by the "core" IGF*. These working groups should have a degree of accountability and an obligation to report to the IGF that the dynamic coalitions do not have. We think this is a very interesting proposal and look forward to discuss this in the next consultations. However, in whatever way dynamic coalitions or working groups are formed or reformed, this *should not affect the openness and informality of discussions at the "core" IGF*.

input / feedback into the next IGF

- The IGF should not only have a clearer outreach on other fora on global, regional and national level, there should also be a *mechanism for input from all levels*. Room should be provided in consultative meetings and the main IGF meetings for people to *report back on the concrete impact*

of the IGF. Especially dynamic coalitions and working groups should have a format to report back on what they achieved since the last IGF.

advisory group

- In our view, the *multistakeholder advisory group* has been very important and has had a *big influence on the success of the IGF* so far. We therefore think, that the link of the advisory group to the United Nations' Secretary General's office, the *current format of and balance within the group should in general be kept*. However, we think that the format and the work of the advisory group should be *defined a little clearer* in order to improve the efficiency, timeliness, independence and transparency of its work.

- We would agree with others in considering the following proposals:
  - the advisory group should be *formally appointed by the UN Secretary General early in the year*
  - there should be a *rotation system* within the stakeholder groups that allows a balance between keeping past expertise and bringing in new ideas, taking also into account a geographical balance and – if possible – also a gender balance)
  - the *mandate* of the advisory group should be *clarified* and possible subgroups with clear mandates and responsibilities could be identified
  - the *division of labour between the IGF secretariat and the advisory group* should be clear and transparent to the outside
  - the advisory group should have the *right to have closed discussions*, but it should improve *transparency to non members* by developing a structure for *regular information* on discussions and decisions

financial stability of IGF and its secretariat

- Up to now, the IGF has operated with a very small budget and also with very limited human resources. In order to give the secretariat – which has worked astonishingly well under these difficult circumstances – a little bit more air to breathe and to allow for a little more planning, sustainability and stability, and in order to meet the rising demands of services the secretariat is facing, *more resources are needed*.

- Also for a desirable *support of the participation of stakeholders from developing countries* additional resources are needed.

- Switzerland, who has substantially contributed to financing the IGF secretariat since its creation, is therefore *urging all stakeholders that wish the IGF to continue to be a relevant and well prepared event to join the group of donors* to the IGF and inviting them to participate at the donors meeting to be held in Geneva on 25 February 2008.

enhanced cooperation

- Since the adoption of the final documents of the Tunis summit, we have seen that there are *diverging views with regard to the interpretation of paragraphs 69 to 71 of the Tunis Agenda* on the so-called "process towards enhanced cooperation" that should have been started by the UN Secretary-General by the end of the first quarter of 2006. While some claim that the process mentioned is well underway in different fora, others still wait for it to be started. We think that it would be useful for many stakeholders and would help to bring those different views and interpretations closer to each other, if the *UN secretary general would be asked to give us his view on how we should understand this process* and how the relevant organization should report annually on this process as requested in paragraph 71 of the Tunsi Agenda.

We are looking forward to discuss these issues and proposals during the next open consultations to be held in Geneva on 26 February 2008.