Von:	"Schneider Thomas BAKOM"
An:	"Schneider Thomas BAKOM"
Gesendet am:	Wed, 6 Feb 2008 15:06:50 +0100
Betreff:	Internet Governance Forum: Kurzkonsultation zum Schweizer Kommentar bis 8. Feb. 2008 15.00!

Liebe Interessierte am Internet Governance Forum

Am 26. Februar finden in Genf offene Konsultationen zum Internet Governance Forum (IGF) statt. An diesem Anlass soll über das vergangene IGF 2007 vom letzten November in Rio de Janeiro Bilanz gezogen werden und der Weg zum nächsten IGF (New Delhi) vom kommenden Dezember geebnet werden.

Das BAKOM hat für diesen Anlass einen Entwurf für einen schweizer Beitrag verfasst.
<<...>>
Gerne empfangen wir Ihre Kommentare dazu bis diesen Freitag 8. Februar 2008 um 15h.
Spätere Kommentare können nicht mehr berücksichtigt werden, da der Text noch am selben Tag an das IGF Sekretariat gesandt werden muss. Für die kurze Frist bitten wir Sie um Verständnis.

In der Anlage finden Sie ebenfalls einen kurzen Text zum IGF 2007 von Rio de Janeiro (auf D und F).
<<...>> <<...>>
Mit freundlichen Grüssen

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
(draft of 5 feb 2008)

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 space 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 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.
As another important 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.

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.

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.

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 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 TV-like formats with good moderators, but they should allow more than 30seconds statements by the panelists and the audience and stick to one issue for more than 2 minutes.

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 strongly oppose to any elaboration of a 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.

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 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.

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.
    (this should be done taking 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 wellprepared 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.

Titre

Vorname / prénom Name / Nom , Dienst Internationales

Lead

Vom 12. bis 15. November 2007 diskutierten und stritten in Rio de Janeiro über 1600 Regierungs-, Unternehmens und NGO-Vertreter im Rahmen des zweiten Internet Governance Forum (IGF) über Fragen der Zugänglichkeit, Offenheit, Sicherheit und Vielfalt des Internets. Diese vier Hauptthemen für den globalen Dialog waren schon in bei der Premiere des IGF im Oktober 2006 in Athen diskutiert worden. Neu ist in Rio ein fünftes umstrittenes Hauptthema hinzugekommen, welches Ende 2005 in den Verhandlungen im Vorfeld des zweiten UN Weltgipfels zur Informationsgesellschaft (WSIS) 2005 in Tunis dazu geführt hatte, dass man überhaupt das IGF als Multistakeholder Diskussionsforum aus der Taufe hob: Die Verwaltung der Internet Kernressourcen wie Root Server, IP-Adressen, Domain Namen, etc., durch die private Organisation ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, www.icann.org), welche allein dem US-Handelsministerium Rechenschaft schuldig ist. Die Tatsache, dass der Gastgeber des IGF 2007, Brasilien, einer der vehementesten Kritiker von ICANN ist, hat nicht wie von Einigen gefürchtet zu allzu heftigen Auseinandersetzungen geführt.

Viele Themen – viele Veranstaltungen
In fünf Haupt-Panels und rund achtzig Workshops, Best-Practice Foren und anderen Veranstaltungen wurden unter anderem Themen wie die Vielsprachigkeit des Internet (nicht nur in Bezug auf Inhalte, sondern auch auf das Domain Name System), die Bekämpfung von Spam und Cyberkriminalität, der Übergang von IPv4 zu IPv6, die Bedeutung von offenen Standards und eines sinnvollen Umgangs mit Rechten des geistigen Eigentums, die Stärkung der Menschenrechte im Internet, Fragen des Daten- und Konsumentenschutzes, des Schutzes von Kindern und Jugendlichen sowie des verbesserten Zugangs der Entwicklungsländer zum Internet und dessen Verwaltung diskutiert. Ein von der Schweiz als Co-Sponsor unterstützter Workshop zur Ausarbeitung einer "Entwicklungs-Agenda" zum Thema Internet Governance nach dem Vorbild der "Entwicklungs-Agenda" der Weltorganisation für Geistiges Eigentum (WIPO) – wurde positiv aufgenommen und wird im Rahmen einer "Dynamischen Koalition" weiter konkretisiert werden.

Vorsichtige Schritte in Richtung globaler Strukturen und Normen
Die Idee der Schaffung einer "Internet Bürgerrechtscharta", welche von Italien am IGF 2006 lanciert wurde, wurde in Rio weiter konkretisiert. Dabei ist man von der Idee abgekommen, für das Internet neue Rechte definieren zu wollen. Vielmehr beabsichtigt man nun die weltweit akzeptierten Menschenrechte und Grundfreiheiten in einer für die Internetnutzer besser verständlichen Form darzustellen – eine Idee, die in Rio auf ein positives Echo gestossen ist und ebenfalls in einer "Dynamischen Koalition" weiterverfolgt wird.
Zur Problematik der Internationalisierung und Demokratisierung der Verwaltung der Internet Kernressourcen gibt es nach wie vor weit divergierende Meinungen. Viele Teilnehmer zeigten sich nach wie vor unzufrieden mit der Tatsache, dass die Regierungen lediglich in unverbindlicher Weise als Beirat in die ICANN Struktur eingebunden sind. Mehrere Vorstösse zielen nun darauf ab, diesen Beirat aus ICANN herauszulösen und einer internationalen Organisation anzugliedern.

Das IGF – ein blosser Debattierklub oder eine Plattform für politisches Agenda-Setting?
Während Länder wie China und Russland darauf drängen, dass im Rahmen des IGF über politische Papiere verhandelt werden soll, sehen viele staatliche und nichtstaatliche Experten eben gerade den Wert des IGF in der Tatsache, dass sich Experten aus Regierungs-, Wirtschafts- und Zivilgesellschaftskreisen hier eben auf informelle Weise und ohne Verhandlungsdruck offen über Chancen und Risiken im Zusammenhang mit dem Internet austauschen können und sich auf freiwilliger Basis zusammenschliessen können, um konkrete Probleme anzupacken. Bemerkenswert ist z.B. die gemeinsame Initiative der bisherigen "Kontrahenten" ICANN mit ITU und UNESCO zur Entwicklung eines mehrsprachigen Domain Name Systems.

Nach der zweiten Ausgabe, gibt es natürlich noch viele Schwächen der Struktur des IGF, die in Zukunft verbessert werden müssen. Zudem wurde von verschiedener Seite die Einrichtung regionaler Internet Governance Foren angeregt. Die Grundidee des IGF als echte Multistakeholder Plattform, wo jeder der was zu sagen hat, seine Erfahrungen einbringen kann und konkrete Initiativen initiieren kann, ist für die UN revolutionär und hat etwas bestechendes. Die Schweiz setzt sich unter Federführung des BAKOM dafür ein, dass das IGF eine Plattform für einen offenen Multistakeholder-Dialog bleibt, dass aber die im IGF gewonnenen Erkenntnisse vermehrt in andere Gremien wo Internet-relevante Entscheide getroffen werden, hineingetragen werden.

Titre

Vorname / prénom Name / Nom , service des Affaires internationales

Lead

Dans le cadre de la deuxième édition de l'Internet Governance Forum (IGF), qui a eu lieu du 12 au 15 novembre 2007 à Rio de Janeiro, plus de 1600 représentants de gouvernements, d'entreprises et d'ONG ont débattu de questions liées à l'accessibilité, à l'ouverture, à la sécurité et à la diversité de l'internet. Ces quatre thèmes avaient déjà été abordés lors de la première édition de l'IGF en octobre 2006 à Athènes. Un cinquième sujet central mais controversé est venu s'ajouter qui, lors des négociations menées fin 2005 en vue du second sommet mondial de l'ONU sur la société de l'information (SMSI) à Tunis, avait abouti à la création de l'IGF en tant que forum de discussion: la gestion des ressources clés de l'internet comme les serveurs racines, les adresse IP, les noms de domaine, etc. par l'organisation privée ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, www.icann.org), qui n'a de compte à rendre qu'au ministère américain du commerce. Le fait que l'hôte de l'IGF 2007, le Brésil, soit l'un des plus virulents critiques de l'ICANN n'a pas entraîné de débats trop véhéments, comme certains le craignaient.

Nombreux thèmes abordés
Les cinq tables rondes et les quelque quatre-vingts ateliers, forums de meilleures pratiques et autres rencontres ont eu pour thèmes le multilinguisme de l'internet (par rapport aux contenus, mais aussi au système des noms de domaine), la lutte contre le pollupostage et la cybercriminalité, le passage de l'IPv4 à l'IPv6, l'importance des normes ouvertes et d'une gestion adéquate des droits liés à la propriété intellectuelle, la consolidation des droits de l'homme dans l'internet, les questions concernant la protection des données et des consommateurs, la protection des enfants et des jeunes, ainsi que la gestion de l'internet et un accès plus aisé pour les pays en développement. L'un des ateliers, soutenu notamment par la Suisse, visait à définir un "agenda de développement" sur la gouvernance de l'internet selon le modèle établi par l'Organisation mondiale de la propriété intellectuelle (OMPI); il a rencontré un écho positif et sera développé dans le cadre d'une "coalition dynamique".

A pas prudents vers des structures et des normes mondiales
Lancée par l'Italie lors de l'IGF 2006, l'idée de créer une "Charte de la citoyenneté sur l'internet" a été reprise à Rio. Il s'agit non pas de définir de nouveaux droits, mais de présenter les droits de l'homme et les libertés fondamentales universellement reconnus sous une forme compréhensible pour les utilisateurs de l'internet. Accueillie favorablement à Rio, l'idée sera aussi reprise dans le cadre d'une "coalition dynamique".
Les opinions divergent toujours quant à la problématique de l'internationalisation et de la démocratisation de la gestion des ressources clés de l'internet. De nombreux participants n'apprécient guère le fait que les gouvernements soient intégrés dans la structure de l'ICANN de manière non-contraignante en tant qu'organe consultatif. De nombreuses démarches sont dorénavant entreprises pour séparer cet organe de l'ICANN et le rattacher à une organisation internationale.

L'IGF – club de discussion ou plateforme permettant de fixer l'agenda politique?
Certains pays comme la Chine ou la Russie insistent pour que l'IGF négocie des papiers politiques. A l'inverse, pour de nombreux spécialistes issus de milieux étatiques et non-étatiques, c'est juste la manière informelle et l'absence de pression de négociations, qui permet à l'IGF de devenir une instance au sein de laquelle les représentants des gouvernements, de l'économie et de la société civile peuvent discuter, de des chances et des risques liés à l'internet, ou se retrouver librement pour affronter certains problèmes. A souligner notamment la décision commune, prise par l'ICANN, l'UIT et l'UNESCO, de développer un système multilingue de noms de domaine.
Bien entendu, la structure de l'IGF présente encore bien des faiblesses auxquelles il s'agira de remédier. En outre, diverses voix se sont élevées pour demander l'instauration de forums régionaux. L'idée de faire de l'IGF une plateforme ouverte où celui qui a quelque chose à dire peut partager ses expériences et prendre des initiatives est révolutionnaire pour l'ONU; elle n'en demeure pas moins

séduisante. Sous la conduite de l'OFCOM, la Suisse s'engage pour que l'IGF demeure une plateforme de dialogue, mais que les enseignements acquis dans ce cadre profitent aussi aux organismes qui prennent des décisions importantes dans le domaine de l'internet.