

CONSULTATIONS ON THE CONVENING OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
TRANSCRIPT OF MORNING SESSION 16 FEBRUARY 2006

Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the Consultations on the Convening of the Internet Governance Forum, in Geneva on 16-17 February in Geneva, Switzerland. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

(Gavel). >>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Good morning, and welcome to Geneva to the consultations on the convening of the Internet Governance Forum, which was requested in the Tunis Agenda. It's my pleasure to meet many old friends all over again. I thought you all had had enough time to exchange notes and find out what you all had been doing between Tunis and now. So I thought we'd get down to work. I really do not wish to take much time in the beginning, but I must begin by a big word of thanks, a big word of thanks to the many people who have -- who made it possible for us to get to this point where we can sit down and talk constructively about how we address this issue of Internet -- of the Internet Governance Forum. I would like to thank particularly the secretary general of the summit, Mr. Utsumi, who is here with me and who will, I'm sure, tell us -- give us his reflections on what is expected of us a little later. I wanted to thank minister WAHLI, who is here, who, for sure, had to bear a great burden of the work which was done in Tunis. I'm really happy that he could be here. I also wanted to particularly thank ambassador Janis Karklins and Ambassador Masood Khan. I really I want to express my deep appreciation of the work that they both did, particularly Ambassador Masood Khan, in leading the negotiations and the discussions which led to the outcome on this very difficult issue. There are, of course, others who have been very involved in that process, but these are the people I really wanted to thank, because they are the ones who have given us the basis for our work today. I will not say much more at this point, but just a word on how we will proceed. I was going to suggest that we spend the morning today listening to some general statements about what people expect out of this Internet Governance Forum, and also their views on organizational issues which have been raised in the questions which have been -- which were sent by the Secretariat. After this round of, if you like, open-ended debate, I thought I would try and pose a set of questions. And then in the second round, people can come back with more precise replies if you like, or comments, on some of these questions, and also possibly commenting on what has been mentioned by other people. I would like to stress that this is a multistakeholder consultation. And I would, therefore, invite everybody to be very free in seeking the floor. I apologize for the fact that we are not well-organized for name plates in Geneva. I hope we can correct that as we go along. But I will try to do my best to recognize people. But in case you have a difficulty in getting yourself recognized, you just send a little note, saying so-and-so from such and such organization wishes to get the floor. In any case, let me tell you that even if we had name plates, at such a distance with my eyesight, I'm not sure that I would be able to read those name plates anyhow. So I apologize for the fact that the civil society and business sector and other stakeholders do not have name plates, but we'll try and make up for that and make sure that we do have a balanced discussion. So I will suggestion, therefore, this process where we have first an open discussion, followed by a most structured discussion around certain questions. And I will try and put some sort of summary of areas where there is general agreement, perhaps areas where there is a variety of views. Because, essentially, my job is as a messenger, a messenger to convey to the secretary general what views and sentiments here are. So I will try and give you a sense towards the end of the session tomorrow evening on what the messages that I think I have received from listening to people here. This is the process that I hope that we will be able to follow. So I do not wish to say anything more substantive at this point, because I'm here to listen, and I will have more opportunities to speak tomorrow when I react to some of the ideas which have come from the floor. So with these words, I would like to turn to Mr. Utsumi and request him to give us a sense of how he sees us doing our work.

>>SECTY-GEN UTSUMI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is very nice to see you once again here in Geneva. Many of you participated in Tunis summit and you saw the success of the summit. There are many reasons why the Tunisian phase of the summit was successful. But I only want to emphasize that from the point of the secretary of the summit, the budget finance for hosting the summit was very important. And in the ITU, we have calculated the expenses we had and the income for the contribution -- by the contributions to the summit fund. And we are seeing that we most probably will not have a deficit. That is one of the most important items of the success of the summit. And I very much appreciate those countries and the donators who made the summit successful. Tunis phase of the summit, in my opinion, has opened a new door for Internet. It has opened up the place for the discussion of many policy matters concerning the Internet openly and transparently. In the past, before the summit, the Internet was discussed mostly by engineers and by experts. Now, the Internet has been and will be discussed from more policy perspective. That is, I think that the -- one of the successes of the summit. And I am hoping that this new forum for Internet governance will have a fruitful discussion on various matters concerning the Internet. There are many, many challenges and problems for the Internet and for our communications to be effective and efficient and secured. So I am very much hoping the success of this forum. And today I am sure that you will have a good consultation how the forum will be formed. This forum is our forum, everyone's forum. And I wish you a very good, successful meeting. And I thank you very much, Mr. Desai, for your very good leadership.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Utsumi. And may I once again thank you for your sort of positive words of support for this exercise. Before we begin, there are a few announcements which Markus Kummer, who has been supporting this process, needs to make. Markus.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you, chairman. Let me start by apologizing for a few hiccups with the registration. But I think by now I would say that most participants are in. And I think -- I suppose there were not too many major problems. We are a learning organization, and I think each time went a bit smoother. The list of participants, we have not received from all participants their names. And I would like to encourage those, especially the Geneva-based people who don't need to register to be allowed to enter the Palais des Nations, that they also give us their names so that at the end of the day we have a complete list of participants. You may have noticed that we had hoped to have Wi-Fi. But I'm told it's not working yet. But we got in touch with the technical services, and they promised they will make it work as soon as possible. We also have at the back of the room the books we had started to distribute in Tunis. There will be some people go around in the room and give every participant a book. And if some participants would like to get more copies, there's no problem; we have more copies available. So please tell us how many you would like to get. And you will also be distributed an invitation by the Swiss authorities for the cocktail this evening. You will have noticed that we again can count on the excellent realtime transcription team, Laura and Teri, who have been with us several times. One important feature is that we have to try and get the names right. So it would be helpful if those who take the floor who don't have a name plate give their business card or write down their exact name and function so we can give it to the scribes. Last, but not least, I would also like to thank those who have made written contributions. They are posted on our Web site. We have 17 general statements and 20 answers to the questionnaire. Five of them were from governments: The government of Canada, Australia, Saudi Arabia, Japan, and Singapore. We did not try to summarize these contributions, as it will have been impossible. They have a very wide variety of views, very rich input. Nevertheless, I think it might be significant that all the governments who responded to the questionnaire speak out in favor of a very open format, and a number of them actually cite the format we used for the WGIG open consultations, and I see this as a very encouraging start. And last, but not least, we also would like, of course, to post general statements made during the course of this meeting. The easiest

would be if you could send it by mail to our Web site address. But you can also, of course, give it on a stick and we will post it as soon as possible. Each session will be posted, at the end of the session, we will post it on the Web site so that there's also a possibility for people who are not in this room to know what's going on. And I hope that, again, our Web-casting team from TURIN, who tore themselves away from the Winter Olympics will be up and running. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much, Markus. The floor is now open. Who is going to lead us off. Austria, then I have Pakistan. Good. We've got a good starting point. May I first give the floor to Austria.

>>AUSTRIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking on behalf of the European Union and the acceding countries Bulgarian and Romania. The European Union would like to thank the secretary general and yourself for holding the present consultations. On this occasion, I would like to present the state of your reflections on the Internet Governance Forum. It is crucial for the first plenary meeting of the Internet Governance Forum, multistakeholder in nature, with equal participation, to concentrate on issues of substance. The EU is therefore particularly grateful for the present consultations, which it expects to address already a wide range of important organizational issues so as to avoid having these issues on the agenda of the first meeting of the IGF. Regarding the substance to be addressed by the IGF in full compliance with Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, the E.U. believes that spam and relevant security-related aspects and multilingualism would be appropriate and substantive topics for the first meeting. These topics are best addressed from a user perspective. Mr. Chairman, the E.U. stands ready to actively participate in the preparation of the IGF discussions on these important issues. The E.U. believes, Mr. Chairman, that spam and multilingualism are of importance to all countries, be they developing or developed. In addition, the E.U. would welcome developing countries bringing forward topics of particular importance in the context of bridging the digital divide. Before moving to more organizational matters, the E.U. would like to recall the guiding principles of the IGF as enshrined in Paragraph 77 of the Tunis Agenda. For the preparation and support of the IGF, the E.U. submits that it would be necessary to have in line with the Tunis Agenda both a representative multistakeholder steering committee and a Secretariat which is small and cost-effective. As far as the frequency of meetings is concerned, the E.U. believes that one meeting per year, lasting for two or three days, would be the appropriate format. It is important that meetings focus on a limited number of well-defined issues. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for giving the E.U. the opportunity to present its views, and the E.U. remains at your disposal for elaborating further on its suggestions and proposals made. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. We now turn to Pakistan, and then Brazil, and then the United States. And may I request members who may feel a little deprived of their name plates to start sending their little slips so that I know who to call on.

Pakistan: Thank you, Mr. Desai. Mr. Desai, it's always a pleasure to see you chairing any meetings. I did turn it on. Thank you, Mr. Desai. I'm saying it's always a pleasure to see you chairing any meeting, because you do bring a lot of intellectual input and drive into IT. On behalf of the G77 AND China, I would like to thank secretary general Kofi Annan for convening today's consultations. We welcome this opportunity to discuss issues agreed in both phases of WSIS. Your continued commitment, Mr. Desai, to Internet governance-related issues will help us launch and keep on track this important post-Tunis phase. We would also like to thank the initiative taken by the government of Greece to brief the G77 and China on the preparations for the holding of the Internet Governance Forum in Greece. Today's consultations are timely. They give us the opportunity to think collectively about the follow-up

and implementation mechanisms with reference to the creation of the Internet Governance Forum. We intend to present the views of the group of 77 and China regarding the overall direction of the forum. Members of the group will make substantive and detailed contributions during the consultations. We look forward to seeing the views of the G77 and China reflected in the output of these consultations and in the future work that may be undertaken in this regard. Mr. chairman, the World Summit on the Information Society belongs to the U.N. series of summits that focused on economic and social development issues. The information society should be seen as an important phase and requirement for achieving the developmental objectives by bridging the digital and developmental divides. International consensus clearly emphasized the development orientation of the Tunis summit. This was aptly reflected in the opening sentence of the Geneva declaration of principles where the representatives of the peoples of the world declared, and I quote, the common desire and commitment to build a people-centered, inclusive, and development-oriented information society where everyone can CREATE, access, utilize, and share information and knowledge, enabling individuals, communities, and peoples to achieve their full potential in promoting the sustainable development and improving their quality of life, unquote. This, in our view, is the guiding principle of all our work and must continue to be accorded primacy during the follow-up and implementation of the Geneva and Tunis outputs. The Internet Governance Forum, in all its aspects, must achieve a development-oriented information society. All dimensions of the IGF, including its mandate, work, agenda, structure, composition, frequency, and venues of meetings, must be development-sensitive. We look forward to working with all stakeholders in ensuring that this development orientation that was reflected in the Geneva and Tunis consensus continues in the post-Tunis phase. Mr. Chairman, the Tunis agenda for the information society gives a very clear mandate for the IGF. In the implementation of this mandate, the Internet Governance Forum provides a unique opportunity for us to harness the potential of information and communication technologies in meeting development objectives. Internet access and easy connectivity are critical to this endeavor. It would be useful to recall and highlight those elements of the Tunis agenda that were clear, the development aspects of Internet governance. These may not be -- this may not be an exhaustive list, but an effort to introduce development-oriented clarity to the discussion at this -- these consultations. The G77 and China would first like to draw attention to paragraph 65, which reads, and I quote: We underline the need to maximize the participation of developing countries in decisions regarding Internet governance, which should reflect their interests as well as in development and capacity-building, unquote. We must not lose sight of the clarity in this paragraph with regard to the participation of developing countries and the decision-making process in Internet governance with a view to reflecting and realizing developmental objectives. The intent of this paragraph needs to be operationalized through a work program on Internet governance, a process wherein the IGF would carry utmost significance. G77 and China believes this paragraph offers a holistic perspective on Internet governance. On the issue of participation, paragraph 5 emphasizes the need to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in policy decision-making related to Internet governance and to promote and facilitate such participation. G77 and China would like to see this reflected clearly in the work of the IGF. The Tunis Agenda opens the door for us to think creatively about the role of all stakeholders in supporting developmental issues. It also highlights the importance of corporate responsibilities linked to positive contribution to the economic and social development of developing countries. We look forward to seeing the IGF as a vehicle for the realization of corporate responsibility for development. This would form a benchmark with regard to the extended development orientation of the forum. Mr. Chairman, the importance of interconnectivity and transfer of technology has been highlighted in paragraph 49 of the Tunis Agenda, which clearly sets the direction. It states, we commit to foster and provide guidance in development areas in the broader internet governance arrangements and to include, amongst other issues, international interconnection costs, capacity-building and technology know-how transfer. Mr. Chairman, we have highlighted only some of the overall development teams of WSIS. We hope that the consultations will be guided by

these principles and inputs from all stakeholders towards ensuring development-oriented architecture of Internet governance. It is time to put the Tunis commitments to action, based on the agenda provided for, an inclusive and people-centered information society by our leaders in Tunis. I thank you, sir.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. We have further comments. Let me just give a list of the people I have. I did mention Brazil, U.S.A. Then I have Canada. After that, UNESCO. After that, the ICC/CCBI. Then Ghana. Then I have the world forum of civil society networks, UBUNTU. And then I have Switzerland. If I may repeat, Brazil, U.S.A., Canada, UNESCO, ICC, Ghana, the UBUNTU forum. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Of course, we do support the statement of Pakistan. Mr. Chairman, the Brazilian government would like to convey to the United Nations secretary general its appreciation for the organization of this consultation on the Internet Governance Forum. This is certainly a great step forward to the international community in its endeavor to set up what our heads of state and heads of governments decided at the Tunis summit last year. As we all know, we have agreed upon, on November 18, 2005, to ask the United Nations secretary general to help us in two tasks. First one is to convene by the second quarter of 2006 a meeting of the new forum for multistakeholder policy dialogue, called Internet Governance Forum, which is Paragraph 72 of the agenda. And the second task, and not less important, is to start a process towards an enhanced cooperation by the end of the first quarter of 2006, which is paragraph 71 of the Tunis Agenda. We were told that this meeting of today is related specifically to the Internet Governance Forum, and, therefore, it is the Brazilian delegation's understanding that another meeting is going to be organized to take care of the enhanced cooperation process. Mr. Chairman, let me be specific. Brazil is looking forward to the establishment of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. Brazil is of the view that what paragraph 55 of the Tunis Agenda calls as, and I quote, existing arrangement for Internet governance, unquote, has neither the mandate nor the treaty-based authority to take on responsibilities related to international public policy issues. Even though these, and I quote, existing arrangements, unquote, have, and I quote again, worked effectively to make the Internet the highly robust, dynamic, and geographically diverse medium that it is today, unquote, the decision-making process of international Internet public policy issues should be taken by the world community at large, and I emphasize at large, and not by a number of technical bodies or by a single government. The most important question to the international community is face -- that the international community is facing nowadays, and that is why we decided to create a forum to discuss it, is that due to a lack of any obvious international organization to deal with Internet public policy issues, a number of entities which should ideally be only in charge of the technical management of the day-to-day operation of the Internet are pushed to fill the void and take political, which is public policy decisions. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to quote paragraph 60 of the Tunis Agenda, quote: We further recognize that there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms. Unquote. In a nutshell, what we are trying to say is, technical bodies are deciding upon public policy issues. This awkward situation cannot go on forever without causing serious trouble and, as we have said before, things that cannot go on forever don't. Mr. Chairman, the root of the problem is the absence of an appropriate international treaty. That is why Brazil favors the Internet Governance Forum should be the locus to discuss the willingness by the international community at large -- and I emphasize again, at large -- to create the necessary international applicable legal framework for Internet-related public policy issues. Therefore, at Athens -- and I shall emphasize that my government is very much grateful to the Greek government for hosting the first IGF meeting -- we have an excellent opportunity to initiate negotiations on a framework treaty to deal with international Internet public policy issues. In the near future, negotiations on specific protocols could also take place to address problems

such as, inter alia, A, cybersecurity; B, cybercrime; countering terrorism. Spam, privacy and the protection of personal information and data. Multilingualization, as was just proposed. Consumer protection. Capacity-building. Global public policies related to generic top-level domain names. And international interconnection costs. Mr. Chairman, allow me to emphasize that Brazil is very much proud of its domestic Internet management system. The Brazilian Internet steering committee -- and I have in my left side here the president of the Brazilian Internet steering committee -- is a tripartite, multistakeholder organization with due representation of not only governmental officials, but also of the civil society, the academia, and the private sector. Discussions are taken on a collective basis, in an open, transparent, and democratic way. Brazilians are very much attached to freedom of expression, Mr. Chairman, and to the rule of law. We hope one day we could have something similar on the decision-making process of public policy issues at the international level. Mr. Chairman, to conclude, let me say that I am personally convinced that secretary general Kofi Annan, and especially you, Mr. Chairman, are both not only patient men, but also examples of those 19th-century Tolstoy-like gentlemen that we used to get acquaintance with through literature. If you, Mr. Chairman, were not that kind of man, you would have already told us that most of this repetitive discussion and endless exercise could have been avoided if we only had read with more attention and *bonne volonte* the WGIG report, which you chaired last year. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: I would recommend Zen Buddhism as a very suitable training for this job. United States.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make the following statement on behalf of the United States and its views on the Internet governance forum. The United States reiterates its commitment to the results of the World Summit on the Information Society, and in particular to the convening of the Internet governance forum. In order for the forum to realize its full potential, we believe that it is critical to ensure that all stakeholders from the Internet community participate in the event on an equal footing. The Internet Governance Forum should offer an opportunity for leading Internet experts from around the world to share experiences and offer visions that support the continued evolution and expansion of the Internet. Consequently, the issue of the use of information and communication technologies to advance development should be at the heart of these discussions. One possible approach to the Internet Governance Forum would involve a series of panels composed of innovators, scholars, and industry leaders from around the world who can debate Internet-related policy matters such as the free flow of information, capacity building, expanded Internet access, cybersecurity, Spam, and privacy. The United States believes that the Internet Governance Forum should be a truly multistakeholder event. Therefore, it is important that it not be encumbered by extensive, existing United Nations processes and procedures. Attendance and participation in the forum should be open to a broad array of stakeholders including governments, business entities, civil society, scientists, and intergovernmental organizations. Linkages to the U.N. should be minimal in terms of procedures, and the forum should avoid burdensome preparatory processes. The Secretariat should be small with a mission to support the smooth functioning of the Internet Governance Forum and to facilitate broad participation in the event. Finally, a multistakeholder bureau will be extremely important to act as a program committee and to offer input as to discussion topics, speakers, and format. The promise of the Internet Governance Forum, an open and inclusive dialogue amongst all stakeholders of the international Internet community, to discuss critical issues concerning the future of the Internet, is viewed by the United States as a positive development. We look forward to a successful inaugural meeting of the Internet Governance Forum in Athens, Greece later this year. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Can I have Canada and then UNESCO.

>>CANADA: Thank you, chairman. Canada is pleased to participate in these open consultations, and we intend to continue to play a positive and active role in the Internet Governance Forum. Canada applauds the decision of the secretary-general of the United Nations to organize this consultation. We are also very appreciative of having you, Mr. Desai, in the chair along with Mr. Kummer in the Secretariat as we valued your important contributions to the earlier working group on Internet governance exercise and hope to benefit further from your considerable experience. Building on the spirit of the working group on Internet governance, Canada believes the IGF must be based on principles of openness and inclusiveness. For Canada, it is crucial that all stakeholders be able to participate fully in the IGF, and note that multistakeholder, as defined in the WSIS context, includes governments, business entities, civil society, and intergovernmental organizations. Canada believes it is vital that these Geneva consultations provide the U.N. secretary-general with definitive guidance on the structural and logistical aspects of the IGF. The first meeting of the IGF can then focus on a substantive agenda, developed in a way that will permit the first IGF to produce meaningful results. Canada has always maintained that the WSIS should be about development. In accordance with the successful ICT for defocus of the WSIS, the IGF's discussions should maintain a focus on capacity building throughout, fully including participants from developing countries. This would permit all countries and stakeholders to participate more effectively in other internet governance organizations and processes, and enable the effective development of national policies and frameworks for Internet Governance. As for the agenda of the IGF, at least for the first few meetings, Canada believes it is essential to concentrate on issues where positive outcome can be anticipated rather than those issues known to be divisive. Canada believes that the IGF can begin its work in a positive manner by helping to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users. Issues related to stability, trust and confidence significantly impact the sustainability, robustness, security, stability, and development of the Internet. If the IGF is successful, its outputs on these issues could contribute to a work program for the coming years within the appropriate organizations. Canada does not envisage the establishment of ongoing work programs for the IGF. The IGF must take great care to be nonduplicative in its efforts. Institutional arrangements around the IGF should be sufficiently flexible and inclusive to attract the best thinkers in the topic areas it is discussing at any particular meeting. This implies a shifting group of participants. Efforts need to be made to ensure such flexibility. Moreover, the tools of the information society should be used to their fullest, both to inform on the activities of the IGF and to engage the competencies of all interested stakeholders. By building a significant online presence, the IGF can also facilitate ongoing discussion between its physical meetings. Canada suggests November 2006 or later for the convening of the first IGF meeting. It should not be in conflict with other major international meetings, in particular the eITU plenipotentiary conference. There is undeniably a link between those parties interested in the ITU and those interested in Internet Governance. For many it would not be possible to prepare for both the plenipotentiary, and the first meeting of the IGF at the same time. In conclusion, Canada would like to emphasize our view that the role of the IGF is to hold policy discussions. By focusing on areas where the IGF can make a positive contribution, Canada believes that the IGF will be a successful forum for discussion. Lastly Canada looks forward to the discussions to take place during the (inaudible) and to the work of the forum itself. Thank you, chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. UNESCO, and then ICCBI.

>>UNESCO: Mr. President, UNESCO appreciates the opportunity to address this meeting. UNESCO, as one of the organizations responsible for essential tasks

associated with the Internet, would like to confirm that Internet Governance remains one of its core concerns because of the multiple opportunities for increased development and prosperity that the Internet represents. UNESCO continues to advocate the transparent and inclusive approach to Internet Governance, highlighting the principle of openness which encompasses the free flow of information, freedom of expression, and technical interoperability on the global level. UNESCO values the emphasis given to Internet Governance in the Tunis Agenda and endorses the statement that Internet Governance should be multilateral, transparent, and democratic. UNESCO notes with satisfaction the frequent references to intergovernmental organizations in the paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda related to Internet Governance. In particular, we appreciate the wish of governments to assign to IGOs a roll in the coordination of internet-related public policy issues and in the development of Internet-related technical standards and relevant policies. We also note with satisfaction that one of the elements of the mandate of the IGF is to interface with the appropriate IGOs on matters under their purview. For UNESCO the main public policy issues related to Internet Governance are freedom of expression and multilingualism. UNESCO also considers capacity building as an important policy issue. As to the nature, character, and structure of the Internet policy debate, stakeholders should ensure that the Internet Governance forum becomes a platform for open dialogue to facilitate exchange of information and best practice. Unesco endorsed the Tunis Agenda for expressing the need to fully include developing countries in the IGF. This requires continuous capacity building and a funding model that allows this participation. Discussion should result in complete recommendations to relevant stakeholders. The structure of the igf could build on the experiences of the working Group on Internet Governance, particularly as regards the participation of stakeholders on a need for full (inaudible). For more focused approach the IGF may decide to establish subgroups on special issues as identified on the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, drawing on expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities. Here again, the multistakeholder approach should be fully respected. IGF meetings should be organized once a year. The preparation of and follow-up of the meetings should make maximum use of electronic working methods. IGF meetings should be prepared by a preparatory committee or bureau which comprises representatives from all stakeholders. Furthermore, this body should ensure the facilitation of transparent decision-making and promotion of dialogue. An independent Secretariat with a light structure, possibly under the auspices of the United Nations could carry out the necessary organizational tasks. Any mechanisms for funding should ensure this independency. Synergies need to be established between the IGF and the existing arrangements for Internet Governance. There should also be appropriate links between the IGF and the various mechanisms that have or will be established for the follow-up to and the implementation for other decisions on the World Summit on the Information Society. The IGF should focus its work on the policy issues that have been defined in the WGIG report as being potentially relevant. The subsequent work of the IGF could be inspired by the four clusters of issues inspired by WGIG. But as Internet Governance will be discussed in an environment characterized by very rapid changes and new issues may emerge, the IGF bureau (inaudible) committee should have the authority to modify the sequence of work. The first meeting of IGF this October or the end of this year should, after having taken the necessary decisions of its own structure and working methods, focus on issues related to infrastructure and the management of critical Internet resources. In closing, I would like to reiterate UNESCO's willingness to cooperate in the work of the IGF. We are confident that it will enable greater use of the Internet and thereby greater participation in the modern information world by an increasing number of citizens from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. CCBI.

>>ccbi :Thank you, chairman Desai, Mr. Kummer, Mr. Utsumi. I am pleased to provide initial comments on the igf on behalf of CCBI and ICC members. The global business community welcomes these consultations and the opportunity to

provide input both online and in person at these meetings. We call attention to the inputs from CCBI and ICC in December of 2005 as well as February 2006, which are on the IGF and ICC Web sites. The business members in the CCBI have appreciated the opportunity presented by the World Summit on the Information Society process to discuss how to bring the benefits of the information society to people around the world. Many business leaders believe that the post-wsis processes present continued opportunities to provide even better ties to other information society stakeholders. Today -- we have outlined other fundamental principles regarding Internet Governance in our written inputs on the IGF, and today we would like to focus on four important areas. One, the multistakeholder principle. Two, the role and mandate of the IGF. Three, the IGF process. And four, supporting the IGF. One, multistakeholder participation on an equal footing. The first and foremost principle for business is that the IGF must be multistakeholder, ensuring full involvement of all stakeholder groups, including business, on an equal footing on all aspects of the IGF, starting from consultation to establishment to operational planning and events. We know that there is widespread support among governments, civil society, academic and technical communities, and other stakeholders for this principle as has already been stated in interventions this morning. Two, the role and mandate of the IGF. Consistent with the mandate articulated in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, the IGF should emphasize the development oriented aspects of Internet Governance, such as enhancement of capacity building, to increase meaningful participation in Internet-related issues by all stakeholders, particularly those from developing countries. The Tunis Agenda paragraph 72 gives the IGF a mandate to promote the expansion and continued development of the Internet through information exchange and sharing of best practices. To maximize that goal and in line with the other relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda, the IGF should do the following: Only address issues that would truly benefit from international multistakeholder dialogue, work with existing fora to improve awareness and existing information on topics already being considered, avoid duplication of the work underway in existing organizations, be consistent with the aim of promoting the security and integrity of the Internet, not compete with or impede the technical management and technical coordination of the Internet or critical Internet resources. The Tunis Agenda is clear that the IGF does not have decision-making or policy-making authority. Three, the IGF process. This third important area of the IGF process we put forth that the IGF should do the following. It should operate in a flexible manner to facilitate open discussion among all participants. Therefore, adherence to rigid rules used in intergovernmental negotiation processes is inappropriate. It should provide the opportunity for all stakeholders from all countries to participate on an equal basis in the consultations and at IGF events. Should involve all stakeholders on an equal footing and all operational planning for the IGF. Utilize online tools to make it more inclusive with no stakeholder group excluded from the discussions of the IGF. And operate in a cost and operationally efficient manner. I would now like to comment on the purpose of the first IGF event in Athens. In Athens we should limit topics on to the importance of the Internet and the success of bringing the Internet to all people. We should limit the discussion to those topics that could truly benefit from further outreach, information exchange, and human capacity building. To be effective, the first event in Athens and any igf events in the future should not be an attempt to open discussion of a plethora of issues. Further consultations both online and in person for all stakeholders should be planned appropriately. CCBI and potentially others cannot provide responses regarding many igf issues until several fundamental igf attributes are established. Furthermore, we call upon all stakeholders to be sensitive to limited resources of all stakeholders. The development of the IGF should bear in mind the extent of human and financial resources required to establish and participate in it. This is especially true since these same resources could alternatively be applied to implementing the development goals of the WSIS. Consistent with this principle, we appreciate the fact that the proposed schedule for the event in Athens is for a two- to three-day time frame. This will provide adequate time for a true exchange on the agenda topic. In addition, for example, meetings on the IGF and other relevant topics could be organized back to back to reduce travel and other cost. Four, supporting the IGF. Lastly, on matters supporting the IGF, we see a fully multistakeholder

bureau taking any and all operational and program decisions by consensus, in consultation with all stakeholder groups regarding the IGF. The host would take the logistical decisions necessary on the ground and a Secretariat in cooperation with those providing logistical support should put the operational decisions of the bureau into practice and facilitate the participation of all stakeholders. The topic identified for an IGF event should be agreed upon by consensus among the stakeholders. A bureau that is in fact multistakeholder with all on an equal footing as discussed earlier. We look forward to providing additional input as the discussions continue today and tomorrow, and thank you for this opportunity and your attention.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Ghana, UBUNTU, and then Switzerland. After that I have Japan. I have the Internet society of Argentina and (inaudible). Ghana.

>>GHANA: Mr. Chairman, we would like to express our position to the secretary-general for helping to convene this meeting and to you, Mr. Chairman, for steering the affairs of this consultation. I will be very brief, as you requested, and also because Africa being a large constituency, is holding full consultations and will be contributing in detail as we progress. Africa's general aim of advocating for a common ground to help us move forward positively on Internet Governance is paramount. We cannot help but reiterate the central theme of these consultations, as in paragraph 29 of the Tunis Agenda. I quote, the management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent, and democratic with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations." To us in Africa, the second parts of this paragraph is also important, and I quote, "It should ensure a equitable distribution of resources, facilitate assets for all, underline for all, and ensure a stable and secure (inaudible) for the Internet, taking into account multilingualism," unquote. As a continent most challenged with ICT development, we are practically interested in the infrastructure development, capacity building, reduced technical costs, and equal participation to help us remove this digital divide. We commend the government and people of Greece once again for agreeing to host us and we look forward to an effective and results-oriented forum. I thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. UBUNTU. Welcome.

>>UBUNTU:

>>world forum of civ. soc.: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, as organization of the civil society, I would like to thank -- express my thanks for the facilities of being here. Although I must also say that these facilities, this setup, are only, let us say, usable if one has the economic means to be able to travel to Geneva, apart from the fact of also the NGOs and the organizations that have headquarters here. Secondly, and to the extent that we are in a part where our statements are general in nature, I would like to express a concern, but positively, not negatively. Indeed, when I saw the list of participants in this meeting, it is very clearly that there are governments, there are international organizations, but then we have the entities list. And in that list, and I understand perfectly that at this stage nothing else has been able to be done, taking into account the whole process, the Geneva process and the Tunis process, as a minimum we should have two lists at least. The business entities, private sector, and the civil society list. And I am saying this positively, not negatively. But these are interested parties that are different, different lists. And in many cases, we can have synergies or points of agreement, but during Tunis and Geneva, these are listed as different lists. And that would be good for them to be listed as different lists. And my concern also is the following. Not few NGOs, and there are a few, only a few of civil society organizations on this list, and from our point of view, one of the organizations here, CONGO, represents many of them. And I would like to

congratulate them and especially to Mr. Bloem for this socialization activity of this issue. But I consider that there are organizations that did not follow the Geneva and Tunis phases. And it would be good at this stage for the information not only to remain with the organizations that took part in this process but also to be extended to other organizations. Indeed, when we speak of civil society and when we speak of NGOs, I think that also with the Internet issues and especially what follows after that, it would be very important for the civil society sector and the NGO sector be represented in this phase in a very active manner. I've said this first because in this phase or this phase of general statements, I would like to underscore from our point of view what, as a world forum -- as Ubuntu, my organization, what, from my point of view, these fundamental spirit is that is behind what is the Geneva and the Tunis phase. Now, I think we agreed that this -- we want to put the ICTs to the service of development. And if that's a fundamental point, well, it has to be a fundamental point that inspires the design of the creation and the organization of the IGF. And in that respect, and I insist on this fact, the socialization of this process and the openness of this process to the civil society organizations and NGOs is an important thing and it's still time for us to act, it's still time for us to socialize this whole process. I wanted to underscore especially that as far as we understand, and we've expressed this to the participants in the forum, what is at stake here is not only that we fight against the digital divide, given that the -- this would be a negative, important, but just a negative battle. But what we need to do is put ICTs at the service of development. Thirdly, and as an organization of the civil society, which, basically, is concerned and monitors the developments in international organizations and the operation of the international organizations and ensuring that there are in-depth reforms in those institutions, we believe that the process to create the IGF is a process which in itself is very important for the life of the international organizations. We are extremely satisfied and interested in the heritage we have from Geneva and Tunis speaks to us as -- of the Internet as a globally -- a global facility, a global facility. Well, it will become that, and it should become that, and it should become a new common good for humanity. And in that respect, the Geneva and Tunis process have emphasized what I think is extremely important in the context in the economic and political situation of the world, namely, the need precisely to have public policies that are international in nature. And before the need to have these international public policies and understanding perfect what is set forth in the Tunis Agenda of namely what the role of IGF should be, I think that this forum, as well as operating well and being operational, as well as being an example of a working experience of the various interested parties in the directions we have underscored and also in other directions we would indicate, we are also in favor of governance and global governance going in the direction of strengthening international public policies. In that respect, in this general statement, I wanted to express our stance. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Going now to Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we are very happy to see you again at the podium. On a number of occasions, we have had an opportunity to appreciate your qualities as chairman. Switzerland, as you know, we have always defended during the summit process a multistakeholder approach, so to speak. And this multipartite approach we think is also important for establishing the IGF. And in setting up this IGF, we also think it's very important that the rules of participation be flexible and that we should not be constrained by too many rigid requirements of the U.N. system. With regard to the themes, Mr. Chairman, we have heard many proposals. But we should bear in mind that the entire process of the summit, and also the reasons why we're here, are, first, to close the digital divide and to strengthen capacity in the ICT. And for that reason, we're here to -- hear what the developing countries say when they propose themes, such as settling the problem of cost of connections, and also settling questions on multilingualism. We also think the question of spam and network security is important. All of these themes are

themes which we think are important. And they deserve to be considered in the IGF. With regard to structures, Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated by a number of speakers already, we think the Secretariat should be independent and light in weight. In this regard, I would also stress that Switzerland would be prepared to contribute substantively if the Secretariat were to be set up in Geneva. It is also important for us to have not a rigid bureau under the U.N. system, but, rather, a steering committee with the participation of all those involved, in other words, governments, but also civil society, the private sector, and international organizations. With regard to financing the IGF, we think that this should take place under the auspices of voluntary contributions. We would like to have the meeting take place at the end of the year, but also taking into account other major international meetings scheduled. Our Canadian colleagues referred to the ITU, which at the end of the year has its PLENIPOTENTIARY ASSEMBLY. We believe the IGF should meet once a year for two or three days. It's important to us that we should not have any redundancy in the IGF's work with what is being done in other organizations, such as UNESCO, the ITU, the UNDP. And I would also, Mr. Chairman, praise the initiatives of those organizations which on 24 February are going to meet to make progress towards implementation of the Geneva and Tunis decisions. We would like the first IGF meeting to be devoted to concrete topics. And for that reason, we would be very glad, Mr. Chairman, if the questions of procedure and organization could be resolved before the end of the year. This would enable us to immediately get down to work and be effective. Thank you, sir.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. May I also take this opportunity of thanking the government of Switzerland for all the support that it has given for this process, both at the stage of the WGIG as well as right now. I thank you for your help and support that you have extended to us in organizing this. I now have Japan, Quebec, ISOC Argentina, and then (inaudible) Switzerland.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Japan would like to appreciate Mr. Chairman and Mr. Kummer for their leadership and excellent contribution made in the WGIG process that we believe led to the successful outcome of the WSIS Tunis phase. And we are also grateful for your chairmanship at the preparatory process of IGF today. At this time, Japan wishes to mention three points that I would like to highlight today and as well as some comments on the substantive priorities. Firstly, the IGF is a space for dialogue and a forum for multistakeholder policy dialogue, as indicated in paragraph 67 of the Tunis Agenda, to discuss public policy issues and facilitate the exchange of information and best practices. And in this regard, make use of the expertise of the academic, scientific, and technical communities. Japan also believes that at its outset, the outcome of the IGF does not have to be a set of recommendations, but, rather, the forum should be well-satisfied to produce a report as its output as the first step and the process of discussion. Secondly, Japan believes that the IGF must be a space for open dialogue by multistakeholders, in line with the paragraph 72, and accordingly, calls meetings expected to be held. Thirdly, any private sector-held forums that satisfy the criteria indicated in paragraph 72 and 77 of the Tunis Agenda should be regarded as candidates for additional joint IGF meetings in addition to a forum that the United Nations secretary general convenes. In order to discuss the diversity of Internet issues, the utilization of these forums should be taken into consideration to incorporate a broad range of professional opinions. And lastly, a substantive priority issue, Japan believes that the discussion at IGF should be broad and inclusive, as paragraph 58 of the Tunis Agenda states, namely, much broader than Internet naming and addressing, and inclusive of other significant public policy issues. In addition, we find it's important for the IGF to identify emerging issues, as stated in paragraph 72 (G) of Tunis Agenda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. The government of Quebec.

>>QUEBEC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The government of Quebec is very pleased to be involved in this work. We firmly believe in the importance of technology and communication as an important mode for economic and social development. We are satisfied with the results of the second phase in Tunis on Internet governance and we welcome the establishment of that forum on Internet governance, and we expect to participate actively in it to contribute to innovative solutions for effective and rapid development of the Internet. We believe that the establishment and organization of the forum require parties -- is involved to review their -- we have cooperating. This presents a new model of governance on the international level. And this requires equality for the parties involved, governments and civil society organizations and the private sector. We are aware that many options are available as regards the organization of the forum and that they all deserve particular attention. We believe that the none binding nature of the forum requires rules and procedures for the operation of the organization, should allow the elaboration of consensus on various issues at stake. This consensus should be reflected in the results of our deliberations. With regard to organizational aspects, we think things should be flexible, and to optimize the work of the forum, we believe that the working languages should be those -- the same as the official languages of the United Nations. We also believe that the use of information and communication technologies should be systematic to maximize exchanges within the -- between meetings, as well as to encourage participation of those who cannot attend physically, integration of intermission and communication technologies as well as technological choices, should, however, be done based on the capacity of the participants. In view of the high number of issues identified, it would be preferable if the work of the forum should be decentralized and that the organizational approach would be upward. We believe that for the first meeting, the forum should consider certain issues, a relatively limited number, and among them could be stability and security of the Internet, including cybercrime, of course, privacy, protection of personal information, education and capacity-building, and, of course, the question of cultural diversity and linguistic ability. We believe, Mr. Chairman, that creating this forum is a great opportunity to establish a constructive dialogue on the Internet and we would like to thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I have from the ISOC Argentina, then WIS@key, then the main ISOC, then Congo, Argentina, and then Australia.

>> ISOC Argentina: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks for organizing these consultations in such an open and inclusive way. My name is Sebastian RICCIARDI, I am also involved in the ICANN at-large advisory committee. I am talking in my individual capacity. It is clear and undeniable that the principles of openness, inclusiveness, transparency, and democracy should be the foundation of this new space for dialogue. To be inclusive and become a truly multistakeholder space, the forum needs to recognize and welcome all stakeholders and let them participate on equal footing at all levels of the discussion. Beyond the model we want to replicate or use, it is important to recognize and follow these values. A truly multistakeholder, transparent, and open process lets everyone participate in the critical tasks. And this task includes the agenda and role of procedure-setting. If we are going to have a BROAD or any kind of committee to perform these important tasks, it should be composed in a way that, one, represents the view and interests of all the stakeholders. Two, conduct their work under open and transparent mechanisms. And, three, have no preeminence for any of the stakeholders involved. Setting up the rule of procedures is, consequently, a critical challenge. In this regard, WSIS rules of procedures should not be considered as a starting point. These rules were tailored for a different kind of forum and are not treatable for a much broader, inclusive policy dialogue. The nature of the IGF is different than WSIS, and hence this should be reflected in the rules. There are many examples of how the WSIS strict rules will undermine the results of the IGF. The input received by a large group of stakeholders was limited to the observer role they have had during WSIS. Some of these stakeholders were very representative of the Internet community, and even when the Tunis Agenda

recognized the importance of their ongoing roles in coordinating technical matters, and their expertise, the process did not recognize them as a (inaudible) GENEROUS stakeholder, and did not allocate a specific time to hear and consider their thoughts on the different matters. Fortunately, members of the civil society and the private sector were kind enough to donate some of their scarce time for this proposal on that opportunity. There were also many organizations a member of the civil society that were precluded because of the rules. Just as an example, the first hours of the last PrepCom here in Geneva were used to discuss the situation of an organization that was excluded because they refused to declare their funding sources. This example shows some of the reason why we should not use the U.N. procedures rules beyond the multilingual capacities. A much higher degree of flexibility is desired to promote an open and inclusive, multistakeholder dialogue. These consultations of the convening FOR THE IETF provide a good example of how a multistakeholder forum should be put in place. The openness and inclusiveness on the process should also be a guideline when considering the mechanism of participation. Physical presence exclude many stakeholders, especially those coming from less-developed countries. This is why we ought to ensure mechanism of remote participation, namely, online discussion forums, E-mail discussion list, WIKIS, Web casts, just to name a few. Physical presence should not be a requirement to fully participate in the different debates that may arise in the forum. IGF meetings should be done mainly through Internet-based mechanism and only one yearly meeting. This meeting shouldn't take more than three or four working days to cope with financial constraints and assure broad participation. It will be also important to promote some financing mechanisms to ensure participation of those who are in a disadvantaged position, an example, those who come from less-developed countries. The investment and promotion of capacity-building programs is also necessary to assure a world balanced participation in the long range. And this is why it should be one of the main topics addressed in the IGF discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I am now going to Ambassador Stauffacher, in your capacity and the private sector.

>> WIS@key: thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, indeed, for allowing me to take the floor here and also giving me the opportunity to thank you again that you have agreed to be the leader of this process. We all know, of course, that you are in well-deserved retirement, but also a very busy person in your own country. So we are very grateful that you continue to lead this process. As you said, now I moved from the diplomacy to the private sector. And be patient with me if I transgress or make mistakes, but I'm glad to be here, and I'm pleased to say a few words, while not repeating what the ICC and CCBI already said, which I endorse fully. Let me make just a few remarks and maybe precisions. We have talked about, of course, the intergovernmental -- the participation of the stakeholders. And I think it is, I think, important to underline that we do not embark on an intergovernmental process with stakeholder participation, but that we really develop a true multistakeholder process. I think this is an important distinction that we have to make, in order to truly benefit of the wisdom and knowledge of all members of societies, of the societies. The second point I would like to make is that WSIS Tunis has given the secretary general and you the mandate now to structure and organize this forum. And I think this is important that this forum, then, also remains under the auspices of the United Nations. Third point is that, as it has been stressed before, I think this is not a forum for decision-making and legislating, but, really, to help us to create awareness with policymakers, with leaders of all quarters, on the challenges and opportunities, and through that, help us to advance the objective that we have set out. I think with Pakistan, of course, I believe the development orientation is very important. And if I look at the themes, if you allow me to make a few comments here, as Brazil said, I think the field of cybersecurity, privacy protection of personal information and data protection, and, in particular, the field of identity protection and management is something that we should look at in this forum as well. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. May I now turn to the Internet society. Who is speak from ISOC? Where is ISOC?

>>ISOC: ISOC Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to be here and to be working with you again. The Internet society believes discussions on Internet governance should focus on those issues that will help bring the Internet to the billions of people not yet connected. This is supported by the WSIS reaffirmation of the importance of ICTs and capacity-building to nations economic development and future welfare and the United Nations secretary general's call that the follow-on from the summit, quote, generate new momentum towards developing the economies and societies of poor countries and transforming the lives of poor people, end quote. We believe at the Internet society that there are some key points that we need to bear in mind in our discussion of convening the forum. We believe that the IGF, the forum should ensure inclusiveness, in other words, maximize participation in the Internet Governance Forum by all interested stakeholders, individuals, et cetera, particularly for those from developing nations. We believe the IGF should use the technology we are discussing, we should facilitate participation through innovative and aggressive use of electronic communications. We believe the forum can do a lot by facilitating knowledge of and participation in existing structures and organizations. We look to the forum and the stakeholders to suggest better ways for stakeholders and interested parties, particularly those from developing nations, to learn about and contribute to the key Internet governance discussions and decisions. We believe the IGF should focus on capacity-building and access needs, it should identify priorities, needed programs for capacity-building, especially in developing nations. We believe the IGF should focus on the fundamentals. It should explore a limited set of Internet governance-related case studies that are cross-cutting and central to capacity-building and ICT deployment. The forum should build on existing forums and organizations. It should leverage existing knowledge and expertise, while promoting the sharing of experience and best practices. And, finally, it should minimize costs of participation. There should be a limit to the forum-related organizational structures and the need for meetings. And while maximizing the use of Internet-based collaboration and communication tools. Chairman, the Internet society believes that the emphasis in the IGF should be in two areas, first, the disseminating and sharing of information, best practices, and expertise across a limited set of issues in a case study approach. And the second should be encouraging a greater understanding across stakeholders of the roles and responsibilities and means of participation in those organizations that are responsible for the current governance mechanisms. The Internet society recommends that the Internet Governance Forum begins the case study approach with a limited set of issues, one or two that are cross-cutting and do not fall within the scope of any existing body, and also build on the WSIS achievements and contribute to reaching the millennium development goals. The forum should draw heavily on existing bodies of work and institutional and individual expertise, highlighting the work already done to address the issues, and then focus on concrete proposals of how governments, the U.N., the World Bank, the private sector, and key Internet governance organizations, et cetera, can work together to ensure that the best available expertise and resources are brought to bear. These case studies should include areas such as interconnection arrangements and connectivity, ICT education and training, spam and multilingualism, all of which report to the WSIS discussions and require further development. We would note, however, that it would be important for the forum focus on workable issue areas and not on those subject to clearly entrenched views that would make discussion unproductive. Clearly, the more focused the forum, the greater its chances of enabling a fuller understanding of the issues in question and of making a difference in the number of people who can access and benefit from the Internet. A recurring concern in the debate over Internet governance has been that key stakeholder groups feel that they have insufficient input into the decision-making processes that are affecting the development and management of the Internet. Many of the key organizations involved in Internet governance have made clear throughout WSIS that they are eager to find ways to involve

more people in decisions, processes, roundtables, workshops, et cetera, and, in particular, they are eager to ensure that civil society and others have a full and active role in the governance processes. Promoting a greater understanding of the roles and responsibilities of these organizations and the mechanisms for participation will be a particularly useful focus for the forum. It follows that success will depend upon the fullest participation by all stakeholders and interested parties. With regard to the functioning of the forum, it will be essential that the time, personnel, and financial constraints all stakeholders are subject to are taken into account. An operating principle of the forum should be to maximize efficiency and cost-effectiveness through limiting organizational structures and the need for meetings, while encouraging the use of Internet-based collaboration and communication tools. Finally, with regard to WSIS commitment to multistakeholder processes, the Internet society believes that the broad recognition of the achievements of the organizations responsible for the administration and management of the Internet is a clear endorsement of their continued and vital role in its further development. While the representational model for the forum has yet to be decided, the Internet society believes that the Internet community should be recognized as a principal stakeholder in the Internet Governance Forum, given its recognition in the Tunis Agenda. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much, ISOC. And thank you for your steady and continuous support for this entire process. I now have RENATE Bloem from Congo. And then Argentina. If others want to speak, just raise your....

>>CONGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Desai, it's great to see you in the chair, and Mr. Kummer next to you. We know that we are in good hands. And for the conference of NGOs CONGO, this is really a great day, because I have never heard so many governments really in full support of the multistakeholder approach. We are here in -- under the roof and under the leadership and also under Mr. Kofi Annan's designation of the forum. But yet this meeting here is already somehow a signal for the future of, I would say, even future diplomacy. This is when we can really speak on equal level to these issues which are so important for all of us that we see something coming out which the whole WSIS process has put into -- has put into a process which we are very, very happy of. I had not prepared anything, because as you know, civil society was very much organized with particular working groups, and we have a very specific working group on Internet Governance forum here, and the members will take the floor on the specific issues. But there is one thing which I want also to reiterate, and what we heard already earlier from the UBUNTU representative. We have the possibilities to have the governments here because all government missions are in Geneva. We have possibilities maybe for limited private sector people, but we have still very limited presentation from civil society. We need to see, when we want to take a development-oriented, I would say, process, that we need to hear from those people in those areas, not only from the governments, also from Civil society, which are directly affected from any decision which can be made from those deliberations which we hope this forum will take on. I wanted to say also one thing. We have heard various, now, mentioning of dates for a meeting later on this year in Athens. The need is absolutely essentially that the consultation comes with a clear date. How can the meeting be -- even be organized if there is not yet a clear date? So at the same time, need to see that the rules and procedures will be as flexible as possible, and we'll take on this, what we had already here, in the same way as it has been applied here for this consultation. And I think the IGF forum should not duplicate in general the whole Tunis agenda, but should really focus on the Internet issues, and we have heard many of them which are vital. But at the same time, I would like to see that the Internet Governance Forum has the linkages and has the synergies with all other mechanisms for follow-up, including the mechanism of the commission, including what will happen in other areas; that it will benefit from all the thinking and from all the input from all areas. Once again, Mr. Desai, we thank you for this meeting today, and I hope that all our other -- our representatives will take the floor later on. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Argentina.

>>ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I'd like to express my thanks to the secretary-general for having convened this consultation meeting, and this first chance we have to take the floor and exchange general ideas and contribute initial points of view. First of all, I would like to point out that with regard to the outcome of the WGIG, the Working Group on Internet Governance, we hope that the IGF provides contributions with working guidelines to bring about an Internet Governance system that is multistakeholder in nature and preserves fundamentally the concept of Internet as we know it to be today, as a communication tool that is homogenous for all the users. And we don't want the risk of the Internet being fragmented and losing its advantage of being a tool for everybody. So it's accessible to all, and everywhere in the world. With regard to the organization and the procedures to follow for this forum, one year -- one meeting a year could be an appropriate number frequency of meeting. The use of ICTs, virtual ICTs would help us to enable a multistakeholder participation, especially for developing countries that are located far away from places in (inaudible). Clearly in this meeting, experts from the whole world and their participation is extremely important. For countries that are actors on the national/international scene, experts from these places should express their will to participate in this whole process. With regard to the funding, clearly the Secretariat should be small, minimal, and have enough to carry out an effective work with the least cost possible involved. These are very preliminary comments, and my delegation, like the other groups, the G77, believe that this should be a development-oriented enterprise. We want to express our agreement with the opinions of Brazil; namely, that we should begin to develop tools that deal with specific issues of Internet Governance, such as cybercrime and others that have been raised by this delegation. Finally, we agree with the appropriateness of having broadened cooperation, as Brazil mentioned, to achieve a result in the near future. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Australia welcomes the multistakeholder consultations on the establishment and operation of the IGF. The IGF has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the development and expansion of the Internet, but how it is set up will be crucial in this regard. At this stage, rather than focus on details, Australia would like to make some comments on the principles that should underpin the IGF and what the IGF should aim to achieve. These two considerations are fundamental to the design of the forum. In doing this, Australia will be adding its support for many of the points already made this morning. The IGF is being established in the context of acknowledgement by WSIS that the spectacular rise of the Internet is the result of multistakeholder action in which the private sector and civil society have played key roles, that there is value on ongoing dialogue on public policy issues and this dialogue to be effective must be multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent. This acknowledgement recognizes the new paradigm that was entered by the internet that while governments may have authority in public policy, the legitimacy and utility of that authority is questionable unless it is exercised in consultation with other stakeholders. Multistakeholder involvement and openness are therefore fundamental to the IGF. They must be genuine and effective if the IGF is to be genuine and effective. These principles mean the design of the IGF must have certain features. From Australia's perspective, these include open and ongoing consultation like that we are currently engaged in on crucial issues; a strong preference for the IGF to be run as a multistakeholder entity by a competent multistakeholder organization or consortium; an IGF Secretariat and advisory group being multistakeholder; accreditation and procedural rules that support inclusiveness, openness and equal participation; active promotion of the IGF

and its relevance, particularly to developing countries and the use of ICTs to the maximum extent to maximize access and engagement. The second principle that Australia would like to emphasize is that the IGF as a whole should be lightweight and cost effective. As many have noted, financial and other resources are limited and we all have competing priorities. In interpreting of the IGF's design, this suggests a relatively flat structure without a proliferation of subgroups and subcommittees, relatively short, focused annual meetings, possibly back-to-back with related events, both intergovernmental and private sector or civil society. Potentially, a fixed central location for both meetings and the Secretariat. Use of external expertise and voluntary contributions, and again, the effective use of ICTs. From a broader perspective it's suggested that IGF discussions should be nonduplicative and should be productive and this leads us to our final theme, the aims of the IGF. Australia considers the IGF can make a valuable contribution to the development of the Internet but this opportunity may be squandered if discussion is too abstract and diffuse. We may end up with a set of fine principles but of little practical value to stakeholders, everyday users of the Internet and world communities, particularly in developing countries. The IGF must consciously aim to produce in relevant time frames substantive outputs that are of real practical value. In terms of its design, Australia therefore considers that the IGF should have its procedural and organizational structures decided before the first meeting. It should focus on key issues or themes at each meeting. It should be responsive to real issues of relevance to stakeholders and Internet users generally, particularly those from developing countries. The IGF's discussions should be structured and focused and rigorously -- the IGF should be structured, focused and rigorous in its operation so it delivers useful outcomes quickly. More existence -- it should make extensive use of inputs from experts and practitioners with on-the-ground expertise and experience from all stakeholder groups but particularly from developing countries. There should be emphasis on information sharing and the development of best practice models and should publish reports that are accessible, documenting its substantive discussions and concrete ideas including best practice, and that provide a basis for action. The question of broad aims inevitably leads to that of priorities. Australia considers the IGF's top priority should be the issues relating to the use and misuse of the Internet and in particular, Spam, E-security and cybercrime. The interlinkages between them and the mechanisms for addressing them. This is top priority because of the consumer harm these issues propose and correspondingly the benefits to be derived from tackling them. These benefits will accrue not only to developed countries but also to developing countries. In addition, WSIS and WGIG identified a range of other issues, particularly with a development focus such as access and multilingualism which also warrant attention. We consider identification and discussion of new and emerging issues in the IGF is also important to the Internet's ongoing and inclusive development. . This focus is in contrast to a focus on the issues that have been discussed at length throughout the WSIS and which are receiving attention in other fora. A process -- a focus on these types of issues in the IGF would divert its limited and valuable resources from tackling issues of real significance to everyday users. Australia looks forward to working constructively with other stakeholders to help ensure the IGF realizes its full potential.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: David Allen from the world collaboration for communications policy research. And I have the OECD. David Allen.

>>DAVID ALLEN:

>>COLLAB. FOR COMM. POLICY: The name of the organization is long, but the intervention is mercifully brief. Mr. Chairman, you have suggested this is the occasion to consider objectives for the IGF. We suggest that the, perhaps, overarching aim forgive be to create processes that allow the participants to get beyond the stalemate that developed in WSIS. This is, if you please, a pregnant proposal in that it does not say how we might go about doing such a

thing, but if we should decide that this is a compelling aim forgive, there will be opportunity later to discuss just exactly how that might proceed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. OECD. And then I have the IGTF, Internet Governance Task Force of Japan. So let me turn to OECD first.

>>OECD: Thank you, Mr. chair. We at the OECD look forward to the formation of the IGF and we look forward to contributing to it as seen appropriate by the various stakeholders participating in it. I want to make two BRIEF points about the OECD and OUR work THAT i feel ARE PERTINENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF the IGF. The first is the OECD is in fact a multistakeholder group such as what the IGF will be as well. We enjoy the active and diverse participation of many groups in our work. The second point I want to make is we see consensus on issues at the OECD that are nonbinding but in fact, bring with them moral pressure for countries to adopt them. In this sense, I think the functioning of the OECD may represent a model for the IGF and we would be happy to provide further details if so desired. The second point I want to make is one on substance. We at the OECD have been working on a range of issues associated with the information society for some time, going from that of infrastructure to ICT and growth, to privacy and security. And in particular we have a TASK FORCE on combating Spam which after two years has completed its work and will issue a final report as well as A TOOLKIT OF VARIOUS ways to EFFECTIVELY combat Spam in the next FEW weeks. This may be of use in IDENTIFYING best practices of the IGF, and we look forward to contributing it to the IGF if so requested. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. IGTF and then Singapore.

>>IGTF: Thank you, chairman Desai. Also, I REALLY appreciate this opportunity given again, and maybe again and again, to continue our dialogue. I'm here not on behalf of the IGTF, but I am a member of the IGTF as well. That's Internet Governance task force of Japan, but I am also a member of ICANN's At-Large Advisory Committee for MORE THAN THREE years, AND ALSO A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY INTERNET GOVERNANCE FOCUS, but this is simply my personal observational comment or contribution. I really appreciate the multistakeholder principle, and especially on equal footing to be implemented in this new forum. Perhaps this may be the real achievement of the WSIS on Internet Governance issues. But perhaps we need to be very creative in implementing this multistakeholder principle into real forum operation. We may have very different ideas as to what multistakeholder approach really mean. I want to make clear that when it comes to the Internet, even public policy related decisions, whether you like it or not, cannot be made by governments alone, and that's part of the reason why, perhaps, we agreed to have this Internet Governance Forum as multistakeholder approach. And there are good reasons or needs for this fact. But practicing or implementing the true multistakeholder approach is not an easy thing. As a member of ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee which is trying to bring the individual user's voices to the ICANN'S public policy development process, that was not an easy task. ICANN has BEEN TRYING TO BE a multistakeholder organization, and it is more so, I can testify, THAN most international bodies or forA we know of. But still, there are good challenges. Most governments in the advisory committee at ICANN, the GAC, and At-Large Advisory Committee again, it's an advisory committee, ALAC, have not been given equal footing on the decision-making process. Again, there are good reasons, perhaps, for this framework, but I would ask you to seriously consider what is the best modality or the mode of the multistakeholder approach in this Internet Governance Forum. And thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. We have Singapore.

>>SINGAPORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Singapore would like to express its appreciation to the secretary-general for convening these consultations. We would like to state some principles on the structure and composition which we believe the IGF should adopt. Singapore believes that any structure and composition of the IGF must be lightweight and scalable. We would LIKE to see that the IGF start small and evolve. Singapore does not believe that the IGF should have a weighty structure. Like any successful organization, there should be milestones in place and opportunities to review progress and for self-evaluation. Singapore believes that it's crucial that the IGF embrace the principles of open participation and multistakeholderism in all aspects of its organization, composition, operation, and rules for participation. We do not believe that any one stakeholder group should be given preeminence in the IGF, as this only precludes that the Internet is the purview of the stakeholders. And doing so will not further the spirit of multistakeholderism as called for in the Tunis Agenda. Therefore, Singapore believes that the IGF should recognize the different competencies of all actors, and bring together the best abilities to the table. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We look forward to contributing to the discussions in the next two days.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: So I think we've had a very useful discussion in this morning's session. And I think in order to move forward, it would perhaps be useful if I were just to place a few questions on the table. And since there are no more speakers, I probably could even break for an early lunch. But we could -- the questions that would be -- some things are clear. Everybody accepts the multistakeholder nature of this. I don't think we need to go over that ground. What I think we do need to go over is what do we actually mean by this in terms of participation. Is the model that of the open consultations that we have had for WGIG where essentially the participation was very open, you simply had to establish that you had some competence and relevance to the issue, and you are welcome. There was no sense in which you had sort of any quotas or any heavy process of screening. So is this a model which would work, which is essentially open-door process? I'm talking of the actual physical meeting, which will be held. I hope that when you come back you will give a little more thought and reflection to this. Several people, not many -- several. Quite a few people mentioned the importance of having a multistakeholder group to direct the work, to organize the work, if you like. The terminology used varied. Some people called it a program committee, some called it a steering group, some called it a bureau, but everybody said something like this is required. You can't just organize it like this open consultation because this open consultation has a very simple purpose, a very simple agenda. It's simply to listen to people on one issue, and then carry back that message. But obviously, a structured forum has to do more than that. So it requires some direction. Some decisions have to be taken on what will be discussed in the morning, what will we discuss in the afternoon, what will we discuss tomorrow. Some decisions will have to be taken. Will everything be discussed in a big plenary meeting or will we have PARALLEL meetings discussing different things. Somebody has to decide that. How will we constitute such a multistakeholder bureau. WHEN we constitute a group such as this, there are certain well-established proceedings we can follow in terms of representation on an equal basis from all regions and so on. We don't have proceedings in the case of this, and I invite your thoughts and reflections; if necessary, IN A thinking ALOUD, which is how could we do this, what are the categories that we would have, who would name the members of the (inaudible). In the case of the member states, there's a very simple process we have in the U.N. which is easy to use, which is you simply turn to the regional groups and say that we need two names from that regional group and they have their own process, and say these other two names. Now, how do we follow -- what's the process that can be followed for the others? Is there perhaps a distinction between the way the first group of direction gets constituted and the subsequent ones? In a sense, a problem in the first one is we have no starting point. We have nobody to whom we can pass the responsibility and say please a constitute a bureau BECAUSE WE HAVE NOT HAD A MEETING. SO MAYBE THE PROBLEM IS LESS AFTER THE FIRST MEETING. BUT please give A LITTLE thought and reflection to this and

come up and see what sort of suggestions you have. As far as THE meetings ITSELF are concerned, everybody has said not more than once a year; THAT the general number that I heard in terms of DAYS is around three. That is, clearly people don't want a week long meeting, nor do they want something just one day. And the typical number that I have been hearing is three. Some said two to three, some said three to four, but essentially around three is what most people have said. And I think it's good for us to keep that in mind as a basis. If you feel strongly about this, what my sense is most people seem to be comfortable with the notion of once a year, a three-day meeting. I think there were some very interesting and valuable reflections which came from ISOC and the others on underpinning this with a, if you like, a virtual meeting which will go on continuously on an Internet basis to allow people time to -- allow people who are not in a position to attend to participate, to create a, if you like, a community which is involved in this process. And I heard this from several people. This does not really pose big issues of principle because there's no reason why we cannot have an online forum as a base for such a physical forum. We had WSIS online which provided very valuable material for the meetings of WSIS itself. But if there are any further reflections on this notion of an underlying base of a virtual forum, then I would very much welcome that in the afternoon session. What of the meeting itself? We have been using this phrase, let's use the model of the open consultations. But as I said, the open consultations, others had a single task in most cases. The single task was to focus like we are focusing on just one issue here. And in the very nature of things, we want everybody to interact. But obviously if you look at the IGF, we will be looking at multiple things. Do you see that organized entirely as a plenary or would you expect to see a little more structure in it in these three days? I think it's very important, because at least as far as the first meeting is concerned, some guidance has to go for the people who are to do this organization as to what are you expecting when you come to Athens. Is it just a big meeting like this going on for three days or do you see something which is more structured? And it's very valuable if you can give us your thoughts, your reflections. Again, I say, in the spirit of thinking aloud, if necessary. You don't have to commit saying this is our country position or civil society position. Let's treat this, if you like, as a joint working session to see how we can make sense out of -- or make this a useful outcome. I think many people referred to the possibility of making sure that this meeting acts as a way of bringing best practices to light. One thought was to highlight it in terms of case studies, of successful and good management of things like Spam or interconnection or cybersecurity. But there are other things people mentioned. And one thing that strikes me here is how do we make sure that this forum is attractive for the people who are really making a difference in these areas? The scholars, the thinkers, the innovators. How do we make this an attractive forum for them? Because those are the people that we need there if this is what we want as part of the IGF process. So any thoughts you have on what can be done in terms of designing this meeting so that we really -- so people would say, okay, yeah, this is a meeting which sounds interesting. Let's go there. There are other issues which -- many issues which have been raised about how do we bring in developmental orientation. I saw that again as a theme common theme. Just about everybody mentioned this. It started off as a strong statement from the G77, but I think many others echoed this, which this is a meeting which should have a strong development orientation. And partly THIS WILL be reflected in the nature of the themes that will be picked up. But also, most important of all, many people refer to the importance of ensuring developing country participation and engagement of governments, of civil society, especially from developing countries. This is a troublesome dimension because I'm not sure that we are all that successful in various exercises we undertake here. And any thoughts, reflections that would come in this area from you in the afternoon session would be, I think, very valuable. In terms of teams, many different areas have been mentioned, areas like multilingualism, spam, cybersecurity, interconnection cost. I will not try and list all of these. But my own sense is that there seems to be reasonably -- reasonable agreement on, provided one can just fix these things so that they're reasonably clear from an early stage, so that we can mobilize your talent to support the process, by and large, I don't -- I don't see these as big controversies. But what is very important is to see how we reflect the

developing country dimension. Do you see, for instance, this forum acting as a space where we can talk of the digital divide? I did hear a couple of contributions which, to me, sounded like as if the forum was about ICT for development. Now, that's fine. If that is the general sense, then certainly the developmentally dimension of Internet governance has to be there. But ICT for development is a much bigger thing. You talk of e-education, e-health, e-governance, and many other dimensions. You talk of the whole telecom infrastructure. I do want to point out that as part of the Tunis follow-up, apart from the IGF, there is a whole implementation mechanism which is being set up, and it consists of -- which is where the ITU is taking the lead -- which consists of a layer of -- which is involved in translating the substantive outcomes of the summit into action in a multistakeholder environment, a regional dimension, possibly involving the regional commissions, and a global dimension, where three institutions, the ITU, UNESCO, and UNDP are expected to take the lead. So a great deal has been launched. There's also an Internet society committee, I think it's called, in the chief executive's board which is being set up. This is, of course, in terms of how the U.N. is taking up the challenge of implementation. So do keep in mind that there are things happening in that area. You also mandated a role for -- a potential role for the commissions for science and technology of development. And that's going to be discussed in July in Geneva. So I think it's very important that we don't try and load everything from Tunis onto the IGF agenda. We must keep in mind that there are other things which are happening. So I would say that when you come back in the afternoon, let's try and get some clarity on what is the expectation when we say that developmentally dimension must be reflected, what is it that we are expecting to see in IGF? So that's, I think, you know, would be helpful in terms of organizing at least the first meeting, the question that I posed to you. I think there are other aspects that will come up in the course of this discussion. One which I will mention which has not been mentioned, which is the importance of flexibility, that let us not treat this as an exercise of setting the IGF for its full term, which I think is five years, its full term of five years. It's treat our job right now as having a good shared understanding of what do we expect the first IGF to look like. And then leave open the possibility that the process itself may change itself, finds that this has worked, this has not worked, and we will change. So is this a good way of proceeding, that instead of sort of asking the secretary general to set everything in stone, let's just say, okay, the first instance, let's focus on getting the first forum off the ground and making sure that that first forum is substantive. A certain amount of discussion did take place on the objectives of the forum. Some were discussion also on what was the expectation on the outcome, and particularly on the latter, I sense much more variation and difference. On what is the expectation on what will come out of this forum. At one level, some people say the main purpose of the forum is to bring people together so that they're able to talk to one another, learn from one another, and there may be some things which may emerge as a consensus, which would then influence a process somewhere else. At the other end, people see a stronger role for the forum in shaping how the appropriate discussions take place elsewhere, perhaps, in this area. I do sense a greater difference in this area of outcomes. My request here is this: I don't think it's our job to fix the outcome. It's the job of the forum to fix the outcome. It's the forum which must decide, rather than, you know, the secretary general or anybody else. I don't see that the secretary general needs to say, "This is what the forum, its outcome is going to be." It's up to the forum to decide on what the outcome will be. Whereas what we need to focus on is, how do we organize this forum, structure it? Of course we will have to keep in mind what our expectations are when we answer these questions. But we don't necessarily have to agree on those expectations fully in order to agree on how the forum should be structured. So let's try and focus on the structuring of the forum and some of the questions that I have raised. I just thought it would be useful if at this point I would propose some questions so that when we come back, we can address these and you can come back and try and give your views on each of these, perhaps even reacting to what some of the other statements that you have heard have implied with regard to some of these aspects. So is this okay as a starting point? Shall we say that we break now, and that we come back at 3:00 and continue this, which will give you time to think about this, discuss it, and then come

back. Okay? Good. Meeting stands adjourned. (Adjourned for lunch.)

CONSULTATIONS ON THE CONVENING OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
TRANSCRIPT OF AFTERNOON SESSION 16 FEBRUARY 2006

Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the Consultations on the Convening of the Internet Governance Forum, in Geneva on 16-17 February in Geneva, Switzerland. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

(Gavel.) >>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Good afternoon. Sorry we started a little late, but we were trying to get a few things organized. I have a long list of speakers. I had posed some questions, and even though most of the speakers are relatively new in the sense they were not there in the morning discussion, I do hope we can start focusing on some of these questions and move beyond the broader questions of the nature of this forum, because I think we've had a good discussion, and I sense a fairly general agreement on that it is a multistakeholder forum, that it must be guided by multistakeholder group of some sort, et cetera, et cetera. But there are issues about what exactly -- how exactly do we work them. So I'm going to start and the first one I'm going to call is from CCBI, Waudo Siganga from Kenya.

>>CCBI: Thank you. Hello? Is it working? Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the members of the CCBI, and that includes the private sector from the developing countries, I would like to offer some of our ideas in response to the points and questions that you raised before our lunch break. First, for the private sector, multistakeholder participation on an equal footing is a fundamental principle that shall guide all aspects of the IGF, including participation, representation, leadership, access, operations, all dimensions. Second, the format for the IGF event should be shaped to meet the clear objective of facilitating the exchange of information, experiences, best practices, and I would add the important component of making human contacts. A few ideas include a format, for instance, with an opening session and plenary to set the stage on the event topic, interactive and expert panels on focus issues to attract the key experts that were suggested by the chair before the lunch break. We should take -- we should take care to ensure that discussion focused on the various aspects of the topic being considered. Finally, a wrap-up plenary, perhaps on the last day of the meeting, could be useful. Mr. Chairman, on the representatives to be selected for the bureau, we would like to stress the importance that these representatives be selected in close consultation with all stakeholder groups and that diversity of expertise as well as geographies are key considerations. On the question that you raised regarding the outcomes of the IGF event, the tangible outcomes should be neutral summaries of the discussions, and in addition, we should consider that a real outcome is the actual exchange of information. That is the process of open, interactive multistakeholder exchange and discussion is the outcome in many ways. On the question of how to actualize the full and effective participation of all stakeholders as required by the Tunis agenda, including those from developing countries, it is important that the program committee or any other group that would be charged with the task of preparing the meetings formulate the agenda and related documentation in a way clearly indicating the relevance of the discussions to all stakeholders, particularly those from the developing countries. Wherever possible, use of online tools should be encouraged in order to maximize the interactions online and minimize the need for expensive traveling. The IGF event should be webcast or broadcast so that stakeholders who cannot attend in person will have another means of participating or following the proceedings. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. And I have a long list, so maybe I should start giving you a sense of the sequence. I have bill Drake and Milton Mueller, then Chantal Lebrument or maybe it's Louis Pouzin, from France. Chris Disspain, the

chair of the country code organization. Maybe let's stop at this point. Because -- so bill Drake, Milton Mueller, then Eurolinc from France, and then Chris Disspain.

>>WILLIAM DRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Having listened carefully to the interventions this morning, I'd like to make points on three matters. And, unfortunately, my phone is ringing. So I will promptly get rid of it. Okay. So -- that was not very helpful at all. Well, what could I do? Okay. The first point pertains to the substantive focus of the forum's discussions. Since early in phase 1, the WSIS principles have been routinely repeated and endorsed by participants in the WSIS process, those principles are, again, that Internet governance should be multilateral, transparent, and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, private sector, civil society, and international organizations, IE, multistakeholder. The Tunis Agenda gives the IGF an unambiguous mandate to promote NSS on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes within existing Internet governance mechanisms. This kind of a horizontal assessment of the existing arrangements and issues that arise within them is essential to promoting a more effective, inclusive, and broadly supported Internet governance activities. The forum could play a very important catalytic role by taking a holistic view of the range of governance mechanisms, fostering understanding and participation in them, and raising awareness about possible ways in which governance might be improved. This implies ongoing monitoring and assessment of developments in those mechanisms and close working relationships with them. The Tunis Agenda is equally clear on these points. When it says that the IGF is to, and I again quote, facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policy issues, interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview, facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, and identify emerging issues and bring them to the attention of relevant bodies, and where appropriate, make recommendations. Presumably, when governments carefully negotiated this text, they meant what they said. If that is the case, then there should be no controversy, one would think, about establishing a process under the IGF to carry out this mandate. Nevertheless, as I listen to the interventions this morning about what the forum might focus on, the focus has been pretty much on what, in the WGIG context, we referred to as vertical issues, sort of individual segmented issues, rather than these horizontal, cross-cutting issues that arise with regard to all governance mechanisms. And so I'm just curious, the mandate is quite elaborate in saying that this is something that the IGF is supposed to do, and yet we have not talked about it doing that. I am wondering, is that, then, something that we no longer support? Was the Tunis Agenda not really a consensual document reflecting the views of all the participants? My second question pertains to the nature of the forum. I have heard the forum referred to this morning as an "event" or "a meeting," which sounds like a series of one-off sessions that would be held on an annual basis, sort of like the ITU's world telecom forums, with some online dialogue in between. I've also heard it said that there should not be any subsidiary bodies related to the IGF. From the beginning, civil society participants have understood this differently. We have long thought of the IGF as a process, not as a series of one-off meetings, but as a process that would promote collective dialogue, learning, and mutual understanding on an ongoing basis. The IGF in this formulation would be an umbrella under which various initiatives could be taken on a bottom-up basis by concerned stakeholders. One possible formulation in that regard would be to create working groups. If there is a set of actors who have a particular interest, they could form a working group. They could have online dialogue amongst themselves. If they had resource and a desire, perhaps they could have an actual face-to-face meeting. And perhaps they would generate some sort of report or text or recommendations which might be brought into the annual large-scale meeting. In that context, I would suggest, for example, and in light of my first point, the possibility of creating a working group on application of the WSIS principles in Internet governance. There are other types of initiatives that one can imagine related to the forum as well, and

these are envisioned both in the WGIG report and in the Tunis Agenda. My colleague Wolfgang will mention later, but some of us are planning on forming an Internet governance research network that would bring together scholars who work in a social science tradition on Internet governance issues, and perhaps that's something that could plug into this more dynamic, flexible, ongoing process kind of conception of the IGF. I think this is particularly important if the Secretariat itself does not have an independent research capacity, somewhere, ideas are going to have to be generated and brought to the table. Otherwise, we're going to have simply, again, a series of sort of one-off meetings with not a lot of connective tissue and cumulative collective learning. The last points I would simply reiterate, and this is, again, in response, I think, to some of the points that have been made, civil society and the Internet governance caucus has always argued that the Internet Governance Forum ought to be convened under the authority of the U.N. secretary general, and I think that we also believe that it should be coordinated by the United Nations as the appropriate inclusive forum that brings all stakeholders together. So those three points I thought I would simply put on the table. The substantive question of what we're talking about and whether or not the Tunis mandate is really the mandate for the IGF. The notion that the IGF should be thought of more as an ongoing and multilayered process than simply a series of one-off meetings. And the question of how it might be convened and coordinated. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI:.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Milton Mueller from Syracuse, university. I think --

>> Microphone, please.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Can you hear me now? I said I'm Milton Mueller --

>> Lost you again.

>>WILLIAM DRAKE: The light's on.

>>MILTON MUELLER: The light's on, nobody's home.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Every time you look at your computer, we lose you.

>>MILTON MUELLER: I will lean over like this. Is that all right? Mr. Chairman, -- [Laughter] [Applause]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Now we can hear you.

>>MILTON MUELLER: I don't have to read it. I'll wing it. I'm complimenting you or trying on the masterful job you did of summarizing questions and putting the topics on the table. Many of the questions you gave us dealt with the questions of institutional design. I want to note that the Internet governance project issued a paper addressing many of those questions. That paper is available. In general, we proposed a specific structure with a defined role for a plenary, a program committee or bureau, and a process for recognizing topics, a BOTTOM-UP process for recognizing topics for IGF activities. We envision, like Mr. Drake, the IGF as an ongoing process, with

annual meetings as simply a capstone. I want to spend most of my intervention on one of your statements, Mr. Chairman, that I took issue with. On the issue of the themes, that is, what topics should the IGF address, you said there seems to be reasonable agreement. And in my reading of what happened this morning, I heard an important disagreement. It wasn't just that different people proposed different or similar ideas, but that speakers raised fundamentally different principles regarding what should be considered a suitable topic and what should not be considered a suitable topic. For example, some commentators would like the IGF to take up the unfinished business of WSIS, such as public-policy principles for coordination of Internet resources. Others claim that the forum should not discuss divisive issues and that there should be no overlap with other organizations. In my opinion, and in that of most of the civil society people that I talk to, a well-organized forum is a way of bridging divisive issues and finding solutions to those issues. If we attempt to prevent the forum from discussing those issues, first of all, where will those issues be discussed? Secondly, how will they ever be resolved? If -- in addition, if we attempt to prevent the forum from discussing anything in a domain of another intergovernmental organization, what will be left? Will there be anything left on its agenda? I think that what will happen is that instead of multistakeholder cooperation, you will invite constant struggles over turf. You will tell -- you will engage in constant struggles over whether this particular topic is in the domain of another organization or not. Now, it seems to me that the WSIS agenda provides a very clear mandate for the forum to take up precisely the kinds of issues that some people are saying we should not take up. In particular, let me read the first bullet point under paragraph 72. The forum should, quote, discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance. It does not say "some key elements." It does not say "nondivisive elements." And I would point out that because the forum has no decision-making authority or legislative authority, what is the reason to prevent it from discussing anything? If people do not come to an agreement, then they will not come to an agreement, and the forum will not succeed in producing anything on that topic. But if there is a chance that they would come to an agreement, why should they be prevented from discussing it? So, to conclude, there is no reason to prevent the forum from discussing any topic in Internet governance. What we really need to do is define a process, an open process, a generalized process, for establishing topics that the Internet Governance Forum will take up. The nature of those topics is clearly defined in the WSIS agenda. We must not allow specific topics to be suppressed. We must instead define a BOTTOM-UP and flexible process for prioritizing its agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: From (inaudible). Eurolinc, please. Eurolinc. There they are. All right.

>>LOUIS POUZIN: Is the sound okay? Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am speaking for Eurolinc and also for another institution, called the nATIVE language consortium. Eurolinc has been created about three years ago for promoting the use of natural languages in the Internet, including domain names. And on the other hand, the native language consortium is a more recent creation, which also intends to promote the use of a specific methods for using natural languages in accessing the Web. So this is already working in several countries, like Korea and turkey, for example. Others are coming behind. So the issue of multilingualism is not just a matter of character codes and keyboards. Languages are a fundamental element of cultures. First the cultural diversity means multilingualism; it also means regional habits, regional customs, jurisdictions, and also religions. We can't ignore those realities in the Internet. For the forum to meet -- to be constructive, we believe that there should be regional consensus in the first place. Some issues may be essential at the regional level, but may be unessential or irrelevant at the world level. But we think those issues should be much better sorted out and discussed and agreed at regional level before they are brought to the world level. And probably it will be an idea to organize the IGF work so that in between the annual or biannual meetings, which are contemplated for the IGF, there could be

also regional meetings in which the various stakeholders discuss together their positions and the way they plan to introduce them in the world level. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. And now Mr. Disspain from the country-code support organization. After that, El Salvador, South Africa, then Mr. Wolfgang Kleinwaechter. And then Nominet U.K. Mr. Disspain.

>>CCNSO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you for the focusing questions that you asked at the end of this morning's session. I spent some time during the lunch break focusing on the focusing questions, and I have some suggestions specifically in respect to the structure of the Internet Governance Forum meetings. I've had to make some assumptions in order to make these suggestions, and my assumptions are that the meeting will take place over three days. And I've also assumed that there will be three topics chosen for discussion during the meeting. Now, these are only examples, but for the purposes of this intervention, I'm suggesting spam, multilingualism, and capacity-building might be three topics. But whatever they are, I would suggest that they should be as diverse as possible to encourage as many people as possible to attend the meeting. The suggested structure would be that after a brief opening session, day one and day two be devoted to sessions on the three topics, and day three be a plenary session. The idea for days one and day two would be to run parallel sessions on each topic. And I would suggest that those parallel sessions follow a format using panels wherever possible. The first part of any session should be basically education. You take spam as an example, the first session on spam should be an introduction -- an introductory session providing basic information on the topic for that session. What is spam exactly? What do spammers do to make sure that their spam gets through? Who's impacted by it. That sort of thing. The second part of the session should be an agreement on goals. The goal might simply be to stop spam. On the other hand, the goal might be more complicated. Thirdly, there should be a presentation on existing initiatives for the topic. Then a general discussion on the topic itself, a brainstorming session, if you like. And, finally, that can all be pulled together to prepare a report or discussion document to be presented at the plenary session. On day three, each of the three streams would deliver their presentation, and there would be open discussion, hopefully leading to consensus, on a series of next steps for each of the topics. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you for that input. We will structure a model which I hope some of you will react to. San Salvador.

>> El Salvador: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. El Salvador would like to express its satisfaction to see you leading these consultations to establish the Internet Governance Forum. We trust that also in relation to the reform of the commission on science and technology, open consultations will take place. Going back to the question that you raised, Mr. Chairman, regarding to the outcome, El Salvador hopes that the Internet Governance Forum will come up with recommendations built on consensus on specific issues. The process itself of the forum also represents in itself an outcome, a result. El Salvador believes that the open consultations of the working group on Internet governance can be a model for the forum. We believe that the forum should be a preparatory body made up of experts similar in that respect to the way other expert groups operate in the area of the environment, human rights, and other areas. As a form of experts, these would act in their personal capacity, these experts, the governments would appoint the experts to take part, and they would convey the points of view of the governments. Similarly, for the rest of the sectors, organized civil society and private sector and the academic world, et cetera, the same method would be adopted. A yearly meeting lasting between three to five days seem to us to be appropriate. The interaction, synchronized and unsynchronized of the Internet users, would be important, in our point of view.

The democratic consensus of the forum is very much linked to a pass and bottoms-up approach rather than a representative approach. The forum should be open for all those who want to take part in the work thereof, as well as the other working groups that derive from the same. A challenge for the forum is to seek actively that universal participation and isolate any disruptive behavior expressed towards it. El Salvador considers that the forum will need a bureau as well as a Secretariat. The setup of both should be multistakeholder in nature. For us, the decentralized structure that appears in the Tunis Agenda could refer to the working group that would then report to the forum. The forum, as a body of experts that generates nonbinding recommendations, should have the ability to refer to any issue linked to Internet governance. The recommendations themselves that arise from the forum will be assessed by another mechanism in accordance to its merits and its inclusive nature. The recommendations of the forum should be adopted by consensus. The vote should not be used, because whilst it could speed up the work, on the other hand, it could give rise to actions that undermine the credibility of the forum or the merits of the recommendations themselves. Mr. Chairman, we have also taken note of the recommendation whereby we should look at the cross-cutting issues as well as the horizontal issues, the vertical issues. El Salvador recommends that one of the priorities at this time should be the treatment of spam. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: South Africa.

>>SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, chairperson, for giving us the floor. South Africa would like to indicate that we've always been proponents of an approach that removes issues of Internet governance from the purview of a small minority to that of a broader, more representative and transparent constituency. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that we support the establishment of an Internet Governance Forum that aims to facilitate discussion on key issues related to not only Internet governance, but awareness and capacity-building. Prior to the lunch break, chairperson, you gave us this process, a specific direction on the areas of emphasis and the spheres with which each delegation should actually make input on. We shall therefore restrict our input to those specified areas. These, in our understanding, specifically are multistakeholder participation, the themes, and the intended outcomes or expectations from this process. In our view, there are various elements that fall under this subheading of multistakeholder participation. Firstly, we need to define the exact participants that we envisage. In our opinion, we believe that the broader that is direction to participation, the more effective and far-reaching the outcomes of the process would be. Therefore, all the groups that have been identified by previous speakers as potential participants, such as governments, civil society, and private sector, are endorsed by our delegation. It is, however, important to emphasize that such participation will be on an equal footing, always bearing in mind that governments are the custodians of public policy, as has been emphasized in the Tunis Agenda. In terms of the cross-cutting issues that were mentioned, especially on Internet governance issues, that impact internationally, these, in our view, would be more appropriately dealt with at the level of the U.N., as outlined in paragraph 61 and 62 of the Tunis Agenda. Secondly, having identified the stakeholders, it is also equally important to outline the nature of participation by such stakeholders. We believe that the participation should be geared towards ensuring maximum output. And how do we do this? Well, we would propose a kind of multipronged approach that will be a combination of plenary with round table discussion and also workshops. I think that one of the areas of emphasize was the fact that we would like to have this forum being more developmental oriented. And if one is to do that, then one has to have the different dimensions. At the same time, we find the idea or the concept of a plenary quite useful in the sense that you could have that on the first day and also on the last day so as to consolidate the diverse positions. We believe that the approach could be -- that is, on the first leg of the process -- convene a very short plenary and then proceed to the themed workshops that will focus on the development agenda. I don't think that we need to go into the specifications as to what would be the direction that different workshops take,

because already they've been outlined even in the WGIG and also in Paragraph 50 of the Tunis Agenda. I think we've got a fair idea of the type of topics one would deem as developmental topics. The participation at such workshops would be structured in a manner of encouraging attendance and participation from all the different regions so that you have (inaudible) representations by the relevant regional organizations, also by people from academia, from civil society, and other interest groups that can, you know, participate in such workshops. The outcomes, then, would set the theme for the roundtable discussion so that they can be pressed further. I think that in our view, the roundtable would be something, in a way, based on a model like the world economic forum, but not quite as high level in terms of -- that is, the global, which focuses on CEOs and heads of state. It would be more people who are geared towards -- who have an interest in terms of the Internet governance, you know, issues that we've been talking about. This would mean that in the end, the plenary session at the IGF would then have the effect of consolidating the views from the various discussions of the roundtables, and thereafter, all countries in attendance would be able to endorse this as the outcome of the meeting. The subsequent report would be submitted to the SGS, the instructions of the Tunis Agenda, paragraph 75, which, of course, outlines the fact that this is not in any way binding, since there will be a process which would take place as well as outlined in paragraph 61. Lastly -- sorry. Before I go on to the last part, I think that I am not sure whether I actually emphasized the issue of the geographical representation and the distribution in terms of composition. The simple purpose, of course, is to ensure that as broad a scope of views as possible is facilitated, and also to ensure that when we are talking about the developmental agenda, we do hear from those who actually come from the developing countries rather than assuming that the expertise actually comes only from the developed countries. Just lastly, we believe that the WGIG report has some -- especially within the first chapter -- some useful suggestions as to some of the themes. And I think we've already indicated that clause 50 and its subbullets actually do begin to give us a sort of direction or suggestion as to the kind of outcome that you would like to get at the end. Thank you very much, chairperson.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. We have Wolfgang Kleinwaechter and then Nominet, and then followed by Trinidad-Tobago, and then Jeanette Hoffman.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Wolfgang Kleinwaechter. I'm a Professor at the University of Aarhus, but I'm also a member of the Internet governance caucus of the civil society. We've heard from Milton and bill, and you will later hear Annette, Karen, from others. We have a rather vibrant discussion on this list about the future of the forum. So we feel it as a responsibility of civil society to bring added value to the process. So our motivation is really to move one step forward and to make a concrete contribution. But I'm speaking here not on behalf of the caucus; I'm speaking as a researcher from at university. The Internet Governance Forum enters new and unknown territory. Cyberspace is still a terra incognita. A lot of new things remain to be discovered. The list of issues which needs clarification is growing. It's a "terror incognito." [Laughter]

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I said -- I'm sorry. It's my English pronunciation. It's a terra inCOGNITa. [Applause]

>> Speak English!

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: It's not English? I am -- I'm sorry for that. But as a German researcher, sometimes you use Latin terminology. Anyhow. A lot of new things remain to be discovered, and more will come. The list of issues which needs clarification is growing. Ten years ago, the United Nations had no idea that domain names, spam, or WI-max in Africa are issues for public policy

discussion. And what we know today about the agenda of the years 2010 or 2015 probably only little. Innovations with regard to the use of the Internet will produce new problems. Take as only one example the challenges of video over I.P, which may be much bigger than voice-over-IP and will go even beyond I.P.TV, Internet television. Millions of private and public video clips and photos will be on the Internet, a great challenge for search engines like Google or the new European project (inaudible) which have started to develop capabilities for video recognition. One of the consequences of such a development could be that biometrical data of individuals could become a public resource for search on the Internet. What happens now on airports could take place anywhere in your home. I take the biometrical data from a photo of my friend, start a search, and we will find all the photos and videos of him available on the Internet. Probably this could become a problem. Such issues need (inaudible) public discussion and should not be discussed in small technical circles or closed governmental negotiations groups. The forum could become the ideal place where the consequences of such new developments are discussed. The forum could write Internet history by functioning as a laboratory or as an early warning system. It would miss an opportunity and will fail if it would restart the battles of yesterday. Since it's certainly a challenge for all stakeholders, governments, private sector, and civil society, but is in particular a challenge for the global research community. Academicians and technicians have been involved in the development of the Internet from the very early days, and they will have to play an even more important role in the future. May I use this opportunity here to inform you that a group of academic researchers has started already a process which we have called enhanced communication to improve the networking and collaboration among existing academic research institutions on the globe. The vision is to develop a global decentralized network of researchers which would improve the flow of Internet-related research results both among the researchers themselves, and among academic researchers and the main stakeholders. Such a network could produce food for thought for governments, private sector, and civil society. It could become something like a flexible and decentralized think tank behind the forum. If the forum is designed as a BOTTOM-UP policy development project, the chance to find the right answers to the new challenges will be higher. More knowledge will probably help to create more wisdom. The groundwork was done just last week in a very inspiring conference which was organized by the DIPLO foundation in Malta. The results of this meeting has been distributed here during the forum. And let me inform you also that the international association of communication, ICA, and the international association for media and communication research, IAMCR, two global organizations representing more 10,000 academic researchers from around the globe, will organize another small joint symposium this year in (inaudible) where we want to develop a more concrete framework for such a new process of enhanced communication. Hopefully, we will produce already some results for the planned forum in Athens in October 2006. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Nominet.

>> Nominet: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm speaking on behalf of Nominet, the not for profit registry for U.K. We have 4.6 million registrations and over 3,700 registrars. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak to one of the questions that you posed just before the break, which is how to make the forum attractive for people making a difference. There are four points I'd like to make, very briefly. Firstly, picking up another of your points, I think flexibility is the key, by focusing perhaps on one or two issues, so that the people involved can shift and change as the issues change as well. Secondly, to be attractive, the forum must be effective and be seen to be so. And perhaps in this instance, we can learn by doing rather than starting first to build elaborate structures. In our view, the vision should be of a lightweight, dynamic space for dialogue, and that over focus on procedural matters or organizational issues will pull against this, leading those people that you want to engage to disengage. Thirdly, identifying issues that will truly benefit from discussion in an international, rather than a national, forum. And perhaps the suggestions of

Spam and multilingualism are good starting points here. Perhaps also, the forum can build on initiatives and processes at the national level which could pick out and draw on examples of best practice and emerging issues which could then be brought to the international table. And lastly, the forum will only be attractive to people making a dinners if they have heard of it. And perhaps we can consider the role of the press and the media in bringing these issues to the wider attention of the stakeholder of the global community, the national community. And in this way, bring people to the table who might not otherwise have heard of the issues or be engaging in the process. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: We now have Jeannette Hofmann.

>>JEANNETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also speak as a member of the Internet Governance caucus but in my own capacity. I'd like to address the question of agenda he setting in the context of the forum. For the forum to succeed, it must be free to choose the issues it addresses as the participants consider appropriate. No matter whether or not those issues touch upon the mandate of other existing organizations. The forum should choose its issues and application of its missions and mandate as defined inter alia by paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda. This implies that the task of agenda setting should be regarded as an essential element in the implementation of the forum's multistakeholder approach. The agenda setting should be organized as a bottom-up process with all members being given the opportunity to suggest issues. Likewise, no single group of actors should be allowed to block the discussion of topics. One of the issues the forum should address concerns the issues of enhanced cooperation, and in relation to this, the development of globally applicable principles and public policy as defined in paragraph 69 and 70 of the Tunis Agenda. The forum on Internet Governance should be part of the environment that facilitates the development of public policy principles. First of all, open discussions in the multistakeholder context of the forum give affected parties, among them users and the Internet industry, a chance to contribute their expertise, but also to make their concerns known. In this way, a multistakeholder environment can enhance the effectiveness of any policy principles designed for shaping Internet Governance. Second, the forum can add to the overall legitimacy of any enhanced cooperation, and thereby increase the chance for compliance to those principles by all involved or affected organizations on the Internet. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Then I have Trinidad and Tobago followed by Senegal.

>>TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just two points. One, we agree that a flexible bottom-up approach is required in terms of setting the IGF's Agenda. However, there needs to be some sequencing of issues that will be discussed to ensure the forum has some type of focus. all issues cannot be discussed at the first time, not if they are to be given the consideration they deserve. Secondly, we also feel strongly that an important element of the IGF process is the inclusion of regional or subregional consultations, especially if the meeting is to be held annually. Participation in these meetings will of course will be multistakeholder in nature. In Trinidad and Tobago's view, this will give greater focus to the IGF outcome while building on existing mechanisms. For groupings such as the Caribbean community, this is a key element. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Senegal.

>>SENEGAL: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As it's the first time I take the floor, I would like to congratulate the organizers of this meeting for this very welcome initiative which is due to lead us to set out the roadmap enabling us or the forum on the Internet Governance to reach the objectives it has been given in

accordance with paragraph 72 and 73 of the Tunis Agenda. Our idea on the forum is that we share everything that was said this morning on the multistakeholder approach and the transparent and democratic approach to the Internet. However, the forum, though it's a consultative body, should be able to take decisions involving all the stakeholders. With regard, as far as Senegal is concerned, we are heading toward this bottom-up consensus through a national forum on the use of the Internet with the involvement of the government, the civil society, and the private sector to deal with all problems of public policy. The results we reach should enable us to share the results at a subregional level and African group level. Furthermore, we believe the Internet must be managed from a single space that is identified and recognized by the international community as it is today so that it doesn't become chaotic and annihilate all the efforts of streamlining it which have been broken until today. With regard to the IPv6, I think this will settle de facto the issue of the Internet protocol addresses.

We think the international community must speed up the adoption of that technology and invite migration from IPv4 to IPv6. We believe that the coming of age of IPv6 will give rise to considerable trade stakes, and we suggest that the WTO become involved in the discussions on the Internet Governance Forum. Thank you very much for your attention.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Mr. Aizu followed by Karen Banks. Izumi Aizu, and followed by Sebastien Bachollet.

>>IZUMI AIZU: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. Again, my name Izumi Aizu and I am a member of the civil society, Internet Governance caucus, but this is my personal observation. We expect this forum to act as a catalyst for possible improvement or reform of existing Internet Governance organizations. From the multistakeholder perspectives we have been talking about, we like to see this to be one of the main activities of the IGF in making ICANN or ITU or any other bodies to be more open and inclusive to all stakeholders to participate on equal footing. And I emphasize this, on equal footing. It was in Tunis at the very last minute in the negotiations, the participation of all stakeholders on equal footing on certain paragraphs were just deleted without much debate, as I observed. But I hope that this spirit will come into implementation again. We also like to emphasize the need to implement and support a multistakeholder approach at the local, national, and regional level as was agreed in the Tunis Agenda, in conjunction with this IGF process. This could mean, following the Brazilian approach of setting up a multistakeholder Steering Committee at the national level or hold open consultation process by a government body in charge with private sector and the civil society in the national level. In a more explicit, transparent, and accountable manner, which is not necessarily exercised in many countries to date, including my country. We see this often in many developing countries, this problem, but sometimes even in the (inaudible) countries. So why we like to emphasize the importance of multistakeholderism. Often the civil societies in developing countries are effectively excluded, so we really need to address this issue. And especially to have this multistakeholder dialogue in a meaningful manner at our own country is much more important, perhaps, than we think, and it will provide real inputs to this IGF process. Finally, in the same spirit, we have some serious concern about the enhanced cooperation process, which might become the old-fashioned way of closed-door in the government negotiation. If anything is to happen under this enhanced cooperation process, we urge the governments to open the door, allow the participation of all stakeholders in the spirit of multistakeholderism as agreed in Tunis, and make relevant bridge between that process and this process at IGF.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Karen Banks.

>>KAREN BANKS: Thank you, chair. I'm just checking I have power here. I wanted to focus on responding to some of your questions. But they are all very closely linked if we look at the issue of the general development orientation

of the IGF. So I want to look at what we mean in terms of issues, participation, capacity building, and then a final comment on the nature of the program committee. Specifically, we'd like to focus on the issue of access and the broader question you mentioned around digital divide, and we think this is probably going to be one of the most challenging elements of shaping the agenda of the IGF, and that we should resist attempts to delegate it too completely to other bodies or processes. We think that the work of the IGF should be informed by rights-based approach and this involves different types of rights and the rights to access and the freedoms to make use of that access really have to feature in the work of the IGF. Whilst we acknowledge that access is obviously a huge component of the broader information and communications development framework, and it is and should be integrated in other areas of work and processes, for example, by the ITU, by the proposed global alliance for ICT policy, UNESCO on culture diversity, the access to knowledge movement around WIPO, et cetera, it should also be addressed by the IGF. And we would recommend that one issue on the igf's inaugural agenda be universal internet access as a human right and that we form a multistakeholder working group to explore that in the IGF's first cycle. The question of what do we mean by multistakeholder participation, I have some very similar comments which support the intervention from South Africa. An important element of it is the identification, a systematic process of stakeholder identification. Particularly, I think, in relation to new and emerging issues where obviously it's fairly easy for us to identify stakeholders who have been involved in the WSIS or the WGIG process, but there are many who are tangentially engaged. One of our experiences have been, for example, with librarians, an incredibly important group, consumer groups who would be critical in any discussions around freedom of expression. And then there are many groups who are not engaged at all. Particularly, I think, at grass-roots level. And we could look at, for example, commissioning research for a comprehensive mapping of key stakeholder groupings on any issue that the IGF took up. Moving on to participation. Izumi focused on the need to, I think, look at this at the national level, and we would strongly support any initiatives that helped to build multistakeholder national level platforms. I think this is really a critical component in contributing to a successful global forum. We've had good experience, certainly, in the UK, very, very useful consultations that we hope will build into a kind of standing platform, if you like, a permanent multistakeholder platform, and that we can work together throughout the cycles of the IGF. But a huge part of this, I think, is capacity building and we had the benefit of several people being together last week at a very useful conference that Diplo organized and emerging from that is a concrete proposal on sort of an Internet Governance capacity building support mechanism for the IGF. And this is building very much on the findings of the louder voices study, which came out of the dot Force in 2002. And one of the key findings being that although there are undoubtedly many problems particularly for developing country delegates in the way international institutions work, such as holding of meetings in high cost locations, scheduling meetings in concurrent sessions and providing either too much or too little information on issues and procedures, these were seen to be less significant in limiting participation than weaknesses in national policy-making processes, and the lack of useful information resources which would enable them to play an active part in the negotiation and decision-making processes. We have identified three components of a capacity building proposal. It is available on the IGF Web site. I have some hard copies here. It includes largely mapping activities, clear objective accounts of meetings and processes, as well as reaching out to, we hope, individuals from all international organizations who are involved in Internet Governance in its broadest possible context to build a kind of networked Wikipedia type of resource that could support the IGF as we move along. I think the IGF annual meeting itself could provide a very important anchoring for providing clearinghouse around capacity building and research, a platform for bringing together the different capacity building initiatives and identifying new needs. And also, we think very, very important, to build the capacity of actors in developed countries; to understand and address the challenges of Internet development and regulation in developing countries. We think that's just as important as all of our initiatives to work with building capacity in developing countries. Just a final note on the bureau Secretariat question. We

don't see a need for a bureau in the context of the WSIS or other U.N. processes. And we feel it raises questions of representivity that are very difficult to address in the context and spirit of the IGF and feel more comfortable with a trusted chair, a resource Secretariat, and the support of a multistakeholder program committee advisory group and working groups. And thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have Mr. Ronald Koven, representative of the world press freedom committee.

>>RONALD KOVEN: Thank you. Excuse my voice. Speaking for world press freedom committee, I would like to say how happy we are to see the Internet Governance forum is to be -- excuse me -- an unrestricted multistakeholder -- excuse me. Unrestricted multistakeholder environment. I will give you my statement in writing. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: We look forward to getting your statement in writing, Mr. Koven. Thank you. I have Sebastien Bachollet of ISOC France many.

>> Somebody is going to read it for him.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: If somebody can read the statement. Could you read the statement?

>> Yes, I will try to help out here.

>>RONALD KOVEN: Sorry.

>> I'm starting from the beginning. Speaking for the world press freedom committee, I would like to say how heartened we are to see that the Internet Governance Forum is to be an unrestricted multistakeholder effort where all the players are to be on an equal footing. During the WSIS process, we said on a number of occasions, as did the media caucus of civil society, how disappointed we were that the news media and news practitioners were not represented as full-fledged players in the discussions of Internet Governance, despite the fact that they are central to the development of the Internet. There were, for example, no news media representatives in the working group on Internet Governance. We have been the unrecognized fourth estate of cyberspace deliberations. Rest assured, Mr. Chairman, that we will now encourage the representative organizations of the world news media to take their full rightful places as partners in discussions of the future of the Internet and the role it can and should play to expand the benefits to our societies of freedom of expression and the free flow of information. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. And now I turn to Sebastien Bachollet, ISOC France followed by Saudi Arabia and then Vittorio Bertola, then Annette. Annette Muehlberg, and then -- I have to read the name out. His handwriting is terrible. Can I have Sebastien Bachollet and then Saudi Arabia.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't repeat what we have put in our written contribution because I think this is also a way of making use of the Internet tools available to us. We organized a meeting on 7 February on the creation of the Internet Governance Forum with representatives of the civil society and the private sector. The objective was mainly to exchange information rather than to arrive at common positions. And many people who

were there are here today. One of the important elements that emerged from that meeting is the need to have at the national level consultation -- I wouldn't say a structure, but an organization such as the Internet Governance Forum at the national level. We also think that it is absolutely essential that we have this at the European level. I would like to stress a number of points. One of the problems, I think, of all of the participants but in particular of representatives of civil society is time, money, and resources to participate in various meetings. And one of the ways of reducing the cost is to organize a meeting of the Internet Governance Forum on the Internet and then at a national level. And of that we could discuss, after the meeting, we could discuss with various organizations to organize this, I think. It's essential, I think, also, to -- also that this forum should use the tools of the Internet, the preparation of work, discussions, should be conducted with the media that we're discussing; otherwise, what's the point of talking about them if we don't use them? But I think we should go farther than that and create -- in creating the Internet Governance Forum. This will force us to think about setting up specific tools, and perhaps this would also be a good opportunity to launch an appeal for tools enabling us to work together at the international level. We also think it would be useful to have reports about what's being done in the various organizations which discuss the Internet, because it's impossible for each of us and each of our organizations and each of our enterprises, and even each of our governments to attend all of the meetings which might take place on this. And the IGF might be a place where all this work could be reported on to enable us to get an overall view of what is going on as far as the Internet and its governance. Reference has been made of best practices. I think that what's important is that we should exchange practices. Some practices may not be good for everyone, and it's important that all of these practices should be expressed and discussed, and this would enable all of us to establish his own best practices; at least, we hope so. As others have said, it's essential that this forum should be created in a flexible manner. It's relatively easy to imagine who should participate. In short, to put it briefly, everyone who wants to. Now, if we organize groups on decisions or a group to organize this, the question of representivity is and will remain complex. But these compromises should not be carved in stone, and can be reconsidered at various times during the forum. Also, I think it's essential that we regularly ask whether the forum is useful and consider its operations and whether we really still need it. Today it seems that we do need it, but perhaps three or four years from now, or five years from now, things will have changed and it won't be necessary anymore. But if we ask the question, I think it's probable that this forum will remain alive for a long time because it does exist. Thank you for your attention.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The kingdom of Saudi Arabia believes that the success of the first meeting of the IGF would lead to the success of the subsequent meetings. So in the context of the preparation of the first meeting of the IGF, we should focus on the main access of the -- of this meeting. And they could be identified by the stakeholders. And we suggest that we should form virtual working groups through the Internet. And these groups would submit their proposals to the Internet governance in order to deal with such subject matters. And this would lead to the support of further participation by all the relevant groups. In this connection, the IGF has to identify the actors that would receive such recommendations in order to make them more practical. For example, the question related to public policy issues, it could be dealt with by the enhanced cooperatives that could be initiated by the secretary-general with all the relevant organizations by the first quarter of 2006 in accordance with the Tunis Agenda, paragraph 71. We also believe that it's very important to find a way to identify the priorities of the subjects that would be discussed by the IGF because there might be too many subjects and time would not be sufficient to discuss them all. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your attention.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much, and also for the written contributing which the kingdom of Saudi Arabia had sent on this subject. I now have Mr. Vittorio Bertola followed by Annette Muehlberg and followed by Francis Muguet.

>>VITTORIO BERTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to start by the concept that was agreed in Tunis Agenda about forum based on authoritativeness and not on authority. I think this implies that participation and inclusiveness are vital elements to get support and for a forum to be effective. And this leads me to my first very specific point which regards rules for accreditation and participation in the meetings. I think it is very important that there are no barriers, there are no obstacles for anyone who wants to participate in these meetings. It should be very simple online-based registration system. In general, you should make it possible for any stakeholder who wants to participate to join the meetings. And this, speaking for what regards civil society, does not just include accredited or established NGOs but also includes informal groups, online campaigns, and even the individual users participating as individuals. And then the most important point I wanted to make I think we all want this forum to have an impact. I think we want this forum to be able to solve issues; otherwise, it will be useless. And so I would like to reiterate the idea that the IGF should be seen as a process and not as an event. And the reason is clear. I think that -- I mean, can you solve issues by meeting once a year for three days, maybe discussing 10 or 15 different issues, maybe in a room filled up by 500 people? I think it's clear that you can't. And so if you want to change the Internet, I think you need to do it the Internet way. You need to encompass the flow of spontaneous initiatives that are born every day on the Internet to solve the issues about which all the users of the Internet care. And so, my proposal, you need working groups. You need to have open, online collaborative initiatives that are started by the people who care. So all stakeholders that care about the specific issue can gather and form an online discussion forum and start to discuss and build consensus and actually work out best practices and recommendations. And then at the same time, I think you need some coordination among all these different working groups. And this is why I think you also need a steering group. Not a bureau, but a steering group that can advance the work and oversee the advancement of this work, can adopt the documents and the recommendations that are prepared and agreed by the different working groups, and also can take care, of course, of the program of the meeting. And I think this should be a sort of moral leader of this entire process, a group of people coming from all the different stakeholders that are spears in their individual capacities, that are broadly respected and are especially open minded. And possibly, these people should be self-selected by the different constituencies and stakeholder groups. But perhaps just to advance the work at an interim stage, I would suggest that they are appointed by the secretary general. I think that we need all of these elements to meet the challenge at this point in front of us. And to conclude personally, I would really like to spend a word of support for the excellent work that the former WGIG Secretariat and chairmanship has been doing and are still doing. I think that many people here hope that they would be allowed to continue in the IGF. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Annette Muehlberg.

>>ANNETTE MUEHLBERG: I'm Annette Muehlberg. I'm a European member of the at-large advisory committee to ICANN, a member of the Internet caucus, governance caucus, and in normal life, I'm the head of e-government of the united services union, dealing with issues of public policies. Here I speak on my own capacity. In the at-large advisory committee, we want to strengthen civil rights and consumer protection in Internet-related issues. And I think the Internet Governance Forum is a great chance to get users with their interests and knowledge involved. And I would like to answer some of the chair's really precise questions. First, on an organizational basis, we need a Secretariat which takes care of technical facilities. And we need a program

advisory group, I think which should help to develop proposals for issues and speakers. We want to have a multistakeholder approach on equal footing, and we want to work efficiently. In this case, the procedure of finding rough consensus is probably the best, not straight consensus, but rough consensus, without veto. We have to assure the participation of developing countries, of people with little budget. And, of course, we have to apply the WSIS principles. Another question of the chair was, how do we attract all the scholars, the thinkers, the innovators? I'd say by sharing best practices and by discussing the crucial issues, which imply some conflicts. We have to build up on the outcome of the WSIS. We should focus on those key issues where clarification is needed, not on issues no one has a problem with. The WSIS already defined certain issues as very important for Internet governance, and there is a need to find a policy for their implementation. One of these issues should be, how do we translate the human rights principles like freedom of expression, privacy, access for all to infrastructure and content of the Internet? How do we implement the human rights principles in Internet governance mechanisms? Here, too, sharing best practices is important. To understand and bridge divisive issues should be our aim. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. We have Francis Muguet from the open access publishing.

>>FRANCIS MUGUET: Good afternoon, my name is Francis Muguet, I am the coordinator of the civil society group on certificate information and a co-coordinator of the civil society group on patents and copyright. I'd like to say first that instead of concentrating on a struggle for power concerning existing structures, as was the case both as WSIS and here, we should take a look at the future, which is very soon going to be the present. It is striking to note, almost schizophrenic, in fact, that most of the questions concerning the net itself, which went before the Internet, or, rather, after the Internet, are unknown. So I'd like to cite a few examples, very simple examples, which are very important, for example, perhaps the audience doesn't know that Microsoft, with its Internet Explorer decided not to respect the specifications, the (inaudible) HTML specification for navigator, which means that many producers of Web sites have to have two versions. Well, that's an extremely important issue, because this is the net. On the other hand, there are questions, for example, digital object identifiers and also there are problems of P to P, and there are search engines. All of this is completely unknown. It is true that an online forum which is based on free software, which will be based on free software, in fact, is a necessity, fully agree. Only it's necessary to give the forum a structure. Otherwise, it'll be chaotic and not very constructive. As a practical suggestion, today's discussion -- for today's discussion, I would suggest that it should be structured with a specific unit dedicated to the study of emerging technologies which are building the Internet of tomorrow, which will soon be today's Internet. The reason is to have a more serene atmosphere to get away from political debates. Who would be in this unit, this scientific unit, devoted to the future of the Internet? From civil society, I think it should be scientists and free software developers. Now, on the practical level, this unit should have the moral authority, mandate, and also the financial resources to bring experts in, because if experts don't come in, there won't be any constructive opinions, and also, another important thing, the representatives of the unit should be able to attend scientific events concerning the Internet, and also events organized by the software makers concerning the Internet. Because it may seem incredible, but those who are building tomorrow's Internet are not at all involved in this forum here, and vice versa. In the conferences on the web, for example, we don't talk about governance at all. So there is a problem. We have to over-- to cross the gap between two worlds if we want to ensure that this forum on Internet governance should have a particular unit. This unit should also report in the simplest possible language to everyone who is not an expert, in other words, all the stakeholders, governments, civil society, and small -- and businesses. So they should be aware of the problems before the problems arrive, and that it should be a tool to lead to a constructive and inclusive debate at the world level. In

addition, it is unrealistic for complex subjects to be evaluated in only three days. So these three days of events are events which summarize these discussions and the dialogue, both among the experts and among the public. And, in addition, it would be pointless for this meeting not to end in recommendations at the political and technical levels, because, otherwise, if it's simply to have a summary of the discussions, it's difficult to see how useful this forum would be. Thank you for your attention.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I have India, followed by Association for Progressive Communication, and the representative of consumers international in Geneva. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. I will restrict India's comments to two points out of the 12 questions you so succinctly posed this afternoon. We endorse all that was said in the G77 and China statement this morning. And I would just raise two issues. One of them was the question you posed on how do you attract more and more countries to attend the IGF. And there we feel that IGF should be a platform for interchange of best practices and active capacity-building. And here, Mr. Chairman, when I mean "active," we talk in terms of some value proposition for those who attend, especially from developing countries, maybe in the form of hand-holding exercises. On the second point, we endorse your flexible paradigm, a word which only you could have found and so beautifully placed in today's context. The ITU secretary general's address this morning also raised the point where he said that the lines dividing technology and public policy are getting increasingly blurred, and therefore, a public policy analyst would -- in order to keep abreast with the latest in technology, required to attend these forums from time to time. And maybe the flexible approach will help him in keeping abreast with what is happening in technology. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. Now the federation for a free information infrastructure. Norbert Bollow.

>>FEDERATION FOR FREE INFORMATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to focus my comments on a single but very important point. Several speakers have said that the multistakeholder process should be, quote, Democratic, unquote. Now, I would point out that this is a very ambitious project to have a Democratic multistakeholder process, since in a country like Switzerland, where every citizen is the same, we have only one kind of citizen, and so there's a lot of effort involved in creating democracy. So I would say the minimum requirement for integrity of the Internet Governance Forum is, in fact, a bit lower. It would just be that no stakeholder can get undue influence through any way of spending a lot of money, like some stakeholders have very limited resources, but others have plenty of money. And if they can sponsor an event and then they have power to get passages removed from the report that they don't like, that is not integrity. Also, all decision-making processes must have genuine transparency. That is also an essential element of integrity. On the other hand, if we claim that this forum is democratic, then we have higher standards to be met, which involve that, for example, every controversial decision could be challenged to a voting. And then you have to have a voting procedure which is really representative of the wide variety of stakeholder interests so that you don't have rich companies sending just 100 delegates to get 100 votes. An alternative to this difficult thing of democracy would be what Australia has proposed in their written proposal, that ISOC could be entrusted with running the Internet Governance Forum. I believe ISOC has earned this trust. But, of course, ISOC would need to get funding for this work, for example, from the United Nations budget or from other donors which would not attach any strings to the money. So my conclusion is, either let's have genuine democracy or some other way of ensuring at least integrity. Any steering group or Secretariat should be lightweight enough so that you can observe its decision-making processes to make sure that they are at least with a reasonable

standard of integrity. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I have Thiru Balasubramaniam of consumers international.

>>CONSUMERS INTERNATIONAL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. From a user perspective, it has been interesting to hear proposals made by governments today on substantive items to be addressed in Athens, particularly the interventions made by the European Union and Brazil flagging spam. One concern of ours is the (inaudible) of the Internet Governance Forum, especially on matters concerning content. In light of this, I have two points. Would the Internet Governance Forum be amenable to discuss such topics as open document formats in the context of government procurement policies? And a propose treaty on access to knowledge which has been raised by the friends of development countries at the world intellectual property organization? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Let's get the next few ones now. I have -- Danish institute of civil rights. Cisse Kane of African society for information society. And then I have Catherine Gabay of MEDEF. Can I ask Jorgensen.

>> Danish institute for human rights: Thank you, chair. My name is Rikke Frank Jorgensen. I am from the Danish human rights institute. I am part of the WSIS human rights caucus and also the privacy and security working group. Both groups have made written contributions to this meeting, which I won't read out aloud. But I would rather pick out a few points to reflect on the discussions that we have had today. I was thinking this morning and also this afternoon during the discussion, what is it that's really special about this forum compared to other similar spaces, policy spaces we have? And I think there are two things, at least, that are very special. One is that we actually, with this forum, have a space that can provide policy analysis across existing issue-specific arenas. I mean, this was stressed when it was set up. And I think this is important to bear in mind. And another specific aspect of it is that it is a child of the WSIS commitment to actually use ICT to promote development and human rights. In other words, this space entails a commitment to actually advance the issues that was raised during the WSIS process and which is spelled out in detail in the political documents from Geneva and Tunis. One of these issues that we have discussed again and again in the WSIS process is human rights compliance of future Internet governance mechanisms. Another, more general, issue is the one of promoting an information society which actually enhance human rights protection both at national and international level. And what we, as human rights caucus, would like to see advanced through the forum is that this so-called human rights-based approach to Internet policy develops into something that is more concrete, that we move forward when we say that we need to assess -- to use the human rights standards as they are spelled out in international law as actually assessing these policies. If we look at the Internet policy arena globally from -- with human rights glasses on, there are a number of developments that are very worrying, most obviously in the field of privacy and freedom of expression. It is no secret that in the current political climate that is so much driven by the so-called war on terror, international privacy standards, they are under the strongest pressure that they have been on since their adoption some 55 years ago. And they are currently being restricted in a number of areas with little or no legal safeguards to ensure checks and balances. With regard to freedom of expression, it is also well documented and well known that online freedom of expression is violated around the globe. This is both in the form of outright censorship, but it's also by more subtle measures that include privatized censorship, filtered information access, commercial censorship of search items, and criminalization of content that is completely legitimate under international freedom of expression standards. So these are just de facto policy developments, and they are not easy to address, they are very politically sensitive. I am very much aware of that. But, nevertheless, they

are crucial to address if we really mean it when we say that we want an information society respectful of human rights. So what I would like to see as concrete studies of working group under this forum to address some of these issues and to advance the discussion on them would be two studies, actually. The first one would be on how human rights principles, as they are laid down in the international human rights treaties translate into Internet governance mechanisms. How do we transform them into concrete policy recommendations which protect and uphold and respect these standards? And this work should, of course, involve the relevant U.N. bodies, not least, the U.N. high commissioner for human rights. Another area would be privacy impact assessment of the regulation that's currently taking place in the field of cybercrime and counterterrorism. To evaluate its compliance with human rights privacy standards and data protection guidelines. And this work would involve the global network of privacy commissioners and could feed into the ongoing considerations in other fora for international legal standards in the privacy field. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. I have (inaudible) for information society access.

>> African society for information society: I represent the African diaspora for the Information Society, speaking on behalf of the African civil society. We welcome the massive participation in the world summit that took place in Tunis, which was a success, according to all. And we thank all those who contributed in making our participation a massive one, especially the economic commission of the United Nations for Africa, the ITU, and the Tunisian government. We also welcome these consultations in Geneva on the IGF and the meeting in Greece in 2006 also. On the principle, our organization would like to continue to contribute actively and effectively on the IGF and all the monitoring mechanisms from the WSIS. As you see, Mr. Chairman, the members on the field weren't able to take part in this important meeting. What (inaudible) on as -- to ask that the financial and logistical and administrative support, I'm thinking about visas and other issues that are necessary to be granted to the African civil society and the developing countries in general to enable them to fully play their role in a process which is open and BOTTOM-UP with the IGF. We naturally are in favor of the setting up of a committee to organize the forum and its monitoring. And we propose that it is comprised of representatives of governments, civil society, and the civil society -- private sector and civil society. It should be decentralized at country level in Africa and every other country, as suggested by the Accra meeting on Internet governance. We are very concerned about the respect of traditional and African values in the Internet governance to guarantee the economic, social, and cultural development of the continent. Finally, the IGF should concern itself with the reduction of connection costs and funding the activities that are linked to it on the African continent. I will submit this oral communication in writing to -- I'll leave it on the table for those who want to have access to it. Thank you for your attention. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. The next few, Catherine Gabay from MEDEF, followed by council of Europe, followed by World Tour of Information Society, Denis Marion, and then the Dutch -- the Netherlands cCTLD, and followed by the Ubuntu forum. Catherine Gabay.

>>MEDEF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Catherine Gabay speaking. I speak on behalf of MEDEF, it's a French business confederation. We represent 750,000 companies in France from all sectors, industry and services, and all sizes. 95% of our members are (inaudible) I wanted to emphasize on the need for the IGF to be fully multistakeholder and to emphasize, of course, on the fact that businesses must have their own place in this process. MEDEF also thinks that links to the U.N. should be kept at minimum for the IGF. As we can only dedicate limited resources, businesses can only dedicate limited resources to all the different organizations and forums on ICT, we would favor only meeting per year two to

three days at most. And we would like it to be focused on one subject in order for it to be more effective. One subject we are particularly keen on is information system security. In MEDEF, we have a written guide for businesses on this subject, and we have widely made it available on the Internet. And it's very successful, meaning that there is a need among business users to have information and solutions for this issue. So we would believe this subject could be a first good subject for the first IGF, mostly because it is an international subject. Cybersecurity should not be treated only at national scales. It makes no sense. It's an international problem in its nature. And also because it's an issue where awareness is very important, and we believe that the IGF could play a good role of awareness of Internet users, businesses, and nonbusiness users, about Internet security, where to find solutions. Not in order to fight on people, but in order to make people using in a much more secure way the Internet. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. The council of Europe.

>> Council of Europe: Chairman Desai, Mr. Kummer. The council of Europe thanks you for convening this very open and inclusive consultation meeting so that we may focus our minds on, as you say, chairman, getting the IGF off the ground and by discussing what we expect to see from the IGF, with reference to possible outcomes. In this context, the council of Europe sees itself as an active partner in the IGF process, in particular, in bringing the results of the WSIS documents to life. The council of Europe welcomes the chance to be one of the intergovernmental organizations referred to in Paragraph 72 (C) of the Tunis Agenda document, in order to discuss matters under its purview with the purview of this organization being one in which the rule of law, human rights, and democracy prevails in both offline and online environments. Indeed, many of you have already touched upon some of the council of Europe's work and values indirectly when you refer to the misuse and abuse of ICTs, to cybersecurity, and, of course, to cybercrime, in particular, you referred indirectly there to the council of Europe cybercrime convention, which, incidentally, will -- the parties and signatories and other interested persons will be meeting to discuss the convention's operation and functioning in Strasbourg on 20 and 21 March, 2006. Many of you already referred to human rights, such as freedom of expression and the right to privacy, which are contained in the European convention on human rights, and shaped by the European court of human rights in Strasbourg, which incidentally, the court is beginning to deal with a number of cases of human rights violations on the Internet. Certainly there's a need for us to think about one of the themes of discussion for this IGF as being the human rights culture for the Internet, I would say. On this basis, on the basis of the council of Europe's expertise, and not wishing to reinvent the wheel, and in response to your question, chairman, regarding what devolved and lightweight structure for the IGF, we should consider whether the council of Europe as a working multistakeholder organization comprising 46 member states, as well as other observer states and states who are making important contributions to our work, such as in the preparation of the cybercrime convention, whether we need to consider the council of Europe as a platform, even a meeting place, for dialogue to discuss public policy issues and to promote and assess WSIS principles. Thank you, chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. Next I have Denis Marion of the World Tour of Information Society.

>>WORLD TOUR OF INFORMATION SOC.: Yes, good afternoon. Denis Marion. I'm with the World Tour of Information Society. And we look at use in France for three years in preparation with the World Summit on the Information Society. The Internet use are observed not in the big towns, even less in Paris, but rather, in the provinces and small villages and little-sized towns, which enables us to have a different outlook from the outlook that you have when you look at big towns. When organizing the world tour, which is a consultation involving 40

countries so that we can see how other people use the Internet, because it's important, indeed, for everyone to see what use of Internet is made by his or her neighbor. Concerning Athens and the governance issue, at the end of Tunis and at the end of Geneva, we had said to ourselves, well, after Tunis, there will be no more WSIS. And I was told, well, no, there won't be. And now I see that at the end of the day, there is a desire once again to meet, and perhaps in a more targeted fashion. Athens is on Internet governance. But I think it's a very difficult technical issue on which experts will be able to have a debate. The civil society and its role. Well, it's to monitor, to follow the debates. Because if the debate is very technical, at the same time in the civil society you need experts. And the more you are an expert, perhaps the less you are part of the civil society. I don't know. But at any rate, we need to be vigilant when it comes to everyday use of the Internet and the Internet users of everyday. And I am one of them. Some of the words didn't used to appear a few years ago, like partnership, and multistakeholder partnerships. It is right that these terms can now be used. And we welcome that development. Regarding Athens, to be useful and to properly use means and money, I hear that the costs will be met. It's not easy to travel. It costs a lot. And why not also add to the topic of Internet governance other issues that were debated in Tunis so that we don't go to Athens just to discuss one issue, but for the other caucuses, be it agenda, education, PCT, et cetera. So that we can consider other issues, other themes, so we can have a complementary forum. All the more so, given that Athens makes one dream, and beyond ICTs, Athens is also the world of art. And we don't hear much reference made to art. And, yet, international artists meet within ICTs, within -- on the Internet. Why shouldn't we also encompass the arts in our approach? And let me also add this: A lady has asked me to read a text. She's not here this afternoon. She's sick. Her name is CONCHITA PUCCINI. She reminds us that behind the caucuses and human rights, there's also GENDER equality. Equal participation of women is essential, in particular, in the decision-making process that includes all the forum that will be established beyond the WSIS and beyond the issues that the Athens forum will deal with. We need, therefore, to enhance capacities and focusing on the participation of women in shaping the World Summit on the Information Society at every level, including developing policies, infrastructures, financing and technological choices people can make. There is a need to make a real effort and to commit oneself to transform a masculine culture rooted in the current structures and speeches on the information society which contribute to enhancing disparities and inequality between genders without a full participation for the principle of gender equality and the nondiscrimination of women, the vision of an information society which is fair and equitable cannot be reached. There you are. You have it. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I have the (inaudible) followed by Iran.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me first briefly introduce myself. My name is Roelof Meijer. I am the CEO of des idn, THE REGISTRY FOR .NL. We HAVE 1.8 million registered domain names. We are the fourth ranking ccTLD in the world. We have about 2,000 registrars. AND WHILE I cannot say that I speak on behalf of all of them, I'm sure I speak on behalf of quite a few of them. I'm going to make some of the points which previous speakers already have made, so I apologize for the repetition. On the other hand, I think there's a lot of power in repetition, and it can also be good to help us see that we are reaching consensus on some of the subjects. On the IGF, I think that the Tunis Agenda sums it up pretty well. So I'm not going to quote from that. But I think definitely that we should not go back to the (inaudible) discussion before the Tunis meeting. But we should use the agenda as a starting point to move forward now. Points on the IGF, I think, or I feel -- in fact, I am convinced that all stakeholders should be represented and should be able to operate on an equal footing. The IGF should have a structure that is lightweight, flexible, consists of professionals, and thereby is effective and efficient. The rules under which the IGF should operate should accommodate those two points I made before. And therefore I think that the applicability of U.N. rules is

questionable, to say the least. I feel the IGF should not contemplate technical issues, but should focus on end user issues, topics, thereby, that merit coordinated global attention. It should strongly avoid duplication, but on the other side it should integrate existing initiatives. Examples have already been mentioned this morning and this afternoon. Cybercrime and E-security, and what we could call access 4 and contribution by all. Interests could indeed be addressed by ad hoc working groups. It could then be finalized during an annual meeting of the whole IGF. Results should include, but should not be limited to, exchange of expertise or exchange of experience, but in fact the main objective should be clear-cut proposals and recommendations for improvement or further development of the Internet in general and Internet Governance in particular. And I think in this way the IGF should be able to preserve the Internet of today. Furthermore, it should also be able to contribute to the development of the Internet of tomorrow. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. (inaudible) didn't want the floor, so can I go to IRAN straight away?

>>: Mr. Chairman. I am trying to respond to some of the questions that were raised before lunch, but also making a previous comment, I would like to say the following. A rich debate like the one we have been having causes me to think about a particular sentence that we had this afternoon. There is the danger, indeed, whereby the forum or the Internet Governance Forum might end up writing the history of Internet. I think a university professor said this afternoon. I think this really would be an interesting result for the forum. But we can't go after the events. We want to anticipate the events and define the elements of the Internet Governance Forum. But any rate, we must locate ourselves where we should be. We must imagine a forum on Internet Governance which is strictly prospective or that tries to foresee the future and foresee the problems of the future, because we wouldn't succeed, and there is no science that would enable us to do that, at this stage, at any rate. Therefore, we must not write history before it happens. Neither must we go to the other extreme. We must try and define what Internet society wants. Why does society want to use Internet? How can it help to meet the challenges of creating a better society and a better world? And that is where we should govern, where we should anticipate. My second comment, my general comment is this. It has to do with whether the forum has to be a forum made up of experts or representatives. Well, I think experts are not a super species of humanity endowed with special gifts. They have, of course, their vision, their gifts, their ideas, their policies. So I'm not saying they shouldn't be experts, and I'm convinced that most of the people who have come to this meeting are already more or less the experts or they are as good as the experts that the governments have, or as good as the experts that the NGOs have in their field. And therefore, we mustn't make the -- turn the expert into a sacred figure. Because this is essentially a political activity and, therefore, of course, the people who must take part are the ones who know the issue, but also not only the technicians but the people who can anticipate what kind of governance we want, what kind of Internet we want. At any rate, I think this is a delicate issue, sensitive issue, but if we have to have some kind of monitoring, experts, representatives from the various interested parties, I think it should be transparent and for every sector. For every sector. And of course the various balances, checks and balances should be respected, and territorial balance, gender balance, et cetera, following the general U.N. principles. Thirdly, I would also like to underscore, to add my voice to those who have said it will be a mistake to think that the IGF is just a three-day meeting every year. We must underscore the fact that this is a process. There must be working groups. There must be a virtual forum. Because if we do not come to the physical yearly meeting with pre-established documents, well, then we would not be having a rich dialogue. Finally, on the issue of -- or the issues to be debated should be, first of all, I would say that we shouldn't choose a small number of topics. That would be a serious mistake. I think that the forum, I understand, will be established at the Athens meeting, and if there we only

have three issues to debate, then we'll have a very biased idea of what the future work will be over the next five years. Therefore, of course I understand that we won't be able to discuss all the issues in the depth that they deserve, but I think we should have a broad agenda that deals -- that touches all the interested parties and that generates within society the idea that the IGF is focusing on their issues. Not just cybercrime, Spam, and those limited -- that limited list. I don't want to be exhaustive, but I think the Tunis document gives us five or six general items, and I think we should -- and it's from there that we have to -- it's from there we need to anticipate and think about what we need to build the construct we want to have. For example, article 42 encourages us to disseminate more broadly information, and create more creation in the Internet. So how are we going to achieve that? How are we going to govern all of that? TO FOLLOW THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS. And article 49 says we must bridge the digital divide and the digital opportunity. How do we do that? With what specific tangible proposals do we do that? With which policies do we do that? I've said this before, I agree with this, the emphasis on the creation of capacity building with ICTs for development has to be a fundamental cross-cutting issue of the Internet forum agenda. I also agree with what was said on the fact, on multilingualism and multi-culturalism through Internet, but be careful. Internet can be harmful to them as well. Of course, there is the issue of how the implementation of human rights can find its place in the Internet world, and how the Internet can contribute to the improvement of the satisfaction of human rights. And I venture to make a last specific proposal which perhaps hasn't been heard as such today. Of course, I'm very concerned, like everyone, about freedom of expression. But I'm, every day, more worried about the freedom of information in the world because day after day, the information in the world is in the hand of fewer and fewer people. I was in the -- we are very worried about this. And, therefore, so that we don't go towards a single thinking world, a Google world, we need to change Internet so that it becomes a place where there are guarantees that citizens of the world can have real information. I thank you for your attention.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Iran.

>>Iran: Thank you very much, mr. chairman. Good afternoon to you and to all colleagues, and it's a great pleasure to see you in the chair. Let me start with expressing my gratitude to you for raising those very formative and time-saving questions. With regard to those questions, Mr. Chairman, if you let me, I would like just to give my own reflection from my own perspective from what I've seen since morning. Having listened to the previous speaker, I decided to modify a little bit what I wanted to say. But I wanted to say that what I feel is that what we get here is really, in principle, a multistakeholder approach, but never equal footing. I was just listening to colleagues and to all those who are present here and are giving their valuable inputs, and I have benefited from them all. But at the same time, the more I listened, I felt more alienated as a developing country because I am lost and I don't know when we all emphasize on equal footing what and if we are supposed, for example, to give a recommendation, as has been reflected in the document of Tunis, then what kind of a balance would there be when different constituencies, supposedly from developed partners, from civil society, from private sector, are giving their inputs, but very few representation from developing countries perspective is here to be reflected. Of course, there is no physical obstacle and mental obstacle fortunately, but there is, of course, financial and other capacity building and structural problems that we don't see them being represented here. So multistakeholder process is here, and we all support. But I don't think equal footing would be there. I was thinking of equal, what is probably the most progressive body in which there are different constituencies being represented is maybe one of them is ILO. I was thinking even there there is a representative from labor, a representative from employer, and two from governments, being developing or developed. In this specific case that we are in, even I think if we give two to governments and one to each other, constituencies, still developing countries would not fairly be represented because developed partners, and in private sector and civil

society the same, would dominate if there is supposed to be any fair balance. I don't think we would be able to have any fair balance or any equal footing. With regard to the report, Mr. Chairman, I have a very specific question which I think answering to that question might be informative, too. I see in paragraph 75 of the Tunis outcome that U.N. secretary-general, I think in this case it would be through you, would report to you and member states periodically on the operation of the forum. And then at the end, in 76, we ask the U.N. secretary-general to examine the desirability of the continue weighing of the forum in formal consultation with forum participants within five years of its creation and to make recommendation to the U.N. membership in this regard. I would like to ask clarification. I think this is very important to know that who is this membership, U.N. membership. Is this general assembly to which we would give our input? Do we get any feedback from them, or it is only a forum for being a forum, for the sake of a forum? If we think that it's only a forum for the sake of a forum, then I think we are just engaging in a, let's say, no matter we are pro choice or pro life, but we are engaging in an aBORTive process. At the end of the day, i think we would be left with no decision and no, let's say, decisive and conclusive decision and outcome. So this is very important how we construe and interpret these two paragraphs. That U.N. membership to which you would report and to which you will ask or recommend desirability, who is this U.N. recommendation? and on the basis of your recommendation, they are supposed to decide. So at the end of the day and at the end of the tunnel we are seeing the U.N. membership as the one who will decide. So I think these can, in a way, interpret what kind of roles governments will play in this forum, specifically with regard to what I said as developing countries are concerned. Their concerns have already been partly reflected in the statement of G77. This is capacity building, financial matters, as distinguished colleague from Pakistan said and distinguished colleague from Brazil said, public policy issues and for entering each other important issues like Spam, like Internet security, like cybercrime, cybersecurity, which are all important, per se, developing countries would need capacity building before. I thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. On your last point which has been raised for the first time, my understanding of that would be that the -- there is a reporting process specified for the whole summit to the ecosoc and the G.A. For the whole summit, there is a reporting process which has been specified. And I presume what you are referring to in paragraphs 75, 76 would follow the same structure. That's my understanding of that particular provision. There is a general provision which requires this overall review. I now have Mr. Bret Fausett of cathcart, Collins & Kneafsey. And then Jovan Kurbalija, followed by Honduras.

>>BRET FAUSETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bret Fausett, and I thank you for opening your meeting today widely to all persons. I am not a part of a government delegation. I am not a member of a recognized NGO, and I am not a part of the nonprofit sector that has identified itself as civil society. I am here because I use the Internet and I care deeply about its future. I hope you will always have place for me and people like me who wish to participate in the activities of the IGF and lend their time and expertise to its work. Mr. Chair, before the lunch break you asked several questions. I would like to address two of them with very concrete suggestions. You asked what should the Steering Committee look like, who will pick the members of the Steering Committee, what is the process for their selection. For this first year of the IGF, I would like to recommend that shortly after the close of the meeting tomorrow, we issue an open call for expressions of interest to serve on the IGF's program committee. I would also like to recommend that you, Mr. Chair, who has established himself as a respected, trusted leader of this process select from among the statements with the assistance and input of secretary Kummer. I also would recommend that you supplement the list again with the assistance of secretary Kummer to balance it in terms of geographic, cultural and economic diversity and expertise. You also asked should the IGF have a perpetual virtual meeting online and what sorts of virtual forums should the IGF create to enable

participation? Yes, the IGF should always be open for contributions and always be open for discussion of the issues affecting Internet users. Interested persons should be able to contribute on their own time and in their own language. To manage this process, I would like to recommend that you appoint Internet rapporteurs or list managers to manage and steer the online discussions so they move forward productively. Unmanaged, open forums unread by the leadership of the IGF can quickly become black holes for public comment, creating the illusion of participation while providing no meaningful access to the IGF. These rapporteurs who would work with the Secretariat would participate in the online forums and help define areas of consensus and highlight areas of disagreement for further work or discussion. Building an effective model for online participation will not be easy, but I believe that the IGF will be able to measure its long-term success by how well it uses the very internet resources under discussion to move its own work forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. I have Jovan Kurbalija and then after that Honduras and then China.

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, I would like to thank you and Markus Kummer for keeping wgig spirit alive, spirit of open and inclusive dialogue between the end of the WSIS in Tunis and the start of the Internet Governance Forum. In my intervention, I would like to focus on the recently held international conference on Internet Governance. It was held in Malta between 10 and 12 of February, attended by 80 participants representing various stakeholders. And the main objective of this event was to have a brainstorming discussion, the first discussion before the more intensive debate on Internet Governance forum will be launched. As a matter of fact, we optimistically named the conference "Internet Governance, the way forward, from Tunis via Malta to Athens." It was some sort of Mediterranean itinerary. But as we can see there will be many more stops and many more events on roads to Athens. And this is one of the important stops. Well, most of the points that were discussed were already raised by those who participated in Malta conference and other participants, and I will try to avoid repeating the points that were already mentioned. One of the important element in Malta discussion was that procedural solution and organization solution should be very flexible. One procedural solution cannot fit all needs and issues. Therefore, it was stressed that procedures and working matters should be adjusted to concrete issues as much as it is possible, as organizational structure allows. It was also highlighted by many participants in Malta that there are already necessary ingredients for future Internet Governance forum. It was mentioned that we can learn a lot from OECD, global knowledge partnership, IETF, and other initiatives in the field of international cooperation. The main challenge will be to find the right balance and to make a proper blend which will make hybrid structure of Internet Governance forum functional and effective. It was strongly indicated and strongly recommended by almost all participants at the Malta conference that Internet Governance Forum should be process based. It should integrate processes as much as it is possible, not only in its deliberation, but also in a sort of side activities, including research, capacity-building, and information-sharing. Participants at the Malta conference also stressed the need to have trust-building and to start deliberation, if it is possible, with issues for which there is a shared understanding and common view that those issues should be addressed, such as spam and multilingualism. Development aspect was strongly highlighted in two main elements. Development is an issue that should be discussed by Internet Governance Forum, and participation of various stakeholders from developing countries. One of the issues which was discussed, and it was mentioned also by previous speaker, is the question of use of online tools. It is clear that there is a need to do more than to -- just to make online tools available. Yes, it's obvious there are already numerous online tools, including WIKI, discussion forum, well, simple E-mail. But there is a considerable difference between availability of online tools and their integration in working procedures. There is a gap that should be bridged in order to have proper integration of those online tools. It was obvious that, for example, civil

society is much more familiar than other stakeholders in using online tools, and we are not referring here purely to the skills how to use WIKI or discussion forum. The skill level is almost established by all stakeholders and participants. The main challenge will be, and probably the main inhibition by other stakeholders, like government representatives, is to create the proper working environment for the -- considering online contributions. It includes the question of the status of online contributions and follow-up to each online contribution. There is a need for both training capacity-building, but also more reflections about the way how to use this online aspect of the Internet Governance Forum. The conference was ended by the meeting of the Internet governance capacity-building initiative, and Karen Banks already summarized a few major points at this meeting. We gathered close to 30 participants, representing the various stakeholders and institutions, in order to see how to make coordinated efforts in the field of Internet governance capacity-building. It was agreed that there are basically three areas, three main areas. One is training and courses. Second area is research, creation of the research network. And what Karen discussed in more details, information-sharing as support for the Internet Governance Forum. When it comes to training, it was highlighted, there is a need for three types of training. One which could be called just-in-time training, helping stakeholders to participate in the IGF-related meetings. Stakeholders mainly from developing countries, but not only from developing countries. It was also, as was already mentioned, highlighted that there is the need for awareness-building among some stakeholders from developed countries, mainly public policy aspects of ICT issues. The second type of training should be related to the capacity-building in medium term. And it was also highlighted that there is a need to integrate Internet governance into curriculum of academic institutions, postgraduate and graduate courses, in order to have more ongoing capacity-building, mainly in developing countries. It was agreed to have a follow-up discussion and to try to coordinate Internet governance capacity-building activities and the initiatives with the process of the formation and development of Internet Governance Forum. We'll use various online tools. The summary of the Malta meeting is available here on the distribution desk. You can consult them, and you can also indicate interest for the participation in the initiative on the other capacity-building activities. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I think we have just a few minutes left. I have three -- I have Honduras, China, and Brazil. And after that, I have six or seven more people. But I think we will probably go into tomorrow morning. It will be better for them also. I suspect that there's a certain sense of exhaustion which is creeping in. [Laughter]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: So maybe we just hear these three and then we call it a day. Honduras.

>>HONDURAS: thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, as it's the first time that our delegation takes the floor, we'd like to thank you for the active way in which you are guiding these discussions and these consultations on the IGF. Since I heard a number of our speakers refer to issues as varied as academic and technical, which, of course, have their place -- part to play in the IGF, I would like to underscore a little the developmentally aspect which was broadly supported by our delegation when we acted as facilitators of the G77 of the previous process. I make this comment, and dealing with some of your questions from this morning, namely, as to whether the development aspects should be dealt with specifically in this IGF or should it be dealt with in the overall WSIS process. Well, my opinion is that, as other delegations have said during today, we must deal with this developmental aspect in this IGF, not because Honduras wants that to happen, and not because developing countries want this to happen, but because this is something that is already agreed upon in the Tunis Agenda. And it is widely substantiated by the Geneva principles. I won't elaborate on this because I don't want to repeat what's already been said. But there are important elements which the -- which were mentioned by the G77 in

their statement this morning. Let us recall, let us not forget, that in the Geneva declaration of principles, there was a key paragraph which says that this process, which includes the IGF process, must be people-centered, inclusive, and development-centered information society. In other words, this process must include the developmental aspect as something which is a priority, because it was defined as such in the principles. I would like to contribute this balance, because other speakers have focused on other issues. But for us developing countries, it is vital and crucial. We know that this is an issue which is a cross-cutting issue. But it pertains to not only -- the IGF not only in paragraphs 5, 49, 65 of the Tunis Agenda also, in which specific reference is made to what actions we must take when it comes to development, such as broadening the participation of developing countries, when it comes to accessibility, and also the equal sharing of resources. And that Tunis Agenda paragraph also speaks of the corporate responsibility and how that can be linked to development. And also paragraph 49 speaks of other issues, such as interconnectivity, capacity-building and transfer of technology. And these are priority issues for developing countries. So I would like to highlight this, because our delegation is flexible when it comes to the modalities, but we must consider what is substantively enshrined in the Tunis Agenda when it comes to development. That's why, though we are flexible, we recommend that this steering committee, which should be comprised of key committees, one of these key committees, perhaps the most important committee, from our point of view, the point of view of the developing countries, should be a working group in which are tackled the application of all of the elements in the principle of the Tunis Agenda related to the issue of Internet governance and the developmental aspects which I have said I already mentioned in the Tunis Agenda that they're black on white. We know what they are. And all we have to do is implement these elements which were agreed by us, all the countries represented. So I wanted to make that comment, because it's an important issue for which we developing countries fought in previous negotiations to ensure that there was equal fair participation of developed countries and developing countries. I think this would be a positive element. I don't think we need to debate this, because this was agreed upon by consensus in the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: China.

>>CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's always a pleasure to see you chairing the meeting, and it's always a pleasure to see Mr. Kummer is still working very hard for this Internet governance. First of all, China would like to associate itself with the statement made by Pakistan this morning on behalf of the group of 77 and China. When we talk about Internet governance, China will look at paragraph 29 to 82, together, in the Tunis Agenda, because especially there's enhanced cooperation and the forum, we think there is some kind of interlinkage between these two very important aspects of Internet governance, enhanced cooperation and the forum. But as we are talking about the forum here today, we will look at paragraph 72 to 82 together, because paragraph 72 to 82 give us a clear picture that the summit asked the secretary general to set up a forum. Of course, the forum automatically will report to the secretary general. Or the outcome of the forum will come to the secretary general's office. Then the secretary general will report to the member states of the U.N. So this is how we look at the forum, the whole picture of this forum. And my third item is about this informal consultation. For the first meeting of the forum, now we have a Secretariat, there is an interim Secretariat, headed by -- I suppose, by Mr. Kummer. And now we have a host, which is our generous offer by the Greek government. But there is still something lacking, that is, the bureau, which also in the Tunis Agenda. And I think that we should start right away the organization of this forum. Of course, we have a lot of valuable points this morning and this afternoon. But I really would like to listen more about the practical arrangement for the forum. Because all of these substantive -- spam, cybercrime, security, I think these will be discussed by the forum rather than here in these informal consultations. So at the moment, I think we should focus on the arrangement or the structure or organizational work of this forum. And,

to me, I think at this moment, the bureau or the steering committee is something very essential, because we do need somebody to start the real arrangement for the forum. Of course, our Iranian colleague has mentioned the possible model as IO. There might be some other kind of models, for example, the WSIS process is -- itself is a model. We have a governmental bureau. We also have a private sector bureau and civil society bureau. We have very close cooperation among these bureaus. And we are ready to listen to more opinions on those models or organizational arrangement for our first meeting of the forum. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: We have three minutes. Is that enough? Or do you want to wait until tomorrow morning. Three minutes is enough? Wonderful.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we are not being very much helpful to our Greek colleagues here, because they are expecting us to give them some guidance on how to organize the forum. And we are not fulfilling our job up to now. That's my feeling. Then let me give you just in -- one, two, three, four, five topics, our suggestions and guidance to the Greek government and to the audience as a whole. On the mandate, the Brazilian government thinks that there's no discussion needed on the mandate. We just need to read paragraph 72. Full stop. On dates, we think that at least -- and I should emphasize at least -- at least five days we need to spend on this discussion. And I suppose the October date, around 24th of October, would be a reasonable date to do so. On the structure, we will be happy, Mr. Chairman, to see you there, along with Mr. Markus Kummer, sharing in taking care of the Secretariat. The problem, Mr. Chairman, is the bureau, how to select people to be there in the bureau. We heard some suggestions from Iran, from China. I think we have to keep in mind and discuss this tomorrow, how to do it. We have some ideas I am going to tell you tomorrow morning. On frequency of the meetings, we think that at least -- and again I say "at least," emphasizing -- once a year. Maybe we would need twice a year. And we think that we need to stick to our geographical rotation of these meetings, in different continents. On topics that we should discuss, this I would like to pay tribute to the excellent intervention made by Mr. Drake and Mr. Mueller at the beginning of this discussion when they said that we should not be afraid of discussion. If the idea is to be there in Athens only to discuss noncontroversial issues, I think there is no need for us and no point for us to be there. I think my three minutes are finished. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Applause.)

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I think I'm not going to summarize. But I think I will just leave you with a story from a person in India and also central Asia. Mulla Nasrudin was asked to make a speech on a subject he knew nothing about. And he went to this meeting, and he asked the people, "do you people know what I am going to say?" And everybody in the audience said, "No." So he says, "How can I talk to people who don't know what I'm going to say?" And he walked off. [Laughter]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Mulla Nasrudin came the next -- again. And this time, they had prepared themselves. So Mulla Nasrudin says, "do you people know what I'm going to talk about?" And everybody said, "Yes." He says, "Then I don't need to talk to you anyhow." [Laughter.]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: So they said "now what do we do?" So they called him a third time, and they planned. They said, "half say this and half say that." So actually when he said, "do you know what I am going to say?" Half said, "no," the other half said "yes." He says, "fine. Those who know tell the others who don't." [Laughter.]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: That's exactly what I am going to do. Go for a wonderful

reception which the Swiss are giving. As for tomorrow, let's get back to this. And it'll probably be in this the spirit . A word from our Swiss host. Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I simply wanted to remind everyone here that they are cordially invited now to a reception organized by Switzerland. It is taking place in the restaurant of the delegates in the central building where the conference center is located. So I'd be delighted to meet you there on the eighth floor for the Swiss reception. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: One second, one second.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER: I was also asked to announce there's an EU coordination at 9:00 in room 27 for the E.U. (6:05 p.m.)

CONSULTATIONS ON THE CONVENING OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
TRANSCRIPT OF MORNING SESSION 17 FEBRUARY 2006

Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the Consultations on the Convening of the Internet Governance Forum, in Geneva on 16-17 February in Geneva, Switzerland. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

(Gavel.) >>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Good morning.

>> Good morning!

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Can we settle down, please. I think we need to -- we could not complete the list of speakers that we had yesterday. And now there are some new ones who have come today on the -- who also want to contribute to the points that we had started discussing yesterday afternoon. So I'm just going to go straight into that list. And perhaps I would like to start with the republic of Korea after that, it will be (inaudible).

>>KOREA: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. I am speaking on behalf of the republic of Korea, since this is my delegation's first intervention, I would like to extend our thanks to you for convening this very open and inclusive consultation meeting. The Korean government is very pleased to participate in these consultations on the convening of the Internet Governance Forum. And we would like to play a positive role in the Internet Governance Forum. In this intervention, we would like to comment on several major issues related to the Internet Governance Forum. The Korean government believes that the Internet Governance Forum must be multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic, and transparent. It is important that all stakeholders must be able to fully participate in the Internet Governance Forum to exchange best practices and to concentrate on the substance issues. Regarding the frequency of the Internet Governance Forum, we believe the Internet Governance Forum should meet once a year for two or three days, and we suggest that there must be a (inaudible) forum to deal with important Internet-related issues between the IGF meetings. The Korean government also would like to suggest that the

first Internet Governance Forum meeting should focus on a limited number of high-priority issues in order to be more effective in producing meaningful results. We believe that spam and multilingualism would be appropriate issues for the first Internet Governance Forum. Whatever issues we decide to discuss for the first Internet Governance Forum, we should try to make our tangible recommendations to the issues and identify emerging issues. With respect to the structure of Internet Governance Forum, we believe that it is necessary to have multistakeholder steering committee to prepare the Internet Governance Forum and facilitate the decision-making process. And they must be lightweight and cost-effective. The Korean government looks forward to collaborating with other stakeholders for a successful Internet Governance Forum and to contributing more to the consultations. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. Bertrand, are you ready?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: No. Later on, if you don't mind.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I welcome you, and I thanked you yesterday, when you were not here, I thanked you once again, and for all the hard work that you did in allowing us to get to this point. So I thank you, I'm sure, on behalf of everybody. Let me go to Ambassador Masood Khan.

>>AMB. MASOOD KHAN: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you so much. I'm so glad to see you in the chair. And Mr. Markus Kummer on your side. I take the floor on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. This intervention primarily aims at providing some preliminary ideas in interacting with some of the important issues raised by you, Mr. Chairman, and other speakers during the rich discussions we had yesterday. As mentioned in the statement made on behalf of the group yesterday, WSIS belongs to the series of U.N. summits that focused on economic and social development issues. The primary objective of the summit in all its aspects, including Internet governance, was to create, and I quote, a people-centered, inclusive, and development-oriented information society. The group would like to reiterate that the Internet Governance Forum we intend to create must help realize this vision of a development-oriented information society. The mandate, work, agenda, structure, composition, frequency, and venues of meetings of the IGF must be geared towards achieving this shared objective in the post-Tunis phase. Mr. Chairman, multistakeholder participation was referred to in most statements made yesterday. The Group of 77 and China would like to reiterate that the nature, composition, and operation of the IGF must be characterized by a balanced approach towards multistakeholder participation. Such an approach, from our perspective, would necessitate ensuring adequate and effective participation by governments, civil society, and businesses from developing countries, as well as international organizations. That are representative of their development aspirations. The objectives must be to seek balanced representation both in terms of physical presence and intellectual input in all formal and informal meetings, in all deliberations, and in any decision-making processes. This would not only lead to incorporating the diversity of views on the critical issue of Internet governance, but will also lay a strong foundation for a transparent, Democratic, and multilateral process with regard to Internet governance that would be inclusive and responsive to the needs of developing countries. The Group of 77 and China believe that the Internet Governance Forum must be structured on the basis of regional representation and convened on the principle of geographical rotation, with particular reference to developing countries. Mr. Chairman, you inquired about the content of the development agenda of the IGF. I

would like to refer once more to paragraph 65 of the Tunis Agenda, which clearly underlines the need to maximize the participation of developing countries in decision regarding Internet governance in a manner that should reflect their interests. This paragraph needs to be operationalized through the IGF. It must also be noted that this paragraph is not limited to capacity-building issues. It casts the net wider, to highlight the systemic perspective of development-oriented Internet governance. The Group of 77 and China would like to mention this, because we noticed that many interventions yesterday adopted a reductionist approach to the development aspects of Internet governance, limiting it to capacity-building. The issue is more complex and has been addressed in a number of paragraphs in the Tunis Agenda, including paragraph 49, which affirms commitment on the part of the international community to turning the digital divide into digital opportunity by ensuring harmonious and equitable development for all and addressing issues like international interconnectivity costs, technology know-how, transfer, multilingualism, and providing the users with choice of different software models, including open source, free, and proprietary software. It would therefore be important for our deliberations to develop a substantive agenda that is development-oriented. We heard a few delegations that raised some issues of priority to developing countries and development in general. We invite stakeholders, especially in the scientific and academic community, to contribute further with specialized ideas in this regard. We could draw on a wealth of literature on issues such as institutional arrangements for equitable and stable resource management, Internet access, and international transit arrangements, multilingualism, and local content. These are the type of contributions that we need to hear and look forward to exploring. Mr. Chairman, we have had a rich discussion so far during which we have heard views expressed earlier during the WSIS process and a host of new ideas with regard to the nature, structure, composition, mandate of the Internet Governance Forum. We expect to hear more views during the course of these consultations today. In view of the importance of the issue that we are dealing with, it would be important for us to take time out in order to reflect on these proposals. This would not only help us digest the essence of various proposals, but would also be useful in identifying the essential ingredients for consensus. The Group of 77 and China would therefore like to propose that we take time out and reconvene consultations in a month for detailed and substantive discussions. Let me conclude by assuring you, Mr. Chairman, that the Group of 77 and China, being the largest stakeholder in this process, would be willing to work closely with all the other stakeholders to ensure a development-oriented future for Internet governance that promotes interconnectivity and affords universal accessibility. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ambassador Masood Khan. Ambassador Masood Khan has suggested that we have these consultations, so to speak, in two rounds, one round now and one round, if I heard right, monthly. Did I? There are some logistical problems there, because the commission on human rights starts in Geneva, and then things become rather difficult. I would also like to stress that our purpose in these consultations was essentially to -- as messengers, to deliver to the secretary general not necessarily a consensus, but a sense of the range of views on the subject. I think it would not be appropriate for us as messengers to presume a consensus, or to presume what view the secretary general would take. So I would like to stress that we certainly do not come here with the intention of finding a single thing which we can then report, but to find what the range of views is, which we can convey to the secretary general. And if he feels it's so necessary, we will certainly condition with these discussions and consultations. But I would certainly request people when they speak to react to what others are saying so that we get a sense of where the

range of -- is particularly wide, where the range is relatively narrow. That's been very helpful. And I think we can now get back to our list of speakers. Senegal, ECA. Where is ECA? Can I first give the floor to Senegal, and then to the ECA?

>>SENEGAL: Thank you, chairman. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in Senegal, after the world summit information society stakeholders approved the idea that at the local level, a national forum be established on the information society which, in the long run, would allow all national stakeholders, government, civil society, and the private sector, to come to an agreement on a minimum common consensual base before defending any position in the international community. This is intended to make you understand that I speak on my own behalf, without being in contradiction with the official position of the government. On the purpose of our meeting today, there is a comment I'd like to make. In paragraph 72 (F) of the Tunis Agenda, it says that one of the mandates of the forum is to strengthen, enhance the commitment of stakeholders, particularly those in developing countries in existing or future Internet governance mechanisms. Now, let's look around ourselves. How many official African delegations do we have here out of the 51 which should be here? How many associations and NGOs from African civil society are present in this room? Maybe four or five. And, finally, how can you imagine initiating inclusive practices for the developing countries if they are left on the touch line from the very outset? And further, if I've understood things properly, the forum is not being called upon to replace or monitor existing bodies which carry out their jobs properly for the greater good of the community of Internet users. However, we cannot but note that when major decisions are taken on the policies required for a global vision, I really sincerely think that it's not up to the brave technicians to guide operations. The creation and establishment of the forum is a timely initiative. The Internet world is a model based on freedom. And we should, thus, avoid placing unacceptable constraints upon it. This means that the forum needs an operational Secretariat, as we've already had in the Working Group on Internet Governance. It doesn't need a cumbersome, inefficient administration. The bureau of the forum should be the same sort of thing, lightweight and operational. The establishment of the forum is a strong recommendation emerging from the world summit where thousands and thousands of men and women were involved, working tirelessly for so many years and who produced some excellent results. I think it would be useful to reproduce models which have shown that they can do. We could refer to the implementation of the bureau and that sort of thing. Although they have been criticized, these structures have produced appreciable results for the mandate of the forum. As long as the causes why the forum was created are still with us, it seems to me that we need to keep in place and improve, if possible, and necessary, the agenda must factor in problems related to developing country participation. I thank you for your attention.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. Economic commission for Africa.

>>ECA: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this important forum, which is fully inclusive, and for also giving us the opportunity to address this gathering of distinguished stakeholders as members of the group of the U.N. general recommendations. Mr. Chairman, we have been talking about Internet governance during the last three years because of the growing importance of the social, economic, cultural, and political role of the Internet. Moreover, at the global level, key ICT decisions are being made at various international meetings and in global institutions that directly or indirectly have implications on the development of ICTs in a number of developing countries, including

Africa. Some of these global policy decisions are also having an impact on and shaping the direction and the nature of ICT for development policies and programs in these countries. These issues have been discussed and learned in Africa in several fora, including discussion list on Internet governance, together Africa input for the WSIS process, face-to-face meetings during the Africa general preparatory conferences on the WSIS, preparing research papers in cooperation with the U.N. ICT task force. However, despite all these efforts, African participation in global IG is still hampered by several factors, including the limited bargaining power and leverage of African countries as compared to other countries in the regional blocs, the absence of consistent positions by African countries on major global Internet governance issues, the lack of expertise and capacity in relevant Internet governance issues, including standards and technical issues, the absence of effective cooperation among African countries on how to engage in collective negotiation on relevant IG issues for their mutual benefit, the effort of some of the extra-regional bloc alliances that some African countries enter into, which in some cases makes it difficult for African countries to act as a group. There is also the lack of necessary financial resources, as stated by several participants, to meet the cost of attending the meetings of the relevant international IG organizations, which are most of the time held in Europe or in America. These factors have increased the acute dependency of African countries on a governance system for which they have little or no influence. Hence, in line with the WSIS outcomes, we recommend the Internet Governance Forum to address IC-related development issues as a priority, including the following: Capacity-building, affordable and equitable access, national infrastructure development, interconnection cost and development of (inaudible) points, cultural and language diversity, network security, data protection, protection and privacy, intellectual property rights, free and open source software. There also need to develop sector applications on e-government, e-education, e-commerce in order to create digital opportunities and enable the countries to achieve the MBGs. Mr. Chairman, on the structure and its composition, we believe that the IGF should have a multistakeholder steering committee at both the regional and international levels. There are -- the regional level, in order to make the process inclusive and take into account view of stakeholders at the national and continental levels, the IGF annual meetings should be preceded by regional meetings which may be organized as often as necessary. This would allow regions to prepare common positions as well as unified input and common understanding, before moving to the global level. These regional meetings may be held together with the implementation and evaluation workshops to be organized by the U.N. regional commissions in accordance to the WSIS action lines. This may lead to more efficient annual meetings. In addition, Mr. Chairman, use of online resources and online meetings as well as video conferencing facilities should be encouraged at both regional and global levels. On the output of the IGF, we believe it will not be enough to exchange views and information only, but to have the IGF influence decisions and processes to be taken into -- in the IG arena. To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to inform you that as capacity-building is one of the biggest impediment to Africa's participation in the IG process, -- we are working in developing training material and organizing onsite and online courses for Internet governance and policymakers. With the support of industry Canada and participation of other partners, such as Agence Intergouvernementale De La Francophonie, ICANN, and DiploFoundation, Africa will have its first course in May 2006 in Kigali, Rwanda. The online course will be made available at the African Virtual Learning Academy. Mr. Chairman, may I also inform that you the first conference of ICT ministers to follow up on the WSIS decision will be held from 3 to 5 April 2006. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. .

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much. I now have a couple of speakers from yesterday, Mary Rundle and then Bertrand de la Chapelle.

>> Mary Rundle: My comments echo those of many speakers. Specifically, I'm here to offer resources from a new, nonprofit Geneva-based association with open membership, that is, Geneva net dialogue. Geneva net dialogue would offer its resources to help carry out the following functions: Maintaining an interactive, multistakeholder Web site; helping to coordinate background papers and academic research; and helping to organize technology tutorials and briefings on emerging issues. Working with other groups, the three academic institutions would like to offer their services to the IGF effort through this association. These include the Berkman Center at Harvard Law School in the United States, the research center for information law at the University of Saint Gallen in Switzerland, and the School of Communication and Information at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. These institutions would welcome the active involvement of IGF fellows as well from developing countries. The envisioned Web site would offer the following features, among others, regular updates from relevant intergovernmental organizations and standards bodies, a calendar to signal upcoming meetings where net-related rules will be discussed, descriptive as well as normative content from the stakeholder community to be summarized in periodic updates for policymakers. Geneva net dialogue already includes members from the technology community who have built successful multilingual Web sites like creative comments international, with a community of international volunteers. These ideas are elaborated in a proposal on the IGF Web site. They are put forward as food for thought. If it turns out that the community would like to draw upon these resources, Geneva net dialogue would be delighted to contribute. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Now Bertrand de la Chapelle from WSIS-online.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. I am Bertrand de la Chapelle, the director of WSIS-online, but I am making this contribution on a personal behalf. Mr. Chairman, you invited us yesterday to contribute in a thinking-aloud mode, and I will follow your recommendation here, presenting a few concrete ideas in a personal capacity to feed the debate. Focusing on the first meeting in Athens, first of all, the IGF should be established in the most pragmatic and self-organizing manner possible. As the participant from Singapore mentioned yesterday, we want the IGF to start small and evolve. And in order to prove the movement by walking and save time, the simplest approach is probably to organize Athens as a three- to four-day open conference with a basic registration process like the one used for the present meeting, open also to interested individuals. The second point is, drawing from the discussions yesterday, it seems that in one way or the other, Athens will, to be substantive, address a diversity of issues in a limited number of thematic sessions. Numbers may vary, but something between four and six sessions might be middle ground. In addition, of course, to the necessary opening and final wrap-up plenarys. A third point is that these thematic sessions would have the main purpose of allowing all actors to reach a better understanding of each issue and the challenges it raises, even -- and I insist on that -- if they do not agree at that stage on how it should be addressed. The only thing that is important is that actors agree that the issue has to be addressed, even if they don't agree on how. And, unfortunately, on what the solutions should be. The fourth point is, as an example, such sessions could start with a panel allowing experts from the different categories of stakeholders to present the different dimensions of the issue, and then a brief overview of the

main actors already involved in addressing it would be followed by a brief discussion on how the forum, according to its mandate, could facilitate discussion on the issue and interaction among the various actors. Now, I'm coming to the tricky part, and the fifth point is how would and should these themes be selected. Several suggestions have been made yesterday and surely others will be made today, but we could benefit from an iterative, inclusive and structured process between now and the coming weeks. I suggest that following these consultations, an open call for suggestions of themes be initiated by the Secretariat to all stakeholders with a deadline at the end of March. The sixth point is that in that respect, to respond to this contribution, to this call for suggestions, stakeholder could ideally contribute one-page submissions in a sort of six-point format. The six points would be, first, a proposed theme in a concise formulation. Second point would be a brief description of why, in their view, it is important to address this theme. The third point would be why, in their view, it is in conformity with the Tunis Agenda in terms of substance, and particularly in reference to paragraph 34 to 54, but not exclusively. Fourth point would be how, in their view, this issue fits within the mandate of the IGF and its mission as detailed in paragraph 72. The two last points would be a rapid indication of who the main actors in the field are to the best of their knowledge. Actors could be anchors to participate in the forum and its thematic sessions. And last but not least, the submissions would indicate why, in their view, this issue should be addressed at the first annual meeting of the forum rather than in subsequent ones. Very quickly to finish, the submissions will be posted online by the Secretariat and a second round, second phase of online comments would be open for all actors to express support or to criticize the proposals during the month of April. Then, as I saw on the Web site of the IGF, the second round of open consultations that is envisaged for May, which is not decided yet, could then provide a summary report to the Secretariat, finalize the precise list of themes for Athens, and multistakeholder program committee would then, then, be formed to organize the introductory panels for its thematic session and guarantee the involvement of the key stakeholders in this field. Finally, Mr. Chairman, as a concluding suggestion, there will be a large number of actors that will be proposing themes that will not be retained for the Athens meeting. I suggest that during the Athens meeting a short session of two to three hours in the format of a posted session is organized to allow all the actors who have submitted a formal suggestion of theme to present in a three- to five-minute strict presentation the various elements of their submissions in order to feed the agenda-setting process. I keep my intervention on that issue for the moment, and I thank you very much for allowing me to give this contribution.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I now, I'll name the next three, Axel Pawlik, the managing director of RIPENCC, Raul Echeberria who is also a member of the numbers resources organization, and then I have Dr. Jeremy Beale from the confederation of British industry, and Brazil.

>>AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to take the floor during these open consultation. My name is Axel Pawlik. I speak for the RIPENCC, a Dutch membership association that operates one of the Internet root name server clusters and also performs the task of regional Internet registry for Europe, Middle East, and parts of central Asia. Having been established in 1992 we are currently serving about 4,300 members in that service region, most of them companies that among themselves are responsible for operating the Internet in this part of the world. We have followed and also actively contributed to the WSIS process since the early Geneva phase. Only last week we hosted a round table meeting for governments and regulators an activity that we view as a direct outflow of our

activities around the world summit. May I say we are quite impressed with and congratulate you for the progress you made so far which you, Mr. Chairman, and secretary Kummer have been able to sustain until today. Listening to the debate, and yesterday and here today, we sense there is a strong consensus emerging on the fundamental principles of the Internet Governance Forum. Clearly it will be multistakeholder, it should not be bound by u.n. procedures or WSIS (inaudible) rules in order to be fully open and accessible. We too feel about three days is appropriate for the meeting itself, that there should be one meeting per year, that the Secretariat should be relatively small and lightweight and there should be a program committee that prepares the individual meetings. We agree with what has been put forward so far to be among the first topics, Spam and multilingualism. And further consistent with our own actions over the last years whew would like to emphasize the need for a strong development approach. Finally I would like to close this intervention with a statement that for the IGF to be a success it is essential that the Internet community in this pervasive medium for decades now is recognized as a primary stakeholder in the process on an equal footing with government, civil society, and the private sector. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Jeremy Beale, confederation of british industry. Dr. Beale.

>>JEREMY BEALE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The confederation of British industry fully supports the statement made yesterday by the ICC/CCBI, but I would just like to elaborate some of the issues raised there about support for a multistakeholder event with a lightweight Secretariat by drawing on some of the experiences that we have had working with our members in the United Kingdom. Like the representative from France, MEDEF in France yesterday who spoke, the CBI represents a very broad range of british businesses, from very, very large ones to very small ones, and in total membership has thousands of members. This area of Internet-based commerce, though, is one where there really are in many respects no established rules of success. Much of the work that we do in the CBI is really about sharing best practice amongst our members. And large companies learn from small ones about how to be dynamic, innovative, and fleet of foot, and small ones learn from large companies about how to be efficient and looking forward over the horizon from their immediate factors. But there are two things that stand out, really, in what companies find that they need to take into account in relation to being successful in developing the Internet as a medium of commerce. Firstly, social factors. Companies find that they cannot operate in the traditional business manner in many respects. They have to take account of the social environment that they operate in and also of their employees, the social background of their employees, the social interests. And that way they become much more effective at marketing, it's a much more sophisticated marketing process, but it also means that they have to design products that are much more tailored to different social interests and social groups. The other area is in governance. Both in terms of internal governance by companies, they have to change the way they operate. Less hierarchical, more decentralized, more participatory. The other form of governance is in terms of the relations with the public sector and the state. There is many different ways, many different new forms of partnership that are being developed between the private sector and the public sector in the UK, and many of these are experimental. Whole new business models and ways of operating have resulted from this, and they are still ongoing. It is a learning process for everyone. But in order to get at that learning process, we found that we have to share best practice. We also have to do so in a way that is not centralized. We can't set the rules. We actually just have to act as a way of supporting the efforts and interests of our members. Now, being

successful at this is essential for our businesses, but that means that in total, it's also essential for global economic growth and the development issues that have been raised here. You can't have successful development globally if you don't have successful commerce. And so the lessons that are being learnt by some very advanced companies, but also some very traditional companies in the UK and in other countries I think would be usefully shared with other countries and businesses in developing countries in the process that we're talking about. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have Raul Echeberria from the Number Resource Organization and LACNIC followed by Brazil, followed by European union.

>>RAUL ECHEBERRIA: thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Raul Echeberria, as you said, and I am the executive director of LACNIC, the registrar of addresses for Latin America and the Caribbean, and I am the chair of the NRO, the number resources organization. And it gives all Internet registries in 2003 the -- it improves the coordination between regional registries and it acts as a focal point in linking the -- linking the various stakeholders up. I wanted to make a number of comments representing the NRO. And I would like to say that I am very pleased to see you chairing this group, sir. Also Mr. Kummer working as the secretary. I'm sorry I wasn't here yesterday because -- but unfortunately I had personal reasons for not being here. It's not easy for many of us to come to meetings in Geneva. It takes me over 20 hours to do a round trip. Many people think that Geneva is the ideal place for these activities to take place, but for many people, it's very difficult to attend and to have these activities centralized in one particular place. As we all know, one of the characteristics of the forum that was defined throughout the long negotiation in the summit, and of course the important aspects that need to be defined don't need to be discussed once again, but one of the aspects that I was mentioning was the multistakeholder nature of this forum, and the importance that all stakeholders take part on an equal footing in the IGF. So this is the basis upon which we should build this forum. It doesn't need to be debated. I agree with those who have taken the floor to say that the forum should not have a bureau but, rather, it should be headed by a program committee. We support that approach. Of course, it being understood that this committee, program committee, must be multistakeholder and the conditions for participation for this committee must be the same conditions for all the stakeholders. In this respect I would like to repeat something that has already been said in this room; namely, the importance for the technical community to be involved, which was recognized in paragraph 36 of the Tunis Agenda. So the technical community is a valuable stakeholder, and they have made extremely valuable contributions to the current situation of the Internet. We also agree with those who say that, if appropriate, the Secretariat should be small and lightweight, and we'd like to add that it should have -- be balanced in its composition. Not only the participation of stakeholders, both in the regional participation and agenda participation. It should be the model used for the creation of the working group on Internet Governance. That could be the basis on which we could build this program committee, which should be smaller than the WGIG was. Smaller than the WGIG was. It's important that in the forum we seek mechanisms to find consensus within the work of the forum, and in that respect the mechanisms that were used and are being used in many Internet organizations and which have proved successful can be taken as a reference point. With regard to the frequency of the meeting of the IGF, we believe that a high frequency of meetings would be an obstacle for the participation of the civil society and organizations developing country organizations because they have fewer resources to fund an effective participation in an international agenda which already has many events. So we think once a year is enough, and

the meetings should not last more than two or three days at the most. That should be enough. And what is most important here, of course, is something we have been repeating, we have been saying before the WGIG; namely, we should have online participatory tools because that guarantees the chance for everybody to participate. Web casting, remote access, the publication of documents for public comments, the availability of electronic forums. These are the most important aspects to take into account for the implementation of the forum. With regard to where to hold the meetings, well, we believe that we need to have geographical diversity in the meetings. As I was saying before, it is no easy for people to attend meetings in Geneva or go to places that are far away from where we live. So, therefore, the regionalization of the meetings and the rotation of the regions would enable a fair participation for stakeholders from the whole world. We propose that the meetings be organized back to back with other important meetings dealing with the same issues. So that not only would more people be able to be involved, but also the organizational costs would fall to the organizations that host the events and the organizations that work with the IGF. Finally, with regard to the agenda, we believe that we mustn't reproduce the ideological discussions which took place in the summit for a long time. We must focus on issues which are real issues for the community. There is a great opportunity here to build things that benefit the greatest possible number of people. Therefore, one of the main issues, as other people have mentioned, should be cybercrime, the right to privacy, cost of interconnections, Spam, capacity building, multilingualism, inter alia. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief in my remarks, just to try to help you on these topics that you asked for our opinion. First of all, of course we would like to say that we support the speech of ambassador Khan on behalf of the G77. I would like to touch upon only three topics, Mr. Chairman. The first one on the proposal of G77 for another round of consultations. The second one on how many days we are planning to stay there in Athens, and the third one on the format of the bureau. On the first one, Mr. Chairman, I think it's very useful the proposal of G77 to have another round of consultations. Maybe the ideal period could be after the ICANN GAC meeting that is going to take place in New Zealand at the end of March. We could have something at the beginning of April here after this gathering there in New Zealand. Second topic, on the days, how many days we should stay there, I told you yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that Brazil favors at least five days. And I think it's a reasonable thing, if we can think together with our Greek colleagues. For them there will be not much trouble because the amount of resources they are going to put in place if we stay there one or two days more for them, there will be no difficulty. And my reasoning is very simple. I'm pretty sure that the Greek government is going to organize a very beautiful opening ceremony with high-ranking officials there that will take at least the whole morning. And then we are going to have the afternoon for speeches. National speeches, speeches from the private sector and civil society. Then we lost the first day [Laughter].

>>BRAZIL: As simple as that. [Laughter] [Applause]

>>BRAZIL: Then we go to the second day, Mr. Chairman, and on the second day we have a very good proposal by our dear friend De La Chapelle. And if we follow what he is proposing us, I think we are going to stay there two weeks at least. But let's see, if we stay just

one day, we manage to split our groups in 10, 15 workshops and then we manage to do all the topics Mr. De La Chapelle is proposing and then we go to the last day. There will be the wrap-up discussion. You are going to prepare a very good resume of the discussions, and then the whole morning is lost. We go to the afternoon session again. The Greek government is going to organize a very beautiful closing ceremony and then finish. I think that's not enough, Mr. Chairman, and that's not fair for people. As my colleague from Uruguay just said, they are going to fly 20 hours to go to Athens just to stay there three days, losing the first and the third one, having just one day of working. I think that that's not reasonable, to say the least. On the third topic, Mr. Chairman, on the format, I think we could profit from our experience in the WSIS. We used to have -- used to have three bureaus.

We used to have the government bureau, private sector bureau, and the civil society bureau. We could have something similar there. Now, three bureaus, 15 representatives in each bureau, which makes a total number of 45. In the governmental bureau, that I understand a little bit more than the other ones, we could have -- we have five regions, we could have three representatives per region making 15 representatives. It's reasonable. It worked in the first phase. In the second phase I think we increased the number of representatives from the regions. But it's manageable. Then the Brazilian proposal to the format of the bureau, which is different from the Secretariat, as I told you, I would like to see you there along with Mr. Markus Kummer heading the Secretariat, we could have the three bureaus, and manage to have a way to exchange information among the three bureaus and take decisions on how to do, how to proceed, which topics to select and things like that. I think I will stop at this point here. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: On your last point, I would like to stress that I am a retired man, and I would certainly, given my eating habits, not fit into the lightweight categories. [Laughter]

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: So that is not practical. As far as time is concerned, I would also like to remind Brazil of a very fundamental principle of all multilateral diplomacy, which is that discussions and negotiations expand the contract to fill the time available. So if we have more time, it will be used. But if we give less time, things will also get done. But we can come back to this. There's nothing set in stone in any of this. Greece, did you want to respond to this? Yes. Then maybe before I turn to you, I would request Greece to respond to this. And then we'll come to the E.U.

>>GREECE: Thank you, chairman. Later in the day, my good friend George Papadatos, who has been dealing with this IGF achievement, because we call it an achievement, will brief us about the Greek position. Just a few remarks, after the very interesting and useful intervention of our Brazilian friends. As far as dates were concerned, we are, of course, I think in the hands of the secretary-general, and we trust the chair to bring to him the message of our consultations today. And as far as the organization is concerned, we have to say that we belong to those who believe in light structures. But once again, we are in your hands to suggest the form of bureau or bureaus. And of course we are ready to be as constructive as one can imagine, and flexible. Now, as far as the days that we last, our meeting in Athens, of course it is not for us to decide, but we think that one of our challenges is to keep this meeting dynamic and interesting for the days it will last. So we are not sure -- although of course we are ready, as a host country, to undertake a longer period than the one envisaged at the beginning from the organizational point of view, we are not sure that long days, or one week or something, one working week, would be the best solution. But once again, we will follow the

consensus and we will be happy to take the measures needed. Thank you, chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: European Union.

>>E.U.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I speak on behalf of the European Union and the acceding countries Romania and Bulgaria. The E.U. would like to thank you for leading yesterday's fruitful and constructive discussion. We have listened with interest to the interventions made and we would like to address some of the questions you put forward yesterday. Mr. Chairman, we reiterate the importance the E.U. attaches to the overall multistakeholder nature of the IGF as enshrined in the Tunis agenda. In this context, we support the idea of a slim workable and representative program committee working in an open and transparent manner. We agree that the Tunis Agenda has identified several follow-up mechanisms, the IGF process being one of them. Bearing in mind the issue of limited resources, we share the views expressed by several participants to limit the number of physical meetings in the IGF process by using virtual and electronic means of communication. At the same time, we would like to ensure that this will not pose an obstacle to the participation of any stakeholder. GIIC in order to ensure a constructive debate, these meetings should focus on a limited number of subjects. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I now turn to Allen Miller of WITSA.

>>WITSA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am the executive director of the World Information Technology and Services Alliance, which is an alliance of over 60 ICT associations from around the world. More than half of our members are from developing countries. WITSA maintains an active capacity-building program, and in recent time, we've been active in countries such as Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Kenya, Rwanda, Mongolia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia. I believe that some of the lessons that we've learned from that program can be useful in the context of the Internet Governance Forum. One main principle that we do support is that participation by all stakeholders in an integrated fashion is a key principle. Stakeholders from developing countries have valuable experience and information to share in this discussion forum, and they must all participate with an equal status and in all dimensions and aspects of the forum. In order for the forum to be truly open and accessible to many of these stakeholders from developing countries, we need to deal with practical issues, such as support for accreditation, visas. We must simplify those processes and be sensitive to their needs for financial resources to ensure their participation. We also feel that the first event should fully integrate and use the online tools that we've been discussing, and not necessarily tools of the Internet itself, but tools such as the realtime transcription system that is being used in this consultation, as this will increase the participation from around the world by all of the interested parties. The supporting functions for the IGF, we feel, should include representatives from all of the stakeholder groups, to ensure that their views are reflected. A small Secretariat or bureau focusing on the implementation of decisions made by a diverse, representative steering committee or similar guiding body is important. And that small Secretariat or bureau can then administer a Web site that acts as a repository for the contributions regarding the issues under discussion at any particular meeting. Finally, and in conclusion, we feel that the forum itself should be inspired by the substantive and constructive way in which these consultations are being managed and the interactive discussion that is taking place here by all on an equal basis. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would perhaps want to respond to your appeal and on the comments, what was said. What is important to us, in our view, is that the first meeting of the IGF, we should be straightaway involved in the work, so straight into the substance. Many people will have made a long journey to arrive there, and they deserve to be involved in substantive discussion straightaway. So the practical issues and the procedural issues of the IGF must be decided upon before Athens. Some have suggested to achieve that that we needed to have an additional meeting to that, perhaps at the beginning of April. We're not against that idea, as long as we know what we will do at that additional meeting, complementary meeting. In other words, we could have clear proposals on the process. We should also have a clear signal from the secretary general on how we can proceed, how people will be convened to the meeting or how the program committee will be set up. And also at this meeting, we need to agree on the issues to deal with in Athens. On that topic, Mr. Chairman, if you try and spread yourself too thinly, then you might not cover things appropriately. So in the first meeting of the IGF, we need to focus on a handful of subjects. We've heard of spam, cybercrime, multilingualism. We could add another one, perhaps. But let us focus on three topics, essentially. I feel that will be the best, the most effective way of working. That's what I think we should think about, Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: CCBI, Ayesha Hassan.

>>CCBI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you, Mr. Kummer. I'm pleased to provide a few follow-up comments on behalf the CCBI and ICC members on the flexibility needed and the format of the IGF. Many interventions have highlighted the reasons and principles for why the IGF needs to be flexible, for example, each IGF event may focus on a different topic or closely related topics which will need different expertise, perhaps different ways of exchanging ideas and information. And this needs to be considered in formulating the support for the IGF and how the event will be shaped. On the format, business envisions the IGF as a vehicle to bring the substantive work and experience on the Internet-related issues selected from existing organizations and all stakeholders to this global space. The unique quality of the IGF is the participation of all stakeholders, participating on an equal footing, and thus the program for the event should be shaped to maximize this opportunity. Key visionaries and experts from all stakeholder groups will be attracted to the IGF because it offers an opportunity for them to reach a large, diverse, inclusive audience, and because they will welcome the opportunity to contribute in a meaningful way. A true exchange of information and experience is best accomplished by focused, well-prepared, interactive discussions. This could be in the form of expert panels discussing the topic from a variety of perspectives, thus sharing the lessons learned, the challenges, and successes. It is possible that solicitation of white papers or written materials may develop as an input to the IGF. And certainly it will be important to public the proceedings of each IGF. Unfocused discussions will not help us reach the goal of sharing and exchanging. We also encourage the secretary general to include in his request for reports information on how each organization is addressing the challenge of the WSIS, becoming more transparent, et cetera, and how the concept of multistakeholderrism is being addressed. On a practical note, we also have noted that there is a May meeting on the revised time line of the IGF Web site. If there are to be planning meetings, we urge them to be

open to all stakeholders that a date be set promptly to allow for travel planning, and that where practical, they be aligned with other open meetings being planned on other activities identified in the Tunis Agenda. I would like to conclude by offering the following ideas from the global business community companies and members of national, regional, global, and sectoral members in the CCBI and ICC networks. First, this is a unique opportunity to maximize the substantive experiences, both the challenges and obstacles of governments, businesses, civil society, the technical and academic communities, and other stakeholders, to promote the information society for all. The most effective way to accomplish that in the IGF is for all of us and all the stakeholders around the world who are interested in these issues to be able to participate together with equal abilities to speak, share, and shape the IGF going forward. The program should facilitate this objective and not be a hindrance to this opportunity being realized. Thank you for this opportunity to contribute.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you. The chairman asked me to take over. He is going to attend a media conference. And this maybe gives me also just the opportunity to address this tentative time line we have put up on our Web site, which may have caused some confusion. But this is basically a tentative time line working backwards. The secretary general has been given a clear mandate to convene the meeting by the second quarter of 2006. That means the end of June. And in order to do so, he will need the information on how he should do so. And we would have thought that it would be necessary for this, be that steering committee, program committee, to meet maybe sometime late in May to make proposals to the secretary general then what the agenda should be like and what the meeting would look like, what the program would look like. And we would hope that it'll be an attractive, interactive, dynamic program. So this is very tentative. But having listened now to various delegates who also proposed a second round of consultations, there are certain logistical constraints we are facing. We depend on the goodwill of the United Nations office here in Geneva, and they have been always very good and very kind at letting us use their facilities if the facilities are available. And I know already that this spring will be extremely heavy. And I think it will be almost impossible to get a date where we can have a meeting in this format, that is, with all the interpretation in all the languages, which I think is very important for all participants. So one way of looking at this might be -- and I say "might be," and I throw it into the room just for consideration -- that we could envisage having this program committee in place by end of May, and we could have maybe an open meeting, open consultation in conjunction with the first meeting of the program committee could meet the day after and would take into account the considerations given to the program committee at the open meeting. But this, as I said, is a very preliminary suggestion, and it is something maybe also participants would like to react. But the paramount concern, of course, is to be in a position to respect the mandate that was given by the summit to the secretary general, that is, to convene a meeting by the second quarter of 2006. And there we will need to have the elements to be in place. And I do apologize for having talked for so long. But I think it is good to -- that we are on the same wavelength also with regard to these logistical constraints. Morocco has asked for the floor, please, Morocco.

>>MOROCCO: Good morning, everybody. On behalf of the Moroccan delegation, I would first of all like to extend our warm thanks to the U.N. secretary general, who was kind enough to stimulate the organization of this meeting, consultations on the establishment of the forum, in keeping with the recommendations from the Tunis Summit. I'd also like to thank the chair and say how pleased we are to take part in a meeting which is so elegantly and skillfully conducted. Morocco has a

major interest in the preparatory meeting for the forum and expects the forum to work to build on what was agreed in the Tunis Summit, particularly the development of the Internet in developing countries. This would, in particular, require the development of infrastructures, capacity-building, and that sort of thing. We'd like to make two proposals to that end on the future organization. It would be desirable for the number of participants in the bureau to be sufficiently large to allow developing countries to be represented and also allow all stakeholders to take an active part in the forum meetings. And, thus, if we are talking about regionalized organizations, we ought to maybe descend, then, to the subregional level, which would allow regions to express their development needs in terms of ICT, needs which could then be consolidated and classified on the basis of an approach yet to be defined. And together with that sort of approach, we consider that all topics and issues are of major importance and that any ranking of priorities may be required, but the importance of each and every topic, as understressed by previous -- as stressed by previous speakers, and the importance of each theme and question will differ from country to country. So our proposal is, first of all, that we provide for subregional representation, and, secondly, that we try to rank priorities, taking account of the specific needs and priorities in each subregion. Thank you.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER:MERCI, and give the floor to theGlobal Information Infrastructure Commission.

>>GIIC: GIIC Kummer, thank you. For the GIIC, the Global Information Infrastructure Commission, which is a confederation of CEOs of information and communications technology companies from throughout the world, I want to briefly reinforce a point deserving, I think, of repetition. I intervened for the narrowly limited purpose of respectfully asking you to remain mindful of the overarching purposes of that from which the need for an Internet Governance Forum arose. That, of course, was the WSIS. And the ends towards which the summit was directed were directly tied to the millennium development goals of the United Nations and had to do with the diffusion of ICTs, including Internet access capabilities, to ICT underserved parts of the world. If the world -- if the forum is going to be responsive to the origins of its establishment, it must focus in a highly disciplined sort of way on those aspects of Internet governance that relate most closely to those who at present are largely unconnected to the world because of their lack of access to communications conduits, network-connecting information appliances, and, of course, the Internet. Absent such a focused orientation, the GIIC fears the forum may be diverted to issues of concern primarily, if not solely, to I understand in economically developed parts of the world. We must maintain our focus, I respectfully submit, on the needs of the vast numbers of the world's inhabitants who live not in the leading, but, rather, the trailing edge of technology. Thank you, and we in the GIIC look forward to cooperating with you, national governments, and other stakeholders in addressing responsive, as yet unresolved Internet governance issues.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you for your statement. And turn now to Cuba. You have the floor, sir.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As it's the first time I take the floor, I would first of all like to congratulate you, and through you, I would like to extend my congratulations to the secretary general and to Mr. Desai for having convened these consultations. First of all, I would like to say that Cuba would like to add its voice to those who spoke yesterday, and in particular, what Pakistan said on behalf of the

G77 and China. Mr. Chairman, we would like, in particular, to underscore or support the proposal of the G77 whereby we should convene new consultations on the organization of the forum for the arguments and criteria which the delegation of Pakistan set forth on behalf of the group. We listened very carefully to your comments on possible obstacles to the holding of those consultations. But taking into account the fact that this meeting was convened by the secretary general of the United Nations, I'm convinced that the office of the United Nations here in Geneva will do everything they can to respond to the request of what we could call the big boss of the Secretariat. Now, I don't think it would be logical to have other consultations, because what we're doing over these two days is the first time we are looking at the structure and the format and other issues related to the forum. So everything that's been said here, we need to formalize it, digest it, and then to be more active and proactive in the debate, we need to come up with specific proposals. I want to make a general comment on the forum. The forum is a product of the summit. I would like to underscore that. And this is the process of follow-up for this meeting, especially with regard to Internet governance. So we're not starting from scratch. We have enough material to continue our work on this topic. For example, there is the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, in which there are specific issues that could be dealt with by the forum. Furthermore, we must not lose sight of the fact that the forum is an outcome of the inconclusive discussions we had in the summit on Internet governance. So some questions are still pending an outcome. We are waiting for answers. And we hope that the forum will enable us to think more deeply on these issues. And we hope that the forum will provide recommendations. In other words, we see the forum as an extension of the Working Group on Internet Governance, but with a broader format and more extensive participation. We believe that the essence of the objective of the forum, as enshrined in paragraph 72, subparagraph (E) of the Tunis Agenda, which stipulates, and I quote, "To promote and permanently ensure the materialization of the principle of the World Summit on the Information Society in the Internet governance processes," end of quote. I agree with what was said yesterday by the delegate from China, namely, that the Tunis Agenda has specifically paragraphs that give us guidelines on the establishment of the forum, in particular, paragraphs 72 to 82. We have heard a lot of references made to the fact that the outcome of the summit was successful, and Cuba agrees with those references. So it makes sense for us to follow the model of the format and the structure of the group of the work we carried out in the summit and which was successful. Therefore, in relation specifically to the structure and the format of the forum, we believe that we can continue -- we can follow the model of the summit. With regard to the bureau, we also believe that we should follow the successful model of the summit, and that the respect we found very interesting what was said by the delegate from Brazil. With regards to the -- how long the meeting should last, the forum, we would say four to five days. And on the frequency, at the beginning, we thought that it should be once a year. But I must say that we are flexible in that area and we are listening to the proposals that are being made in that respect. Thank you.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you, Cuba. Pakistan, you asked for the floor, please.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Mr. Kummer. Mr. Kummer, I just wanted to respond to the specific comment you made earlier about the holding of the next set of consultations. We do appreciate the fact that, obviously, there are time difficulties involved. But the commission on human rights does not start -- now it's scheduled for the third week of March. So there is time between now and the third week of March where consultations could be held. The second point that we have not -- we

need to consider in the Group of 77 is this concept that you are referring to and being referred to in this room on the steering committee or the program committee. There is as such no agreement within the Group of 77, or no discussion within the Group of 77 on a steering committee or a program committee. So this is an idea that we need to discuss before we go and say that the consultations be held after the meeting of the steering committee or before the meeting of the steering committee. I just wanted to flag that as a point of concern from the Group of 77 and China, because these are issues that have to be discussed. And that is why the Group of 77 and China felt that there were a number of points that were raised in the discussions yesterday and today that need further discussion and in-depth discussions, I would say, within the Group of 77 for our positions to be firmed up and for us to be able to come to any decisions within a consultative process to be held later, in a month, as we had suggested. We can have those consultations in three weeks, if not a month, so that we have the period before the commission on human rights gets into session. Thank you.

>>SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you very much for your explanation. But I'm also -- of course, we will look into the possibility of meeting facilities, but I was told that it is very difficult after the February dates. And as you will recall, we already had to change the dates we had planned to have the dates for these consultations later. But then there was the question of hotel capacity. So there are many considerations that come into it. But we have to look into this, and we have listened to the concerns expressed. And to turn back to the distinguished delegate of Cuba, it is not quite as simple as that. I mean, the United Nations office in Geneva has been very, very accommodating because this is a mandate coming from the secretary general. But there are program budget implications. And these meetings are not on the scheduled program of meetings here in Geneva which are planned a long time in advance and which come out of an intergovernmental machinery. So we are really here at the courtesy of the United Nations office in Geneva. They do what they can, but they cannot do the impossible. But we will have to look into the availability of meeting facilities. But let me now turn to the Association -- I think you asked for the floor quite some time ago -- from Paris. Doesn't seem to be in the room. Then ISOC France.

>>ISOC FRANCE: Thank you, chairman. I'd like to take up three brief points. For the organization, a number of people have suggested that the meeting use webcast to be broadcast over the net. It seems to us, as well, useful to benefit from the facilities provided in that sort of meeting where everything is translated, for all the translations to be recorded and put on the net. That would allow people to listen to proceedings in the six languages. A number of speakers have talked about the Internet tomorrow, or at least looking at what we have today and to then think about topics which haven't been covered to any great extent, and which might allow the forum not just to consider today's problems but to look at the tools which will be installed and used tomorrow. And in particular, to consider subjects which would require more collective governance than we have today, and which might lead to the suggestion that -- either that subjects be allocated to an existing organization or that a new body be created to deal with specific subjects. To be clearer about what I'm suggesting, I'm thinking of everything revolving around object Internet, which seems to be a very strong element for the future of the net, where questions such as uses, protection of individual freedom, and that sort of thing are at the heart of the debate, and where, for the time being, these tools are managed fairly well, I imagine, by a small group, but which could usefully be opened up to all those involved in Internet Governance. We have also heard much mention of good practice. My professional

experience leads me to say that what would be even more interesting would be to talk about bad practice, projects which collapsed, because that's where you have the greatest collective benefit, when you analyze that. Last year, I talked about exchange of practice because it seemed more interesting than exchange of good practice, because what's good for some, may be bad for others. But quite frankly, failed experiments and projects allow you to make the most progress collectively. And the representative of Brazil suggested an agenda, and I would suggest that all the useless days, we take off the agenda. We'd save a lot of time if we did that. Thank you.

>> SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you. Holy See, please.

>>HOLY SEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And let me begin by thanking the U.N. secretary-general for inviting us to this consultation and yourself and also Mr. Desai for guiding our reflections since yesterday. And my delegation has been following these reflections very attentively, and we have been actually challenged by some of the ideas we have listened to. And we have been posing questions to ourselves. And what I'm going to do now is to share with you some of these, our questions. We want to think aloud or reflect aloud so that you can listen to us and also reflect with us. First question is, will the forum that we are talking about discuss and maybe eventually propose a model of a structure for the study and management of the Internet Governance process? Second, do we consider Internet Governance Forum as dovetailing into the primordial or wider goal of bridging the digital divide? In other words, are we convinced enough that the main purpose of an Internet Governance is to facilitate access to everybody and to generate rules with the main aim of achieving a better communication between persons and peoples? Four, if the aim is in some way linked to bridging the digital divide, do we agree, then, on starting our discussions by looking at the process from the side of the common Internet user, with particular reference to those in developing countries, and not just from the point of view of the well-established entities and operators? We agree, such entities and operators which are strongly represented here, exercising important rules in the development of the Internet. Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by returning to something I think I heard already proposed yesterday, and that is that for a better use of time, we should establish an online mechanism of the Internet Governance Forum which -- or through which meetings could be prepared. This would help us reduce significantly the time of the meetings, and also to give such meetings the real nature of negotiations. Thank you very much.

>> SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you, sir. I now give the floor to the representative of Francophonie.

>>OIF: thank you. I am speaking on behalf of the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie, which is made up of 53 states and governments, including 24 LDCs. We welcome the fact that this assembly wants to give particular importance to inclusion of developing countries, getting them involved in this very important issue of Internet Governance. We also agree with those speakers who seek maximum efficiency and effectiveness during the forum by sticking to a certain number of issues and by preparing upstream, using those tools available in the digital world. Of course, the question of languages is a very important one. When we have occasion to meet in a room in the U.N., we have translation, interpretation in the six languages. And I know it's difficult, but it's very pleasant for those who don't master the main international language. But to succeed in the work upstream, Internet sites should use more than one language, and we should all make an

effort to try to make the text available in other languages. I know it's a bit easier or it should be a bit easier for international organizations which have a multilingual mandate, particularly United Nations, organizations which would benefit from using more than one language when they submit a text. The same could be said for civil society and private sector groups representing several members. We all have an effort to make, and I think it shows a feeling of unease, that even in a meeting where we have interpretation in six languages, that people use a language which isn't their own language, whereas their own language can be used if it's one of the six U.N. languages. But people nevertheless prefer to use the main international language to try to get their thoughts across. It's a very uncomfortable feeling, and particularly for developing countries. Language can be a factor of exclusion in the major international debates. And when you don't master the main international language, it's very difficult to get your views across and to be heard. I think it's to the benefit of everybody to know each other better, to talk to each other better, if we listen to everybody's expectations and hopes. Thank you.

>> SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you for this statement, which I think you raised a very important point. And I feel somewhat guilty, as you mentioned and you pointed out to our Web site which is one language only. I am painfully aware of this shortcoming. But this is also a question of resources. And I also hope that it's not only resources -- it's financial resources and human resources, but I also hope that maybe we can find ways with voluntary cooperation that we find voluntary contributions, voluntary translators, to have the Web site in more than one language, which would be, of course, a very important step forward. And on this occasion, I would also like to thank you the organization of the Francophonie for having financed the translation of the WGIG background report into French. Thus, at least, making available some material to a large community which may be is not at home as much in English. Thank you once again. I now turn to the gate information technology society. You have the floor, sir.

>> ABDULLTEEF AL-ABDULRAZZAQ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this is Abdullteef Al-Abdulrazzaq, chairman of Kuwait information technology society, a member of the Internet Governance caucus. The society believes that the Internet Governance Forum should emphasize on reaching a workable model for multilateral governance of the Internet that is compliant with the WSIS principles, evolutionary in process, and acceptable by all stakeholders. The IGF should regard the issue of the Internet Governance as a matter that unites the world community, resolves its differences, and not dividing it. Ensuring the effective global participation of multistakeholders is essential to its success. We believe that all stakeholders should participate in the IGF activities in an equal manner. The status of the stakeholders should be agreed upon and settled and finalized from the start of all the activities of the IGF, and should not be reviewed at the specific stage later on. The effective participation of the developing countries and the equal presence of the north and south involvement are key issues that need to be considered. Bearing in mind the limited resources of some stakeholders in terms of participating in the upcoming IGF functions, we urge to take into account the following. First, holding events in various geographical regions. Second, giving electronic means of communications more leverage in holding events and carrying open consultations. Third, organizing back to back IGF events. The U.N. rules and procedures have so far contributed to the success of the WSIS, and seeing it implemented once again in terms of the participation mechanism of the IGF will definitely reflect positively on its activities. Furthermore, a combination of thematic regional conferences and open consultation meetings that would lead to an annual meeting of the IGF will enhance its process. Establishing national IGFs

or local community IGF with open participation for all stakeholders will help the IGF process to be more focused. An acceptable multistakeholder model of Internet Governance will demand minimum requirements that each and everyone should comply with. Issues such as capacity building, such as technical expertise, best practices, and digital inclusion; second, information security and privacy; third, enabling environment, such as laws and regulations; fourth, promoting the national content and preserving the national identity. Such issues are all considered some of the most important matters to developing countries which expects -- which expect to address it with their sisters and involvement of major international bodies. In this respect, the subject of international domain names is an important subject that should be addressed and implemented in a manner that would not create blocs or isolated islands or harm the Internet integrity. But, rather, it should promote cultural diversity, national content, and the openness of the Internet to everyone. In the end, we do look forward to the successful outcome of the IGF. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you very much. I now turn to the Foundation for Free Information Infrastructure, Mr. Bollow.

>>NORBERT BOLLOW: Thank you. I would like to react to the statement of Brazil that the Internet Governance Forum could take many days so that we can wait -- so that we can afford to waste an entire day. I would like to emphasize that technical experts don't think that way. If a lot of patience for political speeches is required, they will simply not come. So the position of FFII is that the IGF should be at most two days, although I suppose we could live with three. There is, of course, the concern that it may not make sense to travel a long way just for two days. And for this reason, I would suggest to schedule the Internet Governance Forum back to back with a technical conference which is of interest to the leading thinkers that everybody has been emphasizing should be attracted to the Internet Governance Forum. And such technical conference would also give diplomats and everyone else here the opportunity to set your feet into the world of how technical experts think and interact with each other. Thank you.

>> SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you. I now give the floor to Francis Urbany, vice president of BellSouth. You have the floor, sir.

>> Francis Urbany: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Francis Urbany with BellSouth corporation in the United States. And as such, I am attending this consultative meeting as part of the private sector. It will not come as a surprise that I endorse the views expressed earlier by CCBI/ICC. What I would like to do, though, is take advantage of this opportunity, mr. chairman, and to make a few personal observations based on some of the discussion I heard here today. I see the clock is moving. I have only a few points, and won't take an undue amount of time. I'll try to be brief. Very brief. First, I would say that I clearly embrace the sentiment discussed here for a multistakeholder participation on an equal footing. Mr. Chairman, I compliment you on the way you have conducted this consultation in such an open way, where all attendees are able to participate on an equal basis. For those of you who may not have participated in earlier sessions during the WSIS in PrepCom 3 particularly, this opportunity for equal participation did not exist for nongovernmental members. I sat in this very room and in other rooms where discussions were going on, was able to listen but not able to interchange views on an equal basis with other participants. So I therefore welcome this opportunity, which leads me to a point. The earlier discussions were held under the procedural rules of the United Nations and intergovernmental organization. Those rules, Mr. Chairman,

in my opinion, are not suitable for the intergovernmental forum, which is of entirely different nature. It is not an intergovernmental meeting. It's a meeting of all participants. Therefore, the rules of participation to allow people like myself and others here to speak freely and present views is really what is needed. In other words, the traditional rules of intergovernmental organizations are really not applicable to the intergovernmental -- Internet Governance Forum. The second point I would like to make is with respect to the initial IGF meeting, after listening to the extensive discussion here, which has been very welcome and has been very enlightening, one can come away with the impression that the IGF could mean all things to all people. Given the limited amount of time and the focus and the mandate in paragraph 72, it is my view that a well focused IGF addressing a few items of importance to the international community should be the MODUS vivendi for operating. In this respect I endorse the view presented yesterday by the spokesman from Canada, that said, to paraphrase, that the focus should be on positive outcomes, and not to address divisive issues. I couldn't stress more how important I think that notion is for the IGF, and particularly for the initial meeting of the IGF. We've come a long ways here. We came to many meetings. IGF is a decision of WSIS. We want that to be successful. Therefore, it's important that the IGF succeed. It's important that the process of the IGF get off to a good start. As we all know from our personal experience, success breeds success. We need to make a good beginning. So in sum, Mr. Chairman, I would say that in the end, common sense, not rhetoric, should guide us in formulating the agenda for the initial IGF, which will be held later this year. With that, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to make these brief remarks.

>> SECRETARY KUMMER: Thank you very much. Marilyn Cade speaking for Limited liability corporation. Well maybe -- she is in the back of the room. Maybe we give the floor to somebody else. ISOC, you also asked for the floor. ISOC first.

>>ISOC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'd like to take this opportunity to address some of the questions that were raised yesterday. In terms of the outcome that we expect of the Internet Governance Forum, we believe that the IGF should act as a forum for sharing best practice, expertise, and for presenting a range of finding related to a particular issue or limited set of issues. As the Tunis Agenda clearly states, the IGF should be a neutral, nonduplicative and nonbinding process, and therefore should merely present findings for consideration by interested parties. With regard to the multistakeholder bureau, ISOC believes the bureau should be renamed into a program committee as many here have said, that the term bureau has specific connotations in the U.N. system. The program committee should, as is anticipated in the Tunis Agenda text, be a multistakeholder, representative advisory body that helps shape and set the agenda and issue focus of the forum. ISOC could foresee a program committee composed of representatives of the principal stakeholders with rotating co-chairs. Which of course brings me to the issue of the principal stakeholders. The Internet society and other organizations, as you have heard, believe that the Internet community should be recognized as a distinct principal stakeholder in the Internet Governance Forum for a number of reasons, not least of is which was the technical and academic communities recognition in the Tunis Agenda in paragraph 36. This request for recognition as a distinct principal stakeholder is, we believe, more than warranted given that the Internet community, including many tens of thousands of individuals and thousands of organizations, comprises inter alia organizations responsible for operating and managing the Internet. Standards setting organizations, international, regional, national, and local organizations responsible for the management and physical distribution of global resources. Organizations responsible for the

long-term development of the Internet, and organizations such as the Internet society with 20,000 members and more than 80 chapters around the world, not forgetting the thousand of Internet user groups across the globe. With regard to the program committee, we see it having an important role in reaching out and encouraging the participation of experts. In addition, we see the program committee as having an important role in encouraging the fullest participation across regions and stakeholders, with a particular emphasis on the developing world. We would note that the levels of expertise and the level of developing country participation will be one of the most significant measures of the success of the forum. Let me just address quickly the issue of what issues the IGF should focus on. There has been some discussion about the issues that should be discussed, whether there should be few or many, and whether contentious issues should be on the table. ISOC agree that is many of the areas included in the WSIS clearly will require additional review, and it will be up to the program committee to decide which will be the subject of its focus. However, we would recommend that the IGF prioritize its issue focus on those that will facilitate progress on developmental issues and address other unresolved issues at a later time. Clearly, work on these unresolved issues will continue in parallel in many existing fora. But the focus, we believe, should reflect a clear focus on ICTs on development that was the goal of the WSIS process. We'd also like to just briefly comment on the question of the online virtual community that was raised yesterday also. ISOC believes that the forum's success will depend very much on the mechanisms for contributing to the discussion, and one of the best means of doing so would be through a Web-based work and communications space. Such a Web-based mechanism will encourage participation from across stakeholders. But it will be important that this collaborative workspace be appropriately hosted, given the need for consistency and stability. However, we would pose a caution. We should all be cognizant of the related time and resource issues. It is unrealistic to expect all stakeholders to be able to participate in multiple-layered list-based exchanges on a realtime basis. Many stakeholders do not have the resources or time to spend managing or participating in ongoing discussions. With regards to the plenary, the forum should meet once a year. The meetings should not exceed two to three days, given the personnel and financial constraints that many stakeholders are subject to. We believe that in order to attract the greatest participation, it might be useful for the forum to be held in a different region each year. The Internet society and the Internet community stand ready to participate fully and constructively in the IGF, just as they have endeavored to do so over the last three to four years of the WSIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Can I have Marilyn Cade from IIC.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Kummer. This is my first public statement to the group at large, so thus, in addition to thanking you both, I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all other participants as well, as we are, by working together, beginning the practice of multistakeholder participation on an equal footing. And to me, as a participant, it seems to be working quite well. I do support statements made earlier by others from the business community, and I have heard contributions from others in the group that we are meeting in yesterday and today that I can also support. But as a speaker today, perhaps my perspective is a bit unique. I am now a small business owner and CEO of a microbusiness. My business is advising a range of companies and organizations that range from multinational corporations to very small entrepreneurs, companies like AT&T, overstock.com, World Stock, the Global IP Alliance, among others. There are several work activities and follow-on mechanisms that are outcomes of the Tunis Agenda. And all of us and

many of the stakeholders who will want to participate in the IGF are also engaged in these issues. And since we are seeking to operate in a multistakeholder mode, we must now look at these congruent and parallel activities and respect that each of them has a space, without the need to duplicate each other's work or agenda. We must seek cooperation, collaboration, congruency, and coexistence across these parallel sets of activities. For instance, some of the relevant parallel activities are the ongoing examination by the ITU's member states and sector members of its work and activities, the action lines from the Tunis Agenda, the follow-on activities within ICANN, where the role of the Government Advisory Committee and the ICANN stakeholders is being examined, and where policies related to IP addressing, domain names, and other technical management issues of the Internet are addressed in a multistakeholder environment. And, of course, the Internet Governance Forum, a very important opportunity for all -- governments, civil society, the Internet technical community, business -- this offers a unique opportunity that deserves our efforts to ensure its success and its contribution to providing improved awareness, increased information, and increased opportunities to participate in a meaningful way, especially for those from the developing countries. I note that there are many demands on human and financial resources, and there is much work to be done. And we must be very careful not to duplicate the work that is being done in one of these other parallel activities. Interested parties, instead, should go to that other forum rather than seeking to centralize all topics into the IGF. I am supportive of an IGF that is focused on issues where there is consensus across all stakeholders to discuss these issues. We cannot address all issues in the IGF, and the selection of issues should be focused on those where there is the greatest consensus and those that address development and capacity-building. An annual event of approximately three days, held in the same time frame each year, with the support of a small, streamlined Secretariat, supported by a representative multistakeholder steering committee, and focused on dialogue and information, will, I believe, ensure the greatest success. As for timing, we must now examine more than just intergovernmental calendars and ensure that care is taken to recognize that major international gatherings exist in the Internet space as well. Just in the late fall alone, we need to take note that in November, there is an important three-week meeting of the ITU's plenipotentiary, the annual meeting of ICANN in the first week of December, and there's an important gathering of the IETF in December. Thus, personally, I look forward to meeting with all of you in Athens in October before the late fall marathon of these other meetings exist. I also urge that there is sensitivity to the demands upon all of us when there are face-to-face meetings for preparation. The vast majority of interested parties from the technical community, from business, from civil society, and, indeed, from governments are not located in Geneva or a single other city. And, of course, we all have our day jobs, that is, the work that must be accomplished as well. So planning should be undertaken largely online, with perhaps contributions of one page in length that are concrete and focused. And when it is essential that there are face-to-face planning meetings, they should be kept to a minimum, there should be realtime transcription, as we have today, as well as posting of materials for access by remote participations. And when there are face-to-face planning meetings of the bureau Secretariat, I welcome the idea to have open consultations, but note that it is challenging for small businesses, and I think for everyone, to devote the human and financial resources to participation. I have appreciated the opportunity to participate yesterday and today, and I look forward to the rest of our working efforts today in how we can jointly ensure a successful and focused Internet Governance Forum that enhances multistakeholder dialogue.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have David Allen from the collaboration for communication policy research.

>>COLLABORATION FOR COMM. POLICY: I'd like to try to build on thoughts from Bertrand de la Chapelle earlier and from Brazil and from Switzerland, among several others. It's clear how important it is to have a successful first IGF, for ourselves, first of all, but to, for the future, attract those who have not so far engaged so much with this process, and also for those here who have some questions, some reservations about exactly what it will do. It seems clear from experience, at least to me, that real substantive, productive, attractive work in a meeting, like IGF, must be preceded by some serious substantive preparation. And I'm talking about substantive work on the topics that the program committee finally picks. And, equally, it seems that that gets done in groups of a size like ten or about that number. Let's call them working groups. Which says that to succeed in October, we need not only a selection of topics, perhaps in May from a steering committee, but there then need to be working groups really quite quickly formed and to get to work so that there is something to present in October. There's a subtext here. It is -- shall I call it the marriage between the working style of the Internet community, where working groups are everything, and where participation in those working groups is wide open, that's on the one side. And on the other side, the working style of U.N. proceedings and those that governments are particularly familiar with. We need in this brave new world to take the risk of those innovations and make some good choices about how that marriage will come together. This also raises issues about how we'll use online tools to support such working groups. But rather than go into that now, let me simply raise for consideration the importance of putting such core capabilities in place and to work soon so that there's something powerful to do in October in Athens. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have George GREVE for the Free Software Foundation forum.

>> GEORG GREVE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I speak in my capacity of the Free Software Foundation Europe, a European nongovernmental organization dedicated to all aspects of free software, as defined by the four fundamental freedoms specified in the free software definition. We operate in a network of sister organizations in Latin America, India, Europe, and the United States, and work in close cooperation with the Global Free Software Community. We have been following the discussions with great interest, and in the interest of moving forward, would like to offer a few comments on what we heard so far. Firstly, though, let me congratulate you and thank you and Mr. Kummer on the meeting and the open and inclusive spirit in which it was convened. We hope this will be maintained for future sessions. One of the terms we heard rather frequently in this debate was "multilingual." Alas, we are somewhat at a loss as to the concrete definition of this term. Private discussions throughout the past day and a half seem to have turned up various meanings and definitions that had little in common and were, in fact, at times contradictory. In the field of software, most people would probably understand it as localization of the software itself in order to make the software talk to each of its users in their own language. Since free software, and in particular, its freedom of modification, permits all groups to adapt the software to their own cultural environment, this has been a major driving force for adoption of free software in many parts of the world, especially many developing countries, which are often not considered interesting enough markets for major proprietary software vendors. You will thus not be surprised if I, of course, fully embrace the importance of multilingualism. If we plan for the IGF to come to concrete and successful outcomes, it does seem, however, necessary to come to a common understanding of what that term is actually supposed to mean.

Spam is another issue on the minds of many delegations. In our experience, spam is not so much a technical, but, fundamentally, a social and economic problem. Most of the technological remedies we have seen proposed in the past would do very little to address the issue of spam, but raise a serious issue of interoperability. Several delegations pointed out that the Internet has a close relation to the principles of interoperability and freedom. The connection between free software and its principles and the Internet is, indeed, not circumstantial. If one takes a look at the history of networks, one will find a list of proprietary approaches to build something like the Internet, which failed without exception. It took free software to make the Internet work. Spam remedies we have seen suggested by major industry vendors require discarding the very principles that made the Internet possible, and it would be tragic, indeed, if attempts at regulating spam were to undo what we have all come to depend on. We therefore consider it necessary for the IGF to establish for itself a set of basic principles that will uphold and strengthen the foundations on which the Internet was built. These principles shall, in particular, ensure freedom and interoperability on a fundamental level as a common ground on which to implement the principles agreed upon during the World Summit on the Information Society. Regarding the tools discussed to continue the forum online between sessions, I wish to emphasize the importance of practicing what we preach. All IGF online resources should be fully accessible to all users, including those with disabilities, and put effective use of bandwidth high on its list of priorities to avoid excluding participants in regions with limited Internet access. The free software community has a longstanding experience in ensuring participation and collaboration across cultural, language, and connectivity barriers and gladly offers its expertise to the process. As a final and very concrete remark, let me suggest that for future sessions of the IGF, the very basic and necessary facilities of those who wish to use the Internet will be provided in future sessions. I observed a serious power struggle going on in this room, and it was not about politics. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: That last point, this is one way you can recognize an IGF meeting is all of these wires where you will trip everywhere you walk. But I hope that these things change in time. I have one more. Philippe Vacheyrout, the president of Capucine.net.

>>PHILIPPE VACHEYROUT: Thank you, sir. Capucine.net, a nonprofit organization, has made a contribution to the Tunis Summit and we're glad to take part in this forum, without which the summit would have had no reason to exist. Our aim is to promote the use of ICT and a social partnership approach. We have a global approach based on users which leads us more specifically to study accessibility, sharing, and interoperability of use whilst we're expecting the specific features of each and every player, whatever his or her role in society. It makes it possible to concentrate on the fundamentals, such as security, accessibility, spam, multilingualism, subjects which we've already heard about, and we can thus contribute to a topic for the forum. To get down to the nitty-gritty, let's take personal medical files, which are being introduced in France. We are seeing the first effects of governance related to Internet use. It's no longer the doctor surrounded by patients, but patients surrounded by doctors, for preventive care and treatment. And the same will be true tomorrow for education, justice, employment, and online voting, with all the problems of accessibility and security relating to data protection, personal data, as well as the use of biometrics with the net, which is a hot topic. The aim is to find the means to put technology to the service of citizens and not the reverse. Convergence of technology, in particular, between the net and mobile phones is changing the possible uses we can make of them because we are seeing the emergence of new

standards and new uses which will provide answers to the questions we are now asking and also raise new questions. This requires innovation. And we will be delighted to see this forum as a context for allowing citizens to contribute to Internet governance. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. We will have one more speaker, but I am waiting for him to sit down. Vittorio Bertola.

>>VITTORIO BERTOLA: Sorry, you will have to wait for ten seconds for me to bring up the statement. Okay. I guess I was possibly the only one getting the floor immediately after asking for it. So thank you for that. Well, actually, my -- I wanted to give a statement on behalf of an online campaign, they had -- I am participating to it. And they've asked me to give this statement to address one specific topic on the agenda for the Athens meeting. And -- okay, it's almost there. Maybe. Well, maybe I can just introduce it. I mean, it is an online campaign named Tunis Mon Amour. It was launched in Tunis. And the objective of this campaign was to raise the creation for a Bill of Rights for the Internet. In particular, a document stating the rights of the users of the network. So this is the statement. We, the supporters of the Tunis campaign for an Internet Bill of Rights would like to plead (inaudible) to receive our proposal. Our campaign was started in Tunis by an appeal signed by members of all the stakeholders groups of the Internet, including Brazil's minister of culture, the former chairman of the European Data Protection Agency's working party, Professor Stefano Rodota; the founder of Creative Commons, Professor Lawrence Lessig; and the founder of the Free Software Foundation, Richard Stallman. The purpose of the campaign is to ask the United Nations to lead an open, inclusive, collaborative process involving all stakeholders, both online and offline, to draft and adopt a Bill of Rights of the Internet, stating rights and duties of the users of the net. So to set a common founding basis at the level of principle necessary to address the numerous methods related to Internet governance that have been raised during the WSIS and WGIG processes. We think that the new Internet Governance Forum is the natural place to host this discussion, and thus we would like to propose that this matter is added to the agenda of the first meeting to be held in 2006. In such occasion, we would like to discuss and agree how to start the process through which consensus on the new document could be reached. We thank you for your understanding and support. If you are interested in getting more information about this campaign, the Web site is www.tunisMONAOMO.org. Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: We have heard, I think, all the speakers who wanted to speak on those questions. And I have just been trying to think on how we proceed for the -- Australia, yes.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You might be going to answer my question, but I'll ask it anyway. Will you be taking further contributions this afternoon or should I do it now? My preference is to wait until after lunch.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I think let's meet after lunch. The reason is that I'm going to try and pose a few more questions to you. Because we need to move forward. And let me try and sense what I believe I can convey to the secretary general. First, as far as the question of convening the forum is concerned, I don't see any matter of dispute. It has already been decided. I do sense also a general agreement that it will be a multistakeholder forum with an open policy of participation, subject only to relatively light scrutiny of relevance, competence, and

bona fides of the organization and people who wish to participate. I would say that there is some question about the exact timing of the first meeting which consultations are going on. And I was hoping it would get resolved by lunchtime now. But it has not yet been resolved. One of the reasons I want to meet in the afternoon is in the hope that it may get resolved by then. But if not, we would have to live with the uncertainty as to the exact dates. But it would be sometime in October and November. I think these are fairly straightforward things. I also am impressed by the fact that there's general agreement on the need for a relatively organized multistakeholder management process for this, and for -- to avoid confusion, I'm proposing to just refer to it as the program committee. Because I think to use concepts from intergovernmental negotiations, words like "bureau" and so on, adds to confusion. Whereas I think "program committee" makes it very clear, its job is to manage the program. And so there are -- I think there is a general agreement on the need for a multistakeholder process for this program management. And I will call this process the program committee. I would like to say that there is agreement on how this will be constituted, but, frankly, there have been many -- people have not given a very precise idea on what they would see this committee as. One notion has been a committee with balanced representation from all of the stakeholders, governments, civil society, private sector, Internet community, also ensuring geographical balance across all of these sectors. %%%l3end.

%%tstart3. Another concept which has been put forward is the notion of three bureaus, A la WSIS, but presumably the three bureaus would have to work together if it is a multistakeholder process to arrive at a decision. But by implication of that three bureaus, it would mean that any one stakeholder group, so to speak, would -- that all stakeholder groups must decide that this is worth doing. That's, I think, the implication as I read it of the three bureau concept which has been put forward. But nevertheless, there are differences in terms of how this Program Committee should be put together or constituted. And also, people are not entirely -- have not been entirely explicit about how they see it being constituted. I would look forward to seeing any further comments that you have on this, because I think it is valuable to constitute this Program Committee -- agree -- that I would like to be able to say that there is general agreement. Otherwise, I will just convey the range of views on the Program Committee, and then the secretary-general will have to take a view on how to handle this. I think there has been a great deal of discussion on what is it that the meeting itself should do, and there there are differences. The differences were highlighted yesterday along what I would describe as three axes. On one axis it is vertical and horizontal issues. A feeling that many of the people were focusing on what would be described as the vertical issues, specific issues of spam or cybercrime and so on, whereas some people felt what were called horizontal issues in the Working Group on Internet Governance, et cetera, needed to get more attention. The second dimension of the things that I sense is if it is being handled somewhere, then the IGF should not get into it. And some people questioned that, saying why? Because after all, if it is being handled somewhere in a process that is not open, we must still need to talk about it in IGF because the whole point of IGF is it's an open process in which everybody can participate. And I sense a difference in the way people would look at the eligibility of an issue to be on the agenda in this dimension also. And the third dimension is let's avoid controversial issues, and some people said, no, not necessarily. Why should we avoid controversial issues. After all, the forum exists to give voice to people. And if it exists to give voice, you cannot necessarily avoid controversial issues. So these are differences, and I cannot tell the secretary-general that there is complete unanimity or agreement among people in those areas. In specific, I feel that there is a very strong message from not just the

developing countries but many of you on the importance of reflecting the developmental dimension more fully and adequately in the work of the IGF. And the question I had raised yesterday as to exactly what we mean, and some clarity did emerge today as to what do we mean when we say the development. And there was, for instance, a certain listing of what these things could be, which was mentioned by several participants, which I think is very helpful. I feel that there is -- perhaps this is not an area where there are big differences. Most people seem to -- the message they were conveying is that they really see the role of the IGF as something which is focused on development, except that what they meant by "development" was sometimes very broad, sometimes a little more narrow in interprets of just Internet development. So I would -- I feel this also needs to be explored a little bit further. I can't see that we can do that today, on this exploration of the agenda, and what the IGF could deal with more generally as well as what it should deal with in its first session. I don't think it's possible for me to be able to convey to the secretary-general a clear idea saying, "This is what we should be doing" type of thing. I also feel that there was some discussion on the format of the meeting. Several very useful suggestions came. Clearly, the impression that I gather is most people expect this to have a plenary at the beginning and the end, and a fair number of working sessions in the middle, depending on what the agenda is, whether it is one, five, or -- it all depends on what finally is the view taken on the agenda. There was also a suggestion on, if you like, a sort of high box speaker's corner, where people could just come and say their peace, a poster session, if you wish to call it. These are, I think, ideas which could be looked at. My own sense is that there's also been the idea, suggestion, that we really can't complete the consultations on this in these two days; that we may need a second round of consultation. I think there are some logistical problems in the second round in terms of doing it in Geneva because of the almost total lack of availability of meeting facilities, but there are other ways in which the consultation could be done. And maybe we can do the thing in two parts, which is that initially we just take some -- the secretary-general basically takes the minimal decisions which need to be taken in order to convene the forum so that there is some definiteness on the basis of which the Greek authorities can start proceeding, and the second round would then try to see, in greater depth, as to what would be done, the structure of the forum, the teams, and various other issues which arise. What I would like to see is some sense of agreement on how -- what sort of Program Committee should be constituted. I don't think we should get too focused on numbers, whether it should be 20 people or whatever it is. Some people said smaller than the Working Group on Internet Governance. That's one number that you can work with. Many people have mentioned the number 15 as the number for the country representation, because it gives you three from each region. I think that's something which is -- we can get to without too much difficulty. It's really a question of how it will be constituted, if it is a three-part committee, do you really see the three parts working independently or working together, in which case it really becomes a big committee of what do you see decisions being taken, so to speak, by -- separately and then coming together for some type of common agreement? How do we reflect the multistakeholder management dimension? We have to be creative in this process. The reason I'm stressing that we discuss a little, the whole question of the Program Committee in the afternoon and see whether we can get to some -- whether there is some further ideas which I could convey to the secretary-general, is because it's possible that the next round of further consultations would really be done by the Program Committee, who would then -- who would have the responsibility for managing the forum itself. There have been many references to how close or how far it should be from the U.N. I think in certain respects, we have to recognize that this is a forum which is born out of a U.N.-based process; that it is the U.N. later which will be looking into its

functioning as well as the various decisions, as we were reminded yesterday. But nevertheless, it's not a U.N. intergovernmental forum. The language is very clear. It is an Internet Governance Forum. It is not a classical U.N. subsidiary body of any sort. That is -- and this is certainly the legal opinion as far as I look. The point, however, is we have to see what aspects of the connection with the U.N. would be of use and value in this whole process. For instance, if we are to have host countries for this, as we have now, and this is probably almost unavoidable, because since nobody has a budget for this forum, it is going to depend very much on host countries and on voluntary funding. It would seem to me that it's useful to use some of the practices of the U.N. when it comes to the -- that aspect. I think as far as other aspects are concerned, it could be done, as things evolve.

There are some other aspects of U.N. work like the working in six languages which perhaps is something which also may be desirable for the forum to continue with, because it is meant to be a global forum, and if you start getting involved in the discussions in the forum on how many languages we should have, it will become too difficult.

Whereas here you have a standard, the six languages of the U.N. You work with that. And let's live with that practical approach. So there are aspects where I believe the forum could gain. But are there other?

Can people be a little more explicit and elaborate what other aspects of U.N. practice which they think would be of value, which other aspects are not of value? Because it's worth keeping in mind. I don't think this needs to be decided now, but it is something as a small matter which we wish to look at. I think the funding issue is important. As I said, none of us have a budget for this in the U.N. At the moment, a small Secretariat -- and let me be clear, the Program Committee is the management committee, like the political management committee for the forum, the Secretariat is just right now three of us, and I'm very part time. I work roughly 20 days a year for the Secretariat, whereas Markus and his assistant are there all the time, so it is pretty lightweight. If it is any lighter than that it will disappear [Laughter]

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: So it can't be lighter than what we have now. So I would say that the Secretariat arrangements are there, we have some resources. But perhaps the actual forum costs will, to some extent, will start being covered because of this hosting arrangements that we may have for the different forums. But I think the important point that I want to stress, which came across very sharply, is the resources that we need to enjoy -- to ensure that developing countries can participate effectively. I think this is a dimension we have often tended to miss out in this process -- in many of these processes. And I would stress this also. I would also now stress one more thing. A multistakeholder process involves not just rights. It also involves obligations. If it is a multistakeholder process, people are participating on an equal basis. I will then say, well, please help, then, with the running -- with the financing of this process also. Because I don't think it's possible to say that we'll run it as a multistakeholder process and then say, oh, no, the secretary must keep mobilizing money from governments on a voluntary basis to run everything. I would say I would certainly deliver one strong message from my side to this, which is that a multistakeholder process has to be looked at not just in terms of right but in terms of obligations to support that process, both financially but as well as politically and in terms of outreach. There are some -- one final issue I wanted to raise with you. When we start talking about the teams which we will cover in a forum like this, when we start talking about how the forum will be structured, let's keep in mind that we need to make this forum an attractive forum for people who are not normally a part of multilateral diplomacy. I was very impressed by a phrase which was used which was we need to make something where there is active capacity building of the people who come. A value proposition. Somebody said yes, if I go there, I will learn something.

I am going to come away with some contacts, maybe, maybe I learn something. Maybe some new deal will come out of this. We must keep this in mind. I have noticed, now that I live mostly in my own country rather than the big centers of multilateralism, Geneva and New York, that when I talk to people about this process and about Tunis, their reaction is "what's in it for me? Why should I go there?" It's not that they -- they have the money. All these chaps in India are making tons of money. But that's not their problem. Their problem is they don't see any value. They say there's nothing in this for me. And I think it's important that we keep this dimension in mind; that we have to try and design a forum which is not just a forum which would be attractive for people who are involved in multilateral diplomacy. We have to design a forum which is attractive for the people who are really involved in the development of the Internet at every level. At country level, at whatever else. And they are not going to be interested only in the big political issues. They are also going to be interested in the sorts of things we do, which make them -- which allow them to learn things, which allow them to connect with other people. So would urge you to keep this aspect in mind also, that I don't think we are going to get the sort of participation we want, particularly from developing countries. But people are much more particular about what they spend their money on since they have so much less of it. We will not get the participation from developing countries unless we make this a forum which really is a learning experience and not just a negotiating experience. I've seen this not just in this. I saw this when I was doing the Johannesburg summit. I saw this in other places, that the bulk of the -- most of the people who come there do not come there because of their interest in the negotiating processes or even in the debates. The people come there because they want to find out what is happening in their area of interest when other places in the world, what they can learn from it, what they can take away from it, who they can network with, what connections they can establish. And I think we should not lose sight of this when we speak of encouraging participation. Can we reflect this in some way in the way we actually manage this forum and run this forum? So I would pose these questions to you, and let's come back and see what reflections you have so that in the hope that I can convey to the secretary-general probably a somewhat slightly greater sense of convergence on some of these issues than what I sense so far. So with this, I would like to -- Pakistan. Sorry.

>>PAKISTAN: Sorry, Mr. Desai. When you were away, we had raised a point to Mr. Kummer from which we didn't get a response and we hope to get it in the afternoon. As you know, we represent the group of 77 and China. This concept of the Steering Committee or the Program Committee, there is no discussion within the group of 77 on that, and there is no agreement that we can convey to you or no understanding on that concept as such that we can convey to you here. And therefore, we'd like to put that down as a footnote and come back to it in the afternoon.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Certainly. In fact, my hope is that we focus on this. And as I said, basically the responsibility of convening the forum rests with the secretary-general. We are not negotiating here. I am only trying to get forth some views so I can convey something. Because this isn't a classical intergovernmental forum. And as I said, I would urge that we keep it flexible, so it's not as if things get decided forever. But we simply say that we decide things for the first forum, and then we see how things are and maybe change as they -- if things don't work out. But at this stage, let's see how much we can -- what sort of convergence I can sense. If I don't, I will just convey that to the secretary-general, say this is the range. And perhaps we may think in terms of doing things in two stages. Stage one where we

just take the basic decisions required for the Greek authorities to start their work, and then stage two where we get into some of the other details, where differences are more larger and more substantial, and where the process of finding common ground would then have to include some measure of give and take by the different parties. Let's see whether something like this can be done. We don't have to decide everything straight away, but at least enough to allow the process to start. Okay? Thank you very much. I see you at 3:00, then.

CONSULTATIONS ON THE CONVENING OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM TRANSCRIPT OF AFTERNOON SESSION 17 FEBRUARY 2006

[Note: The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the Consultations on the Convening of the Internet Governance Forum, in Geneva on 16-17 February in Geneva, Switzerland. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I posed a few questions at the end of the morning. And I hope some of you have had a chance to think about it and come back. I'm not sure we need to go all the way until 6:00, because we may just end up going over the same ground again. But I think we do need some timetable. I already have a set of speakers. I'm going to call on them. And then perhaps later turn to some of the sentiments of some of the others, if they have any suggestions to offer at this point. And then I'll try and see where we have ended up in the course of these two days and how we proceed further.

So can I first begin with Fay Howard from the center of European national top-level domain registries, followed by Norbert Bollow of Bollow software and economics research, followed by John Mathiason of Syracuse University, followed by (inaudible) of ICC, and then Francis Muguet of ENSTA.

Fay Howard.

>>FAY HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CENTR, the Council of European National Top-Level Domain Registries, represents 42 ccTLDs in Europe and beyond and has eight associate TLD members.

I must stress that we don't have a CENTR position here, but I'm speaking on behalf of four of our member registries who operate the .nl, .FR, .CA, and .UK registries, with a combined number of 8 million registrations or more.

And we would just like to address a couple of the questions that you raised this morning.

With regard to a program committee, we support the idea of a lightweight program committee with approximately 15 members, with a mechanism for renewing and changing the membership of that committee.

We'd like to see multistakeholder, but only one committee as we believe that is the most effective way of balancing and engaging the interplay of the interests.

And we need a balance between effectiveness, accountability, and representation.

And we would urge that the committee is formed as soon as possible.

With regard to the committee, we'd like to see if consultations could be continued online, so we're urging technological solutions for meeting.

We think the committee should operate in -- excuse me, I have a lot to scroll down here -- should operate in a manner that is transparent, accountable, and inclusive.

Decisions must be consensus-based and comparable with the principles of the Tunis Agenda.

The committee should also be charged with ensuring meaningful participation in the forum of participates from developing countries, both with financial and other support.

And we very much endorse your idea that there needs to be good reason to attend these meetings and that a learning process should be also in -- the reason for travel.

And we can definitely vouch within CENTR, one of the main interests for our members is exchange of information and that learning process about good practices.

We feel that the topics of the meeting should be initially on end user issues which merit discussion in the global context.

We've heard some speakers identifying things such as spam and multilingualism.

The forum should not avoid other topics, but, initially, it needs to build trust and consensus before moving on to those issues.

And we endorse the statement of participation in the broadest possible sense.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: My next one was Norbert Bollow.

>>NORBERT BOLLOW: Thank you.

I would just like to give a short follow-on to my statement this morning, where I spoke about giving leading technologists reason to come to the IGF.

And during discussions over lunchtime, I found that there seems to be considerable interest and reason for having a small workshop either before or after the IGF, focused on the question which technologies can build a bridge over the digital divide.

So I would very much like to invite everybody who thinks this is a great idea to get in touch with me, and we will get something organized.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

John Mathiason from Syracuse University.

>>JOHN MATHIASON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a short intervention on a subject that was provoked by one of your comments that one of the problems that the forum has is that funding is always going to be an issue.

And one of the issues is secretariat funding.

And I would just like to bring to everyone's attention that there are two secretariat functions.

One is the technical secretariat that organizes things, which Markus Kummer and his colleagues have done with exceptional competence, integrity, and efficiency.

And the second is substantive servicing, where the secretariat tries to provide information, ideas, and whatnot, that can provide the starting point for debate, move it along, and that sort of thing.

And that's the kind of thing which usually costs the most in resource terms.

Since the forum is a -- an innovative approach to issues of governance, we might want to think about an innovative approach to secretariats.

And using a computer analogy, perhaps one might consider in terms of the substantive secretariat a kind of distributed secretariat, where organizations that are willing to provide the secretariat-like function, meeting the criteria that secretariats usually have of independence, neutrality, and technical competence, to provide a kind of analysis that would be considered a useful starting point for discussions in whatever issue is chosen for the IGF.

The Internet Governance Project with which I work has tried to do some of the papers that we've prepared for the WSIS process and for this meeting with that philosophy in mind, in other words, that you have to have a set of documents that put the facts on the table, bring the precedents up forward.

And in some respects, outline the different perspectives that could be taken on a given issue.

This is something which you might consider as one of the innovations of the IGF process.

And this could be something that the program committee could work on as a means of engaging more of the -- at least the academic community in this process.

And it could be one in which you could achieve genuine partnership between institutions and scholars in developing countries as well as the usual developed-country people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: The next was Ayesha Hassan from CCBI.

>>AYESHA HASSAN: On behalf of CCBI and ICC, I'd like to provide a few comments in response to the questions that you posed before the lunch break.

On the program committee, we view it as an integrated program committee, with

equal, multistakeholder representation from governments, business, civil society, and the technical community.

We believe that these representatives should be selected in close consultation with stakeholders and would be looking to ensure diversity of geographic representation as well as experience in the representatives put forward.

We view this in the context of making recommendations and would hope that the U.N. secretary general would draw from that list, recognizing the decision-making role of the U.N. secretary general.

Business would put forward names of business representatives, along with biographical information, to reflect their expertise and experience to represent business interests, bring appropriate skills and diversity to the program committee.

Part of the aim of the selection process should be to ensure that the representatives will be vehicles for outreach to each group, to increase input from the broader expertise in the business community, for instance.

On the idea of multiple bureaus or program committees representing each stakeholder group, any one of the interested groups could always meet to discuss areas of mutual interest related to the integrated, multistakeholder program committee.

On the possibility of a second round of consultations, which has been mentioned, I would like to reiterate a few key considerations in this regard.

One, any further consultations must continue to be inclusive.

They should be planned with sensitivity to the limited financial and human resources of all stakeholders.

And the locations and dates should be selected so as to align them with other meetings on activities identified in the Tunis Agenda.

Lastly, we have listened to the discussions and would like to add that we look at the IGF as an opportunity to progress development, participation, and capacity-building issues.

And we support topics that could be constructive as an attempt to avoid controversy.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

Francis Muguet of ENSTA.

>>FRANCIS MUGUET: Yes.

I believe that there are two fundamental aspects that must be dealt with if we want to move ahead in our discussion.

The first one is to know whether or not IGF, as part of a U.N. summit, has to obey the rules of procedure of the United Nations.

That's the first point.

And secondly, to know whether or not the terms, terms such as "bureau," must be taken within the U.N. sense or on the basis of perhaps a broader, more

commonplace type of use or practice.

Now, having said that, if there is a bureau in the United Nations sense of the term, well, this bureau must deal with matters of procedure, and, furthermore, the bureau must be a multistakeholder one.

Now, when it comes to matters of content, and not talking about procedure, but content, we could envisage a program committee that would deal with matters of content.

And this program committee also should be multiactor and multistakeholder in nature.

And we should also make a distinction between the organizing committee for the first event looking at this forum on Internet governance.

Then this committee, this same committee, could benefit, as I said earlier, from a scientific committee.

This scientific committee would prepare the proposals for different themes and also keep the public abreast of different themes that are emerging.

And when I say the public, I mean all the actors, it be the government, governmental sector, civil society, but also the private sector as well.

And so I think that these are matters that should be set forth very clearly, on a very clear basis.

And then I would like to make another suggestion.

This suggestion is linked to the issues that I just raised, but which is different, nonetheless.

And this is that following the first event of Internet governance, well, some players think that we're only looking at Internet governance, but it would be possible to look at also a world forum of digital solidarity.

And this could be an event that would occur just after the first forum.

I will not speak at greater length, because this is perhaps not within the crux of the subject that we're dealing with right now.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

Adam Peake, and then I have Dominican Republic there.

>>ADAM PEAKE: Thank you, chairman.

Adam Peake from Glocom.

I'm speaking on behalf of a few civil society people who met over lunch and tried to come up with answers to the questions you posed earlier in the day.

So this is just a brief summary of our thoughts.

The first question, I think, was the membership of the program committee.

And we did agree on the concept of a program committee.

Quite simply, all stakeholders should be represented, we think equally, and as equals.

All regions should be represented.

We think we can learn much from the WGIG process in terms of selection and composition.

There are certainly lessons there to be learned.

But, essentially, more balanced in terms of representation than we saw the eventual WGIG, although that was very favorable.

And we're very aware of the development perspective of the forum.

So, of course, much stronger representation of developing nations than we've seen previously.

We do believe that the program committee should not be an advocacy space.

It's not something that people should lobby to get their pet issue taken up.

A trusted group that works to consider suggestions from all stakeholders is what we were really thinking about.

And we suggest that it should be a working-level group.

I think that reflects an answer to a question that was in the questionnaire you sent around before this meeting.

What should the actual meeting do when we meet in Athens?

Well, we've been hearing some different ideas, really, about the idea of themes.

Some people have been talking about the selection of themes and what that selection actually means against themes that emerge from discussion and deliberation.

I think those are two distinct processes.

Themes that evolve should be really what we're talking about, rather than trying to specifically select them.

And we do have time for that kind of consideration, I think.

We strongly suggest that horizontal issues should not be excluded.

That doesn't necessarily mean that they have to be taken up.

But they should not be excluded as a matter of course.

On issues of duplication and the idea of don't do what is being done elsewhere, we'd suggest that nothing is being done elsewhere, that absolute "nothing" is perhaps a bit too strong.

What we mean is issues may be being addressed within the context of a meeting or process, but they are most likely not being addressed in a multidimensional way, not considering the cross-cutting issues, gaps, et cetera, that I think the Tunis Agenda refers to.

So there is nothing that should be excluded.

And, again, a sort of caveat to that is that doesn't mean that everything should be included.

But there's nothing that should be excluded.

In terms of controversy, basically, what's controversial for me may not be controversial for you.

So solutions might themselves be controversial, but topics are not.

Therefore, I think we're suggesting that nothing should be excluded simply because someone says, "Oh, this is controversial."

So that's our answer there, I think.

There was an issue about the development perspective.

And we believe capacity-building is critical.

And will you -- there have been some proposals from civil society members about this.

However, capacity-building is not the be-all and end-all of this process.

The focus of the forum should be on ensuring that developing nations are heard, developing nation issues are prioritized and led by people from developing nations.

So I think that's the development perspective summarized.

In terms of meetings and duration, we think the three days, as we understand it being suggested now, is probably too short.

Very much recognizing the common sense of the proposal of the comments from Brazil in this regard.

We're beginning a new process, and any pilot process may require more time rather than less.

So we should take the opportunity of enjoying time in Athens.

And a very specific suggestion is that if we actually begin the formal meeting on a Tuesday, well, you almost automatically have a day on Monday for stakeholder meetings, thematic meetings and other preparations.

So there are all kinds of considerations to be taken into account when thinking about meeting timing and duration.

Rushing through, second round of consultations.

Yes, absolutely.

So long as that they're multistakeholder.

And we suggest held in conjunction with a meeting of the program committee.

They should, we think, be supported by prior online processes.

And we can learn much from the WGIG consultations in this regard, which I think were quite successful and certainly we can improve upon.

About the United Nations and learning from experiences there and linkages, the only concern we really have is about the meaning and understanding of what a working group is.

Our perspective from civil society is that it would be the light Internet community-type working group, not a very formal, bureaucratic group.

These should be almost self-forming, thematic kind of entities.

So we're thinking of a very lightweight group there.

And I don't think that's quite what the U.N. often means.

In terms of resourcing, we'd like to suggest the idea of considering supporting the secretariat through a distributed plan of work.

And this is very much what John Mathiason was saying, I think, designing a work plan and then inviting people to support it through papers or whatever may be the appropriate means to support that.

But I think you can get a lot of work from the rest of us by inviting us to participate.

And I hope we'll be able to take up any challenge that you can give us in that regard.

Finally, a definition of success.

Well, I think we're envisaging this as a process.

So success will mean not necessarily a report, but a continuation of that process.

And that would mean ongoing discussions, perhaps groups working towards best practices, shared learning, and so on.

So a continuation of the process, an acceptance of that process by stakeholders as being something worthwhile to continue would be the definition of success we would be looking for.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Adam, yes, I think it will be -- your intellectual contributions will be very nice.

But hard cash would be even nicer.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: And --

>> Philanthropic people, yes.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have the Dominican Republic.

>>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is the first time my delegation is speaking, so we would like to thank the secretary general of the United Nations for having called this meeting, and also, my delegation would like to add its voice to those statements made this morning and yesterday by the delegation of the G77 and China and Pakistan.

Our delegation in this connection would like to put on the record a number of items regarding what we think the IGF forum should be.

Our understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the meetings should be held on an annual basis and they should last three to five days.

We say three to five days because this is the first time we'll be debating these various themes in a very open way, and for my delegation, it would be very important to involve many different themes in this forum.

And also, it is our hope that there will be very wide participation as well.

So in our view, three days would be a bit short.

But five days, in five days, we should be able to deal with many themes and have a more constructive debate as well.

Regarding the program committee that was proposed, that you proposed and others proposed as well, and seconded, this should be formed as was the case in the conference on information.

But we think it could be a little bit more vast as well, that there could be greater input, greater participation, stronger regional participation so as to take into account the interests of developing countries and to have greater input and participation by developing countries.

Also, we would like to agree with what was stated by the delegation of Morocco when it comes to regional events as well.

This would be very important for us.

It would be good to have working groups set up, and it would be good if these working groups could meet on a regional level and then also there could be conclusions on a multilateral level.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I don't have more speakers, so let me try and bring this to some sense -- Raul, the head of the NRO.

Then Australia.

And the Worldwide Web consortium.

Raul.

First was Raul and then Australia.

>>RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to express some comments regarding the questions that you raised this morning as the representative of the NRO regarding the setting up of the program committee, and as other speakers have stated already, as we see it, the experience of WGIG has been very interesting and we should draw upon this.

I think that the way in which WGIG was set up was a format making it possible to arrive at a good balance in terms of regional representation and also the interest of the various positions, and also the various sectors as well.

It's our hope and it's the hope of the NRO, that we can have as much

participation as possible by the technical committee within the program committee.

And we hope it'll be better participation, stronger than what we had in WGIG.

And so in this regard, we would like to express our will to contribute as we have in the past as well.

It's our belief that there should be a balanced, fair participation by governments, civil society, private sector, and also the Internet technical committee as well.

As other speakers have said as well, it's very important that we have working mechanisms put in place on the basis of consensus.

And this was also stated in the comments that we sent before this event and which are on the Internet Web page on Internet governance.

Furthermore, I'd like to say that the size of the program committee should not -- well, should not exceed 20 people.

And we consider that the secretary general of the U.N. will find the best format, along with you and Mr. Kummer as well, and so in this way, there should be a good balanced makeup of the program committee and it should be one single committee.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Australia generally concurs with what appears to be the emerging consensus on the structure and the operation of the IGF, namely that it be an open and multistakeholder, focused on an event of three days and that it's Secretariat be guided in its preparation by some kind of multistakeholder committee.

In terms of the format for the meeting, we think there is sufficient experience on this question not to make it too problematic. Our initial views on some of the finer details of the forum are set out in our responses to the questionnaire which is with the Secretariat. To a large extent these views stand, though we are, of course, listening carefully to the ideas coming forward and we will be reviewing our position accordingly. In this intervention, however, in response to your request this morning that we engage in an interactive dialogue, we would like to give our reaction to some concerns and proposals that have been made yesterday and today.

Concerns has been expressed that issues are being put forward as priorities for discussion in the IGF which are not cross-cutting enough or are too readily being consigned to silos. I'm not quite sure that we would agree that Spam, security, and cybercrime, for example, are not cross cutting. They seem to raise implications in a range of areas and to warrant responses from a range of areas and institutions. But I do not really want to ponder on the meaning of cross cutting. I would observe that many issues lend themselves to be tackled in a cross-cutting manner from a multidimensional perspective, and we consider that is what is important. In addition, while there is a general statement that there are many cross-cutting issues, paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda also identifies particular functions and themes for the IGF which may not always be easily reconciled with this idea of cross-cutting issues.

Concerns have also been expressed that to call for IGF discussions to be

nonduplicative will unnecessarily limit discussion. I do not think the point here is really to rule out particular issues.

To try to do so would not sit well with the IGF's mandate for, for example, to facilitate discourse between bodies and to interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations.

The point here, and the reason the words were included in the Tunis Agenda, is to recognize there are some established expert bodies where certain issues can be discussed and are being discussed, and the substantive work of these bodies need not be duplicated, and to do so would waste the scarce resources of the IGF.

Another point that was -- was that divisive issues should not be quarantined, and conversely, there is little value in discussing issues on which there is agreement. The reference in particular was to the development of public policy principles for Internet Governance and the process for enhanced cooperation.

Our view is that parallel but separate process has been established to progress these matters, and that is the best process to use.

To duplicate that debate in the IGF will give stakeholders an excuse not to constructively engage in the other process.

Moreover, as we saw in WSIS, it will see the sidelining of the issues that, yes, everyone agrees are problems, but no one rarely goes any further to deal with.

Surely, Internet users will appreciate some solid action in areas where there is an agreed problem, where progress is more likely, the benefit more certain, and there is not a parallel process.

Several speakers have also emphasized that we should take a flexible approach to the IGF, to see how it goes and be prepared to adapt as appropriate.

We would endorse this view. As Singapore has said, it makes sense to start small and to get bigger as the IGF is proven.

Now, to turn to some procedural issues, and I apologize for the time taken, but obviously we've covered a lot of ground, and it's a long flight here.

[Laughter]

>>AUSTRALIA: There have been proposals that the IGF (inaudible) meeting but rather an ongoing, online policy discussion process or cycle that culminates with each annual IGF meeting. Various models have been proposed and comments and contributions. We Fully support the use of ICTs to maximize preparation for and participation in the IGF. We also understand the attractions of such proposed online policy discussion processes, but we think the proposition needs to be considered carefully. A key concern from our perspective is the actual human resources such processes would require on an ongoing basis if all stakeholders are to participate in them in a meaningful way. We are concerned such processes may not receive the substantive commitment that they would require. It would also need to be clear what exactly those processes would produce. The issue of language also arises. We tend to see, in contrast, a focused annual meeting as a more resource efficient and effective means of proceeding. As such, we do not see online processes being mandated from above as an integral part of the IGF, but rather being encouraged as bottom-up initiatives.

On the composition of any advisory group, we consider that if there is such a group, there should be only one and that it should be multistakeholder. That is, there should not be separate groups for separate constituencies. There is

a tension between having a small manageable group and a larger one which provides for a diversity of views. This is something on which the chair may be interested in expressing his views given his WSIS experience.

On reflection, a slightly larger group than what we propose now contribution may be better. Key stakeholders should be included, including from the Internet community. This may mean that the secretary-general should select the members in the first instance. We stand by our view, however, that this group's member should have expertise, seniority, and the networks needed to fulfill their functions. This should be true, too, of any government representatives. They should have these qualities, not simply be there to reflect political considerations.

We agree that the development focus of WSIS suggests this, too, should be taken into account in composing the group, but does not necessarily mean weighted representation from developing country governments. It could mean people with expertise in the developmental area from both developed and developing world. We think it is very important that the group operate transparently and consult widely.

On the question of duration of meetings, Brazil has made some good points, particularly that if a large number of issues are discussed, there will not be much substantive discussion. And this is not something we would prefer.

Our solution to this, as we have said here and in our submission, is to focus on a key theme or issue and treat it in depth.

We would see these meetings being based on substantive inputs prepared and possibly published in advance by relevant experts, experienced practitioners and interested stakeholders. Here we support the comments of Switzerland and others made this morning. Further, we consider substantive discussion is the way to attract the high profile stakeholders which in turn will make the IGF a success. And a successful forum will also make it easier to attract funding.

On the issue of whether forum meetings should rotate geographically, Australia sees both advantages and disadvantages with this proposal. The positives include facilitating access to meetings, particularly in developed countries, and sharing costs. The negatives potentially include logistical difficulties distance for missions with subject experience and additional cost for the Secretariat. I'm sure these debates are all well-rehearsed within the U.N. system.

This is an issue on which we are flexible, but on the assumption the first IGF will take place in Athens, we do tend towards the view that our meetings should be in a single geographically convenient location. But as I said, we are fairly flexible on that. We do, however, think it is important for the secretary not to rotate for cost and continuity reasons and for it to remain in a single geographically convenient location.

The issue of further consultation has been raised. For its part, Australia welcomes consultation on key issues. If there is to be further consultation before advice is provided to the secretary-general, we would find it helpful if some outline of the state of thinking were published to which we could respond. We would also support this consultation being undertaken online.

Fortunately, in conclusion, Australia would like to reiterate its view that the IGF can be a very valuable mechanism for ongoing innovation, development, and expansion of the Internet, particularly with regard to the concerns of developing countries. And here we welcome the contributions from developing country stakeholders as to their particular priorities.

We need to ensure that the IGF is organized and operates in a way that addresses this.

This includes a commitment of all stakeholders, including government, private

sector, civil society, and the technical and academic communities.

And thank you and I'm sorry for taking so long.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

I have the WorldWide Web Consortium.

>>WORLDWIDE WEB CONSORTIUM: Thank you. So my name is DANIEL Dardailler. I am representing the World Wide Web Consortium, W3C, and this is the organization defining THE FORMAT THAT is used on the Internet, LIKE HTML OR XML or Web services AND things like that.

SO we are not really on the agenda of the IGF yet, but like other consortia like IETF and others, we are completely open to your participation, and of course we are ready to participate in the IGF, whatever format it takes, and to our level of expertise and resource, of course, because I think we have things to say as technician and in project like the web ACCESSIBILITY initiative, for INSTANCE, FOR defining technology for people with disability, like blind user to use the Internet and the Web. And we also have activity on privacy and security.

So the W3C is open to PARTICIPATION today, and we have a lot of international participate in that level already.

So I think what I would like to do for the IGF, what I would like to see happening is that the -- it use operationally the full power of the Internet, of the Web, and HYPERTEXT system. It's kind of difficult today to browse the document because they have usually not used the full power of links and things like that.

So I would like to encourage the IGF, whatever format it takes, is that the outcomes are presented in open, nonproprietary format that are used on the web everywhere else, like HTML.

Thanks.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I have Khaled FATTAL from the MINC, and then Francophonie, and then the U.S., and then Milton Mueller.

>>MINC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Khaled Fattal. I am THE CHAIRMAN AND NCO OF MINC, Multilingual Internet Names Consortium.

I would like to START BY paying tribute and I am feeling very humble. Yesterday's intervention and today's intervention from many parties, in comparison with some of the interventions we used to hear two, MAYBE three years ago and especially at the formation of WGIG, the EDUCATION process has REALLY TAKEN A MAJOR LEAP FORWARD, AND I THINK THIS IS a VERY positive thing. You will recall the issue of multilingualism at that time may have been picked up by a few interventions. It really needed further highlighting. Yesterday and today I observed that many of the interventions have actually made this as a key component. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, Brazil, China, the E.U. seem to have all put it as a major priority.

Something else I would like to add. So in that sense, I feel a lot of the work that MINC and other groups have been undertaking in highlighting this issue have actually reaped some fruits and to a large extent, repetition also has

been good.

So it has really fermented that issue.

Something else I would like to add.

I did have a prepared statement. I'm going to break away from that for the interest of time. But it's important for us to lay out what really is at issue.

There are many ways to measure successes and failures. In ONE sense the international community has been debating and demanding equal access to the Internet for years. As emphasized by the secretary-general of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, CULTURES AND COMMUNITIES ALL OVER THE WORLD, WHEN THEIR NATIVE LANGUAGES USE NEITHER ENGLISH nor Latin-based character sets have been left out of the Internet. As a result, more than 4.5 billion people remain at the margins of the information society and cannot really benefit from the Internet as a tool for enlightenment and education. They are disenfranchised from the Internet. In December of 2003, the WSIS declaration of principles and action plan adopted in Geneva by the representatives of some 172 countries, civil society, private sector, worldwide, clearly identified, multilingualism as a key objective, necessary for an inclusive information society.

It was also recognized that multilingual Internet access, including through URLs in local languages, was a vital element in Internet Governance. Good governance, Mr. Chairman, of the Internet requires active and inclusive participation by all stakeholders, including the 4.5 people still left out.

Two years later in November 2005, the world summit concluded its final phase in Tunis, despite great efforts, very wide participation, and hundreds of millions of dollars in cost. There was no SIGNIFICANT process to eliminate the digital divide that everyone seems to be calling on for continuously. Those COMMUNITIES are still disenfranchised and left out.

So now the IGF is discussing the next step forward, which we fully support and we actively wish to participate in. In that sense, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion what i would like to add is that you will need all the help that you can get to succeed.

And for that, MINC is undertaking some major initiatives in 2006. One of them which is in support of the Tunis declaration, paragraph 71, which specifically relates -- states relevant organizations should commence a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders, proceeding as quickly as possible and responsive to innovation.

The announcement and formation in order to facilitate the coordination with local language authority.

We would like to offer the IGF that MINC will be -- has announced and will be further informing the public at large the formation of the MINC coordination mechanism council. It's the MINC ICMC, it's a coordination mechanism council. In its process it aims to work with all interested stakeholders and parties so that we can actually bring this digital divide to a close as soon as possible.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, we offer whatever capabilities that MINC can present to support IGF and your leadership so that we can bring the disenfranchised into this Internet phenomenon. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Francophonie.

>>OIF: Thank you, chairman.

We've taken the floor again to reflect the special interest that we have in your comment on the participation of developing countries in the IGF process.

You rightly said that it was important for these countries beyond any negotiations should learn something, should benefit from their participation in the IGF.

And this question of developing country participation was raised by several delegations here. It's a core issue. But it's also complicated, because there are financial problems, financing which hasn't yet been found.

So in the light of what we have discovered in Africa when preparing the Tunis phase of the summit, we would like to recommend that there be a regional approach, particularly under the U.N. secretary-general based on the regional organizations.

Now, on the world summit, between the first and the second phases, thanks to the various regional preparatory measures which occurred in Africa and which were supported by international organizations such as ECA, UNESCO, of course Francophonie and others, all this made it possible for Africa to strengthen its contribution to the world summit.

And we think that in the IGF, that sort of process, if it were proposed by the secretary-general through his recommendations, and if it were supported, could allow the various regions, and particularly developing regions, to prepare well before the holding of the forum. Activities, for example, could occur on the fringes of regional activities which already take place, and with the support of various organizations would allow the various topic adopted to be broached.

This would, at lesser cost, allow for greater participation, because the few people who could attend the forum in Greece could then spread the word throughout the region and ensure that the forum be as inclusive as possible.

That then was the proposal we wanted to put before you just to add to the ideas that you raised this morning.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

The United States.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to reiterate a few ideas I expressed yesterday on behalf of my delegation.

The United States would like to see as light a process as possible with as few cumbersome procedures as possible. We would like to see a multistakeholder process. We would encourage the adoption of just one multistakeholder program committee which would include participation from both developed and developing countries.

As far as format, we would anticipate a forum of two to three days, using a combination of plenary sessions and expert panels, as suggested by other speakers.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

Milton Mueller.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Can you hear me?

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Yes.

>>MILTON MUELLER: This is Milton Mueller.

I appreciate the direct response and dialogue that was contained in the Australian delegate's discussion just a few minutes ago. So I'd like to continue that process and respond to certain parts of that.

The clarifications regarding what he considers to be duplicative issues and his expansions on the notion of cross-cutting issues I think are useful and helpful.

I was a little bit more concerned about the intervention about there being a parallel process, and that was a reason for excluding a particular topic from the forum.

We are unaware of any officially declared parallel process. And if there is such a process, we'd like for it to be identified and for the rest of us to be told how we could participate in this process and provide input into it.

Otherwise, one gets into a somewhat strange situation in which the forum's legitimacy and its capacity are undermined by decisions to take what certain governments consider to be the really important issues out of the forum and exempt them from discussion in a fully multistakeholder environment.

I'm sure the Australian government can understand the concern that civil society would have about this, that we are told that we cannot discuss something in the forum because it's already being discussed possibly in an invisible process we don't know about that we cannot participate in. That doesn't sound like a viable response to our concern.

So I hope that this could be clarified also.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

I have Switzerland, then followed by Dr. Jeremy Beale from the confederation of British industries, and then ISOC.

Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, chairman.

I'd just like to take up the appeal you made at the end of the morning session on a number of issues and give you our impressions.

On the Program Committee, I think we want to keep it simple and practical. And one single committee, with all the various participants involved, government, private sector, civil society and international organizations, would be enough.

On the topics for discussion, I don't think we should engage in self-censorship

and exclude any given topic or topics, but we must be aware that there are topic where we can already see a fairly consensual approach to allow for progress. We've heard a lot about Spam and cybersecurity. And then there are other rather more delicate and difficult topics.

And for us to have a properly structured forum which can make progress, I think we need both consensual and maybe more difficult -- a more difficult topic. We should realize that enlightenment comes from dialogue. We can get solutions in that way. And we shouldn't be afraid of any topics. We should also be aware, though, that some topics are already being discussed in other fora with other partners, and that we have to avoid duplication.

We would be doing a disservice to the forum if it were to deal with topic which were already dealt with in depth elsewhere.

I think people might get tired of that sort of thing.

So we need some sort of balance.

On the rules to be applied, the IGF is a rather special sort of entity. It's an ELIOD (phonetic) as you would put it, as legal experts would put it in Latin. It's not what you can classify on what already exists. It's not the U.N., as most speakers have said, but some U.N. rules could apply. For example, languages, a matter raised several times. It's very important for us to be able to use the six U.N. languages.

Whereas, it's also been frequently said that we don't want the overly rigid U.N. rules involving participation, in particular because of the inclusive nature of the IGF.

So I think we have to be creative, take some of the U.N. rules but not forget that the IGF was something -- was intended to be something autonomous.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you. I have Dr. Beale from the confederation of British industries.

>>JEREMY BEALE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will make what I hope is a short but pertinent point.

It's in regard to the question of working groups, and of a Secretariat with a research or paper generating capacity that was raised a few moments ago.

Given the points that you raised before the lunch break about the question, if not the problem, of funding, it would seem to me that it might be both more efficient in terms of use of resources if we actually didn't go down that path, but actually allowed all the constituent parts of the IGF to be able to submit their own papers.

We have, I'm sure, many areas of expertise within civil society, the business community, and amongst governments.

It would also allow regions to be able to define their own positions as was suggested earlier, but also it wouldn't mean that every region had to feel obliged to do that. So it would be more flexible and it would allow the development of a more lightweight operation, which is a stated goal in many respects.

So I would just think that we could take that more sort of less cumbersome organizational approach.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you.

Can I turn to ISOC.

>>ISOC: Chairman, thank you for giving us the floor again. I promise to be brief.

We would first and foremost like to commend you and the secretary on shepherding us through this meeting. As usual, you have done so with humor, fairness, and great skill.

We would also like to address one of the questions you left us with before lunch, that of the forum as a learning forum.

One of the Internet society's core responsibilities is education, and the importance of education to Internet deployment and capacity building and economic development.

It is with education and learning in mind that we, along with the Internet community, will continue to support increased participation by developing countries in the Internet Governance forum.

We will do so through our ongoing and recognized education and policy-related programs, roundtables and workshops around the globe.

We also commit to provide the technical expertise to the forum, as is appropriate and necessary, to ensure the fullest understanding of the fundamental technical aspects that underlie the issue areas that will be focused on in the forum meeting.

Chairman, we stand ready to exist and to making the forum a success.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Bill Drake.

>>WILLIAM DRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I also wanted to speak to the question of working groups very briefly in response to a couple of the comments that were made.

Concerns were expressed about the cost and personnel requirements, if all stakeholders were to participate in a meaningful way, about mandating from rather than -- what would be produced by them.

On the first point, I think there's perhaps a little bit of a disconnect in how some of us are thinking about this could be rather easily bridged.

In the U.N. setting, perhaps a working group sounds like an invitation to a large, compulsory type of event in which all stakeholders would feel that they must be represented and must weigh in and must issue a lot of inputs and so forth.

We certainly in civil society were not thinking of it in that way.

We were thinking of it much more in the manner of the Internet engineering task

force, a fairly decentralized process, a light one.

It doesn't have to have a heavy administrative I don't know head at all.

Some people identify an issue that they think is important and compelling.

They perhaps formulate a problem statement that would be made available to other potential partners through some central mechanism, perhaps the secretariat would have an e-flash or something where they make people aware of things that are being debated.

Maybe it would be on secretariat Web site, whatever.

There would be a call to participate.

Anybody who wanted to join could join.

You would have, then, some electronic discussion and sharing of ideas.

And then the group would decide whether, A, it wants to do anything beyond that in terms of physically meeting, or perhaps holding a meeting on the day prior to the official forum itself to carry on other discussion.

And then, B, they could select what kind of output, if any, they might want to have, which might then be input into the larger plenary session.

That might be simply a short position paper, a more elaborate study of some sort.

Recommendations.

It could take a variety of forms.

But the point is, it need not be overly standardized, overly rigid.

And it need not involve a great deal of resources.

It would be an opportunity under the umbrella of the IGF for those people who have a shared interest in a topic to discuss it in a nonbinding way.

It's come as you are.

If you want to be there, you are.

And if you're not -- you're not interested in being there, you're not.

So, to us, that is very much a bottom-up process, and the product would be one that is potentially something that could enrich the larger dialogue.

The larger plenary then could designed whether, hmm, this is an interesting matter that's been brought up by this working group.

Perhaps this merits further conversation in a larger, more structured setting, et cetera.

Or they might just look at it and say, "Thank you very much for your efforts," and do nothing with it.

But either way, the vehicle is there to provide people on a multistakeholder basis to have a dialogue that they can't have anywhere else.

And that would be, I think, quite useful.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: I have (inaudible), the president of (inaudible).

>> Thank you, Chairman.

I'll be speaking on behalf of African civil society.

And, in particular, I wanted to support two positions, that of Francophonie, just now speaking of decentralization.

I think it's important to note that very few developing countries are represented here.

And as long as the structure is centralized here in Geneva and everything passes through Geneva, obviously, developing country participation will be low, because people just can't afford to go to Geneva every time to take part.

So the idea of decentralizing structures, in particular, working through the United Nations economic commissions seem to me a basic idea.

In any case, African experience has shown the extremely important role in terms of logistics and preparation of content and substance on the themes dealt with by the summit.

It's an almost irreplaceable role played by ECA, in particular, by regional meetings and other ensuing meetings.

So I think there's a real concern for decentralization which must be shared by people in charge of the IGF.

Even if you have to set aside room for expert committees which might be freer to work and which could add expert input to the subjects to be dealt with, that's something we think is important to support for African civil society, which, as you know, doesn't always have the money to come to Geneva or Europe.

Secondly, on Athens, the site for the time being is only in English, and it seems very important for the future for things to be posted up at least in French as well, given the importance and the numbers of French-speaking participants.

Those are the two points we wanted to underscore, repeating the interest that African civil society has in taking part in this session, and we hope in continuing to contribute to consideration in sessions yet to come.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Mr. Kleinwaechter.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: You can keep a lot of trouble out if you give the Program Committee only a limited mandate.

The real work which has to be done by the Program Committee is to draft an agenda and to guarantee that the invited speakers are really representatives for the global Internet community, that means come from several countries, from all around the globe, gender-balanced and things like that.

That means to have a very limited mandate for the Program Committee would make it much more easier and help to avoid conflicts.

And it would make the life easier for the Program Committee if you would start soon.

And virtual discussion process on the Web site of the forum so that the Program Committee can look into the discussion and can then get a feeling or a clue, you know, what -- in which direction the discussion goes so that it's not that the discussion will predetermine what the Program Committee will have to decide, but the Program Committee would be in a better position than to come to the final decision with regard to the agenda.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Okay.

What I'm suggesting now is that we have a word, hear from Greece, the organizers of the first forum.

After that, I will try to say a few words, to see how we proceed from this point.

Because, clearly, we cannot close things now.

So we have to -- I have to suggest how -- before Greece, my apologies, Bertrand.

Greece, we can wait, Bertrand de la Chapelle, and then Greece.

I will try to suggest what are the next steps, because I cannot say that we can close the issue at this space, and what's the sort of time line for the work.

And then we'll see how it goes from there.

Bertrand.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor.

I am sorry for imposing myself on that.

Just a few points.

First of all, focusing the IGF, the annual IGF on a single issue would make this forum look like many thematic conferences of all sorts, business or elsewhere.

Addressing a few issues is probably necessary, in a limited number, as I said.

A correction on what I said this morning.

The Brazilian delegate made a reference afterwards.

But I want to repeat that the number of themes that I suggested is between four and six, and not more, so that we don't stay during two weeks.

Another point is that in the debate between vertical issues and horizontal issues that you mentioned, in many cases, vertical issues, meaning precise themes, such as, for instance, Internet connection costs, can, in fact, serve to illustrate horizontal issues like accessibility and availability to the Internet.

And, finally, two points.

The format in six points for suggesting themes that I presented this morning is, of course, following a few private comments that I received from governments, not, and couldn't be, a compulsory format for submission, but just an attempt to propose a format that could be shared by actors who want to use it.

And I will circulate something later on that.

The last point is to support what Milton Mueller was saying earlier about the enhanced cooperation.

I want just to remind everybody in this room that paragraph 71 of the Tunis Agenda says that the process towards enhanced cooperation to be started by the U.N. secretary general involving all relevant organizations will involve all stakeholders and should be -- and launched before the end of the first quarter of 2006.

So we're a bit late.

And, obviously, the process should be multistakeholder.

And we're all looking forward to more information on how the two processes will be articulated one with the other.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Did you want the floor, Ayesha?

>>AYESHA HASSAN: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I'd like it for my colleague, Peter Hellmonds, who's trying to bring his card up to you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Peter Hellmonds.

>>AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you very much.

We appreciate it.

>> Peter Hellmonds: Thank you, chairman.

This is the nature of these consultations, I guess, that you're in final rounds of talking to your colleagues.

Anyhow, I'm Peter Hellmonds.

I work for Siemens in communications, but here I speak on behalf of CCBI and ICC members, to provide a few concluding remarks from the business community.

First of all, we'd like to thank you for so efficiently conducting these consultations and for the spirit of free information exchange.

We can see the workings of the future of the Internet Governance Forum right here in action, already embodying some of the key elements that we from the business community and many others have stressed.

Allow me briefly, Mr. Chairman, to elaborate on the idea of spirit by using an analogy to doing business, where, from my experience, there are two modes of dealing with business counterparts.

First, there is what we can call a bizarre style of bargaining, where you drive each other down to rock bottom prices and conditions.

This, however, is a style of one-off deals, because it often leaves one party sour.

The other style is what the first could and should turn into, which is a more familiar style.

Here, it is informing a continuing relationship between business partners where the emphasis is on keeping good relations between these partners.

And I must say I'm pleased to see that we have in these consultations already begun very successfully to turn from the bizarre style bargaining model that perhaps we had more in the WSIS and PrepCom process leading up to the WSIS in Tunis, that we have changed that into the more familiar style of forging good working relations amongst each other.

We can see that happening in the plenary interventions we have heard, but even more so in the bilateral and multilateral discussions that are taking place during lunch and coffee breaks and other occasions here in the Palais des Nations.

I would like to call upon all of us to maintain this positive spirit.

We are in this together because the Internet is here for all of us.

We all should find that it works to our advantage to maintain the global nature of the Internet and make sure that all of the stakeholders, even those who are not here and who have not spoken out, can benefit from its positive effects.

The Internet Governance Forum must provide the opportunity for all affected groups and communities to bring their requests and requirements to the table.

In this regard, we welcome the notion that there could be self-forming information society initiatives or committees, whatever, on the national and regional level organized perhaps along the same lines of multistakeholder participation as the IGF, to help inform national representatives of governments, businesses, civil society, and other interested stakeholder groups, of their local interests.

Let me now, if I may, Mr. Chairman, come back to the substantial questions that you sent us off with yesterday and today and conclude this intervention with a few final remarks on what we see here as the convergence or agreement around the IGF.

On the one hand, it should be composed of all stakeholder groups.

I think we agree on that.

And they should be on an equal footing with an adequate regional diversity.

Secondly, we prefer an integrated and not a separate program committee, and as such, it should be composed of a relatively small number of qualified individuals.

Thirdly, a format that facilitates true information exchange and provides for a learning experience and support of human capacity-building and a development perspective, keeping in mind the goals of the World Summit on the Information Society.

Needless to say that the business community looks forward to contributing to the continued definition and evolution of the Internet Governance Forum, and thus, we look forward to the next round of consultations.

Finally, I would like to conclude by applauding chairman Desai and Markus Kummer for the considerable progress that we have achieved already in these two days of consultations.

Thank you.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: If we have achieved progress, it's due to you, not to us.

And may I now turn to Greece.

Then I will say a few words.

Then let's see where we are.

Greece.

>>GREECE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I may be the last speaker, but I don't have the last word.

You have been entrusted by the secretary general with the challenge of carrying out consultations aiming at extracting all the necessary elements needed to add flesh to the Tunis text regarding the IGF.

In our view, the forum's character is unique.

It should be multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent, as it emerged from delicate consultations involving all stakeholders.

The secretary general's choice regarding your appointment couldn't have been a better one.

You have prepared and carried out the implementation of more summits than most of us remember, and you have done it with masterful dexterity while remaining unruffled, even under the most pressing of circumstances.

Next to you is Markus Kummer, a man who demonstrated remarkable organizational skills, and who, with his well-known Swiss caution, carried the heavy load of WGIG in an exemplary manner.

On behalf of the Greek delegation, we thank you both for your efforts and pledge to continue our cooperation towards convening the inaugural meeting of the IGF later this year in Athens.

Mr. Chairman, these consultations are a transition from a paper exercise towards the assembly of the building blocks of the forum.

The cornerstone of the forum is basically everyone represented in this room.

We are the forum.

We are a very diverse crowd which has worked together in a cooperative spirit, building trust.

And I hope we carry on in the same manner, even in what at times seem to be uncharted and troubled waters.

Mr. Chairman, the successful organization of the Internet Governance Forum is a priority for the Greek government.

While the ink was still wet on the Tunis text, the Greek government had begun to take a number of steps towards the first meeting of the IGF.

Most of you already know the rest of the story.

We have been ubiquitous.

The minister of transport and communications, Mr. Mihalis Liapis, has set up a steering committee to tackle the various tasks required for the organization of the IGF's inaugural meeting.

A Web site, www.IGF-Greece2006.org, has already been created specifically for the Athens meeting.

As of recently, the Web site, and I stress this, is fully bilingual.

The second language being French.

It has recorded impressive hits, mounting in the thousands to this date.

ICANN, GAC, the United Nations, deputy secretary general have been briefed.

We have already reported the state of our preparations in meetings with the Group of 77 in Geneva, the western group, the eastern group, and CCBI/ICC in Paris.

I have recently participated in the Diplo conference in Malta, which turned out to be a most useful brainstorming exercise.

I have in my possession a first draft of a 60-page illustrated document giving a detailed analysis of our preparations so far.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished participants, we have done all that without even having the dates for the meeting itself.

We came to these consultations hoping that the SG will provide us soon after at least with a starting kit so we can move on with concrete arrangements and commitments regarding the preparations.

The kit should contain firm dates for the inaugural meeting, the format of the meeting, and possibly topics to be discussed.

Anything else, of course, in addition to the above will be most welcome to allow organizers to prepare in an optimal manner.

On the issue of dates, we have already outlined a possibility, which, in our view, had taken into account possible conflicts with other similar meetings and religious holidays.

Furthermore, the possible dates are in line with an indication to this effect we received in a letter addressed to us by the United Nations secretary general.

Consultations are taking place on this subject and the results may come shortly.

We remain hopeful that our expectations will be fulfilled soon and rest assured that we are ready to continue to work with you and with all stakeholders towards the next step after Tunis, the inaugural meeting of the IGF in Athens.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIRMAN DESAI: Thank you very much, Mr. Papadatos.

I would say we are truly impressed at the commitment shown by the government of Greece for hosting this, the efforts which have already been put in.

Let me try and suggest a way on how to -- a way forward from now, keeping in mind there are very clear indications that I have received from some of you that you do need a little more time to react to some of the ideas which have been thrown up here.

So I will not try and give any sort of definitive summary or a sense of closure to the issues that are -- that we have been discussing.

I think what I will try and do is first to say what is the minimum that we have to agree on, which I think we have -- it's acceptable so that we can at least start the process of -- with the government -- with our host.

Because it's -- you know, we've only got, what, seven to eight months.

And as Mr. Papadatos said, I've organized a lot of these things, and I can tell you, that's not a lot of time.

So we need to start this process of discussion between the government of Greece and the United Nations sufficiently -- well, we have to start it, frankly, now, if we can.

So what does this mean?

What does this require?

What is it that I think we can comfortably say?

Certainly we are having the forum there.

It will be in October/November.

We hope the dates will be set in a few days, after some consultations which are going on.

We will, of course, make sure through e-flash, et cetera, that all of you get to know this date.

I'm sorry I could not announce them today, because the consultations are not over, and we do need to consult, because it's very important that these dates are consistent with normal international practice.

You can't just decide them arbitrarily.

But we hope in a couple of days that will be done.

That certainly will help.

We certainly see this as a forum which will be very -- in a sense, a forum open to open participation.

And in terms of numbers, we are -- I have said that perhaps one should take the numbers who attended the open consultations for WGIG as a baseline.

You should certainly expect at least that much, and perhaps mostly what we are looking at is at least 500 to 600 people attending this forum.

It could be more.

But this is the baseline that we work with, because, in a sense, we -- there is a general concept that it is more or less participation similar to the way participation took place in the WGIG open consultations, and we do need -- they need to have some idea of how many people they should be working for in terms of space and so on.

I think we would, of course, have a -- have to have a host country agreement with -- between the United Nations and Greece.

The summit is a product of a United Nations process.

The secretariat support is being provided by the United Nations.

And for legal reasons, we will have to have a host country agreement with Greece.

I incidentally here mention that the very normal practice in the United Nations when you have a host country which is taking on the responsibility of organizing a meeting which the United Nations has been asked to convene, it's fairly normal practice to request the host country to provide the chair for the process.

That has been the case with all the summits that we have run.

And that also is a simple solution of the issue of who is the chair of the process.

And it's a very common practice.

It's then entirely up to the host country to decide whether it will be somebody from the private sector, somebody from the civil society sector, somebody from the government sector.

It's their responsibility.

But we don't -- as the United Nations, we don't get into that issue.

I think we have not had an agreement, or I don't sense a consensus on the issue of the management structure for the forum.

There have been various ideas which have been thrown out.

I think terms like "Program Committee," "steering committee," et cetera have been used.

Sometimes the terminology has caused confusion.

Let's for the moment simply say a multistakeholder group.

What that will be called we can leave open.

And a multistakeholder group, what people have different ideas, A, on whether such a group is -- people want some time to think whether such a group is necessary.

I think my sense is that a very large number of people here do believe it is.

But, in fairness, we have to give people time to react to that idea.

And second, how it will be constituted, whether it will be constituted as a single group, if so, how large, or whether it is constituted as multiple groups.

So what I am proposing is that this is one of the issues on which we need a response relatively quickly, which is, let us say, ten -- about ten days from

now.

I don't think it's going to be possible within this time frame to organize another consultation like this.

And apart from that, it would be very burdensome for a lot of people who have come from outside to come once again.

I was going to suggest that we have discussed this.

We have heard each others' views quite extensively.

And I would suggest that those who feel they need a little more time to think about this take that time, and just communicate their views through Mr. Markus Kummer to the secretary general.

To me and then to the secretary general.

And I -- we will, of course, faithfully -- our job is to faithfully reflect the range of views that have been presented.

I am stressing this because I think this program committee needs to get working as fast -- or whatever we wish to call it, if constituted, needs to get cracking as soon as possible.

And as some people said, when it gets moving, perhaps at its first meeting there could be a round of consultations.

But my experience is that even if we decide -- once and if and when we decide to constitute such a group, the very process of constituting it, getting names from regional groups or from various, you know, organizations or civil society and business will itself take a couple of weeks, and then trying to sort that out into a set of names will take time.

And that's the reason why I am saying please, if we can have the views in about ten days, it will be very -- if we can then think in terms of having this group, if we were to constitute it, functioning hopefully before the end of March.

I don't think we have to -- we perhaps had more of a discussion on what is the -- what are the themes which should be covered in the IGF than we needed to have.

I say more because I started rereading the text.

And the text does not rule out anything.

The text does not say that this will be discussed and this will not be discussed.

So I don't think the issue is at all, is this something that I -- you know, that this forum should discuss.

I think it's more useful if, in your further comments, a second thing on which you may comment, I don't think the issue is should or should not the forum discuss this ever.

Is this part of the work of the forum.

But simply what do you think are the priorities for this October.

That's all.

Simply what are the priorities.

Nothing to do with, you know, is this a part of the forum mandate or not.

I would say the forum language is pretty general.

And at this point, instead of a futile discussion on should this or should this not be discussed in the forum, just focus on a very simple thing.

Given your political priorities, given your sense of what the mood outside there is like, what do you think are the issues?

I would suggest that perhaps it'll be useful if those who wish to contribute were to fix their ideas on three major themes.

It doesn't have to be -- it can be five; it can be six.

But I would say three because of the fact that, you know, we have a certain number of days, a number of days, which is another point which we need to communicate fairly clearly.

I would say that I have heard a lot of views, many different views, two to three days; five days.

So I am subtly suggesting to our friends in Greece that they plan on the basis of a four-day meeting.

Let's work with this.

Including, you know, the opening ceremony, et cetera.

And let's work on that.

It's, frankly, very arbitrary.

But we have to have some basis to start.

We can't just leave it for April, May, June, or something.

Because then it's too late.

In terms of the facilities, structure of the meeting itself, many very interesting ideas have come up.

Again, I don't think we need to -- we will not set the themes.

The themes will come afterwards.

In fact, my own personal feeling is that this has to be decided by the program group or whatever it is that is set up, rather than being set from New York.

Why -- So I would not even try and summarize as to what it would be.

But in terms of the physical facilities they need to provide, I would suspect that what we are looking at is probably a place for a plenary meeting, which will be, of course, used for the opening and closing, but will also be available for the major thematic discussions.

I'm sure when you get down to it, when the management group is constituted, they will have some ideas on how this thematic discussion should be conducted.

I have some ideas which I will certainly pass on to the management group from my experiences as to what would make it interesting.

But a plenary space which would allow the entire -- all of the people attending, or a substantial portion of those attending, to participate in this -- the major thematic discussions over these days.

And that's the space where we would have -- where we would request them to provide full translation facilities in all six U.N. languages.

Around this, I think we will have to, perhaps, suggest to them that there should be space for smaller meetings, panel discussions, roundtables, working groups. And we do not know what it would be. This would depend on when the planning starts. For lack of any better number, I would say that let us, as a starting point, I would suggest to the Greek authorities start with five, at least. But if the room, the space that you have has more space there, that's better. It's always better, because my experience is once you start this process, then a lot of people want to hold roundtables, panels and so on. And you will find that the space gets used up pretty quickly.

Then my third plea, which again requires some advanced work, is I do take this message of this becoming a learning experience very seriously. And I hope that when you look at your site, that there is space there for the people who will be coming there not to participate in the debate but to showcase things, or to learn from other people. Something like a learning space.

I am very happy that ISOC has shown a strong interest in this, and I would suggest that perhaps this is something that, at a fairly early stage, we could perhaps -- there's no harm in their starting to think about this.

So my suggest is that we treat this as our starting point. We recognize that we do not have -- we have not yet come to any -- so I cannot report to the secretary-general that these are the range of views on issues like the multistakeholder management group, on issues like the themes, which should be discussed. And I will say that people have sought time for this, and that I would communicate a sense of the range of views. Because at the end of ten days, it's not as if everybody is going to agree, but I will have then a better sense of what the range of views is, and that I will communicate to the secretary-general on the basis of which he will take certain review, certain decisions, and we will proceed on that basis.

I think I have covered most of what I need to cover in terms of getting the process moving and started.

I think we've done many -- there's a lot of substantive discussion here which I -- for which it's very valuable but which is not immediately germane from the process. And logistical decisions about things that need to start straight away.

But I would say that perhaps the probative record that we have will be something that will be of great value.

There has been a great deal of discussion on the motion that you shouldn't just focus on this event, but you should also be focusing on IGF as a process for things happening which will feed into the IGF.

Certainly if it is a bottom-up process, it is not something which requires decision by anybody.

There's nothing whatever which stops people forming a group to contribute to the IGF.

I think one aspect of it which may require a little advanced work is a message I have heard very strongly from many people here, and that is the need for some type of regional process to contribute to this.

And that's not something which can be done at the last minute. You can't just say suddenly, you know, three months or four months before, "Oh, please get off the ground."

So my own feeling is that listening to people here, it will not be a bad idea

if one were to suggest -- in fact, i would suggest, to the U.N. that they may wish to get in touch with the regional commissions to see how, within the resources that the regional commissions have, they could start thinking about what sort of regional contribution they could make to this process. Of course, it's very difficult till they know what the themes are, but at least one can start getting them to think about how they would do it. And we are happy the ECA is here, and perhaps they will start giving thought to it straight away and communicate with their fellow regional commissions in this area.

But in many areas I think it will be left basically to people to do it. I don't think it requires a directive from anybody, least of all the secretary-general.

One more -- besides -- one more point I would make here is the importance of getting certain things started at the national level. Some countries already have multistakeholder processes, et cetera. But I think it's very important that if the IGF at the global level is to work, it should have some -- there should be a process at the national level which can feed into that.

Now, it's possible that it's perfectly fine in many cases for, say, the government to participate, for industry from that country to participate, for civil society from that country to participate on a totally independent basis. That will be fine. There's no harm in that. But My own sense, particularly in developing countries is, that much of this will be facilitated if there is a national process. And I just leave this with you. Again, this does not require any sort of decision by anybody. It's up to each country whether they do it or not, and I simply leave it with you as a thought and as a reflection.

And I think it's very important to -- I would like to -- the last thing I wish to say is I think it's very important that we place this on a basis which is structurally sound, which does not depend on individuals.

I say this because I have heard too often, you know, about mr. Desai, mr. Kummer. "You know, mr, Desai and mr. Kummer are mortal men." and one of them at least is looking forward to putting his feet up.

[Laughter]

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: So I would say we should put things on a much more structured basis. And I would hope that when we finally end up with the IGF, it will be something that will be on the structured basis.

So I think things are moving ahead reasonably well, and I wish we could have done a little bit more on some of these issues, but I'm not too worried. I think ten days is not an unreasonable amount of time, and we can certainly get this thing -- some idea of what the range of views is so the S.G. can take a view and then I think we can be in business.

This is more or less what I wanted to say, but before I conclude, I have a request for the floor.

And it's a very valuable request for the floor, so I shall immediately hand the floor to Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Brazil would like to make an offer, and if you allow me, this offer is going to be introduced by the chairman of our Brazilian Internet national Steering Committee.

>>BRAZIL: Mr. Chairman, allow me to congratulate you and Mr. Kummer for the excellence of coordinating this wonderful meeting, which was a very productive one. I would like to take this opportunity to offer the candidacy of Brazil for the next meeting after Greece, next year, 2007, to be placed in Brazil in Rio de Janeiro.

>> CHAIRMAN DESAI: I thank you for the offer. This is of course something which will have been to be considered by the IGF itself, but it's very nice and I'm very happy that we have an offer of hosting for the second IGF already on the table, before we have got the first IGF. But I thank you very much, and it also responds in many ways to the principle of geographical rotation which was mentioned earlier.

I think this is more or less where we are. I'm not sure it makes much sense to try and continue dialogue or discussion at this stage.

As I said, I will await the comments on two key issues, the constitution of the -- possible constitution of the management -- multistakeholder management group, whatever it finally is called, and possible themes. I'm suggesting three simply because excluding the opening, there will be three plenary days available. But if three happens to become five, I'm sure there are ways one can be accommodated on that.

So on these two issues, if within ten days you can communicate with Mr. Kummer or anybody here who feels they still would like to rethink -- many of you have already given your views on this, but those of you who feel they want to go back and think about it, any group or NGO or any civil society representative, please communicate this to Mr. Kummer.

So thank you very much. Have a good day, evening in Geneva, and see you anon.

[Applause]