The following text is excerpted from an ongoing discussion on the IGF Advisory Group mailing list. The only changes made relate to an effort to anonymize the comments in respect of the Chatham House rule. The discussion took place between 17 May - 5 June, 2008.

(Writer A)

I have been thinking about the new design of the main sessions and I have to admit that I am still a bit concerned about the afternoon main sessions. From what I remember there was a general consensus after Athens that 3 hours sessions are bit long, and in Rio we shortened them accordingly. Now, it seems we are going back to the original duration of 3 hours for the afternoon sessions. Are we sure we want to do that?

I know, it is a bit late to bring this up but I thought I should at least mention this.

(Markus Kummer)

Dear Writer A,
dear colleagues,

I owe you an answer with regard to the duration of sessions. I checked and was told that it is difficult to have interpretation for anything else than the 'classical' format, i.e. a three hour session in the morning and a three hour session in the afternoon. We can of course shorten the afternoon sessions, as Writer A is suggesting, but that wold also be a waste of resources.

As there was some demand for reporting back sessions, I wonder whether we could not combine the two and have some (improved) reporting back from other workshops prior to the main session debate?

(Writer A)

actually I didn't mean to simply shorten them. I think structuring them a bit more would also help. Using some of the session for reporting back might help. I am not sure though if we should start a main session with reporting back activities.

(Writer B)

Thank you to you and team for getting this helpful summary report done effectively and promptly!
Just one point for us to keep in mind as the programme develops---a session, perhaps of 1 hour long as part of the taking stock and way forward, that highlights commitments, initiatives, partnerships that have been catalyzed by the IGF will be important to include.

(Writer C)

Accessibility is now a worldwide concern regarding Internet access. According to the World Health Organization, about 650 million people are disabled, more than 500 million of them in developing countries. As able bodied people grow older, failing sight and hearing, reduced mobility and strength confront them with accessibility issues.

The speed of technological innovations, particularly in information and communication technologies, can outstrip the capability of users, particularly the disabled and elderly, to benefit from access to e-mail, the Internet and mobile phones.

International Standards on assistive technologies to improve accessibility to the Internet by designing web tools, services and environments with the disabled, elderly and disadvantaged in mind, on ergonomics and harmonized tested methods can help to implement the aims of United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Raising the awareness of Accessibility needs in the Internet Governance Forum can also help to disseminate technological innovation to developing countries, to increase the market for new products and services, while meeting the generalized aspiration towards social responsibility.

This is why the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability would like to encourage the inclusion of an ICT accessibility related workshop as main session workshop.

A workshop proposal "Including Accessibility and Human Factors in the Universalization of the Internet - How to reach persons with disabilities, the 10% of the next billion" would be a good candidate or a merged workshop with the other very interesting proposal (Internet accessibility for people with disabilities) or any other combination of workshops in case of eventual other proposals submitted.

Furthermore, we could perhaps think of having more emphasis on ICT accessibility within the sub items of main theme "Reaching the next billion".
Something like "Access and Accessibility" would perhaps address both perspectives in a balanced manner, or having another sub theme dealing with this important matter.

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

It is my pleasure to report that the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development - the UN body in charge of WSIS follow-up and implementation - has given good marks to the IGF.

The Resolution it recommends to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) for adoption states in preambular paragraph 18 that it "takes note with appreciation of the ongoing work in the Internet Governance Forum, its multi-stakeholder approach and its innovative platform and thanks host Governments for their contribution."

In operational paragraph 27 it "Recommends that the Internet Governance Forum, as a multistakeholder discussion forum, shall retain its focus on public policy issues related to Internet Governance".

In simpler words: well done and carry on the good work!

We have to thank the MAG members, former MAG members and friends who were closely involved in the drafting of the resolution, starting with Janis, who chaired the drafting group which included Bertrand, Olga, Yriö and Thomas and last but not least Ayesha who accompanied the work as an observer. (My apologies if I left anybody out .)

Please find attached the text of the resolution as adopted by the CSTD.

Best regards

Markus

(See attached file: Resolution.2008.pdf)

(Writer D)

Let me add my thanks and congratulations. And another comment -- the fact the IGF has been so recognized is very much because of the hard work that Markus and the shifting Secretariat crew have done.

You deserve a lot of credit, and thanks from all of us!

Well done

(Nitin Desai)

Congragulations!

(Writer I)

Dear Markus

Congratulations to you, Nitin and the secretariat on this well deserved recognition.

Kind regards

(Writer E)

Congratulations to Markus and Nitin.

(Writer F)

Very well done, specifically Nitin, Markus, rest of the Secretariat --
and of course the drafting group.

(Writer G)

I wish to join with the rest of the MAG in congratulating you, Chairman Desai and the secretariat on this well deserved recognition.

Best regards as we continue to make a valuable contribution to development.

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

Please find attached a revised version of the programme paper for the Hyderabad meeting. The current update reflects last month's open round of consultations and the MAG meeting. It combines into a single paper all the previous papers dealing with this matter and incorporates the relevant content of the summary record of the MAG meeting.

It is our intention to post the document on Thursday. Please let us know by end of business on Wednesday Geneva time should you have any comments or suggestions of improving the document.

Many thanks and best regards

Markus

(See attached file: ProgrammePaper.02.06.2008.doc)

ATTACHMENT

Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Programme, Agenda and Format of the Hyderabad Meeting

11 June 2008

I.   Introduction

This paper aims to provide an update to the planning on programme, agenda and format of the third IGF meeting, which is to take place in Hyderabad on 3 – 6 December 2008. The paper is conceived as a rolling document and will be updated as appropriate.

The current update reflects the open round of consultations, held on 13 May 2008, and the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) meeting, held on 14-15 May, 2008. It gives a reworked draft programme outline and incorporates relevant content from the following papers:

- The paper reflecting a synthesis of all contributions for the open consultations on 26 February 2008;
- The summary report of the MAG meeting on 27-28 February;
- The paper with a draft programme outline, posted on the IGF Web site on 31 March 2008.
- Comments and views on the Hyderabad meeting to the IGF Secretariat submitted by stakeholders regard to the preparation of the 2008 meeting after the February 2008 consultations.
- Additional comments made during the open consultations of 13 May 2008.
- Summary report of the MAG meting held 14-15 May 2008.
- Comments made on the IGF Forum site.

All contributions and open consultation transcripts are posted on the IGF Web site. The readers of this paper are encouraged to read those contributions and the open consultations transcripts for further details and in depth discussions.

Comments have been numbered and boxed for ease of reference. The goal in this document is to layer the comments into the appropriate spot within the general document describing the programme and agenda of the Hyderabad meeting. Some earlier comments were left out, as they were either taken on board or were overtaken by events. Other comments reflect the MAG discussions. A general comment was that the written contributions to the IGF should receive greater recognition and acknowledgement.

II.   Agenda

The planning for 2008 takes into account the Chairman's Summary of the Rio meeting and looks at the lessons learned and issues raised in the previous meetings. The agenda setting process commenced with the open consultations and MAG meetings of February 2008 and continued on to the open consultations and MAG meeting held in May 2008.

Building on the comments made during the open consultations, the MAG recommended that the overall theme for the Hyderabad meeting be: Internet for All.

1.   'Internet for All' was chosen as the overall theme for the Hyderabad

meting in analogy with UNESCO's 'Education for All'.

The MAG proposed the following agenda:

- Reaching the Next Billion
- Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust
- Managing Critical Internet Resources
- Taking Stock and the Way Forward
- Emerging Issues

Each of these agenda items is discussed further in the following sections.

III.   Programme

This section aims to provide an update after the open round of consultations on 13 May 2008 and the MAG meeting on 14-15 May 2008 on the programme for the third meeting of the IGF in Hyderabad. It gives a revised draft programme outline. The draft programme outline tries to make best possible use of the facilities that are available at the conference venue. It also takes into account the fact that participation at the first meetings in Athens and Rio de Janeiro exceeded expectations and that as many, if not more people, are expected to attend the Hyderabad meeting.

A.   Basic structure for the Hyderabad meeting

The proposed meeting structure builds on the Athens and Rio meetings and takes into account the comments made in the consultations in February and in May 2008 as well as the written comments. As was the case in Rio de Janeiro, the Hyderabad meeting will not be merely repeating the structure of the inaugural meeting, but will have its own character and will go beyond the formats used previously. The informal, interactive multistakeholder format was generally seen as one of the key factors for the success of the first two meetings and should be maintained and reinforced as a guiding principle. Participation will follow the format used at the previous meetings and all entities and persons with proven expertise and experience in matters related to Internet governance may apply to register as participants.

The MAG discussed various ways of organizing the agenda and the programme of the Hyderabad meeting and agreed to recommend two types of main sessions:

- Main Session Workshops;

- Main Session Debates.

While the basic format of the previous meetings, with main sessions and workshops, has been maintained, the current recommendation includes a tighter linkage between the

workshops and the main sessions. The ground for each of the thematic threads should be prepared by Main Session Workshops. There will be two main session workshops in the morning of the first three days dealing with each of the sub-themes under the main threads. They will be of 90 minutes duration. Other workshops can also provide input into the Main Session Debates, as appropriate.

The Main Session Debates, of three hours duration, will be held in the afternoon of the first three days. The debates will be moderated. Both the Main Session Workshops and the Main Session Debates will be held in the main session hall, benefiting from interpretation and real-time transcription.

In addition, there will be workshops, best practice forums, open forums and meetings of the Dynamic Coalitions.

The programme should be finalized at the next consultations and MAG meeting on 16 and 17-18 September 2008. The written detailed programme should be published immediately thereafter.

The MAG also agreed on the following:

- Other workshops will be scheduled in parallel to the main session workshops and main session debates, depending on the quantity and quality of the proposals.
- All organizers of official events (workshops, best practices etc) will be asked to commit themselves to submit a report on their event. Non-submission of a report will disqualify the organizer from scheduling an event for the following year.
- Scheduling preference will be given in 2008 to those who did submit a report for 2007. (Submission of reports is still possible and encouraged.)
- Discussion is ongoing on a method for scheduling a reporting back session, though it is unlikely that daily reporting back session will be scheduled.
- No official events should start after 1800 hours.
- No official events will be held during the lunch-break between 1300-1400 hours.
- Further efforts will be made to enable remote participation.

The objective is to maximize the opportunity of open dialogue and the exchange of ideas; to try and create feedback loops between the different types of sessions; to create opportunities to share best practices and experiences; to listen, debate and learn as well as to identify key themes that would, in the future, benefit from the multistakeholder perspective of the IGF.

There will be no prepared statements read out during the main sessions. However, prepared statements will be recorded in a specially equipped AV-studio and shown in a loop in selected areas of the conference venue as well as made available on the IGF Web site. Efforts will be made to improve the promotion of this possibility. Prepared statements can be submitted in advance to the IGF Secretariat.

Comment Box 1:   General meeting structure and planning

2.   The point was made that if the wide range of different formats were to be kept (workshops, open forums, best practice forums, etc.), the difference between them and their concrete structure and participants had to be presented more clearly, so that participants would know better in advance what to expect from an individual event. .

3.   Some comments recommended that the number of parallel events be limited especially during main sessions.

4.   Some commented on the importance of including more opportunities for social networking. It was pointed out that for business participants this was a real "value add" and that it was a necessary outcome of the IGF meetings.

5.   Many contributions discussed the importance of facilities for remote participation and the need for the arrangements to be determined by September 2008 so that participants could prepare.

6.   One contribution suggested that if the IGF secretariat gave the same priority toward organizing remote communications as it did on planning the annual meeting the "IGF's facilities for remote participation could be second to none."

7.   One comment wrote that while some of the minor improvements being made in the programme deserved some credit, it was regrettable that further changes had not been made to make the IGF a deliberative forum as opposed to a conference. The author regretted that the IGF had not embraced a more deliberative and democratic form of discussion.

8.   Severals comment praised the inclusion of debates in the schedule as debate are a common form of public discourse and encourage the expression of diverse opinion and tend to bring out the pros and cons of an issue.

B.   Meeting types

1.   Main Sessions

The main focus of the meeting will be on the main sessions*.* The main sessions will be of two types: Main Session Workshops and Main Session Debates. All of the main sessions will take place in the main meeting hall and they will be organized around the focal themes. In addition, there will be an opening and a closing ceremony in the same meeting hall. Interpretation will be provided in the into all six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) for all meetings taking place in the main hall. The Main Sessions will be Web cast and will be rendered in real-time transcription.

(a)   Main Session Workshops

The Main Session Workshops will be scheduled before the Main Session Debates on the same theme, thereby allowing the workshop results to be fed into that session. The focus should be on learning from experiences and sharing of best practices. The Main Session Workshops will be held in the morning of each day, except on the last day. It was suggested that the main sessions be prepared in co-operation with the MAG and the workshop organizers and other relevant institutions, as appropriate.. They should communicate their interest to the IGF Secretariat. These workshops will be supported/facilitated by the MAG and IGF Secretariat, but organized by the sponsors of the workshop. Workshop sponsors whose workshop proposals fit within the topics recommended by the MAG are invited to contact the IGF Secretariat if they wish to have their workshop considered as Main Session Workshops. However, they should not be prevented from holding their separate workshop if they prefer, depending on the availability of meeting rooms. One of the important considerations in choosing Main Session Workshops as well as individual workshops remains the need for a multistakeholder approach and the need to present different perspectives on the issue under discussion. As with individual workshops, there may be reason to combine several similar workshop proposals into a single Main Session Workshop.

(b)   Main Session Debates

The MAG recommends that the afternoon main sessions be planned as participant debates. The debates will be introduced by a brief presentation by the Main Session Workshop chairs on the content of morning workshops. The Main Session debates will be moderated. The afternoon main sessions will have neither panellists nor designated respondents. The goal of these debates will be to bring as many participants into the dialogue as is possible and will allow for a debate with maximum interaction with participants. On the fourth, one session will be devoted to 'Emerging Issues' and another session devoted to 'Taking Stock and the Way Forward'.

Duration of all the main sessions will be three hours.

In the case of the Main Session Workshops, each workshop will be allocated half of the meeting time, that is 90 minutes, without a scheduled break except for the minimum necessary to change panellists between the workshops.

Comment Box 2:   Main Sessions

> *9.   It was recommended that the cross-cutting themes, especially the specific issues of concern to developing country participants, should be linked into the main sessions.*
>
> *10.   One contribution brought out the importance of retaining the five themes, access, openness, security, diversity and critical Internet resources from the Second IGF meeting even if these themes were not to be dealt with in individual sessions as had been done in the past. This contribution went on to explain that it was important that the main sessions be focused in such as way as to make the connection with the original themes very clear.*

*11.	The view was held that the main sessions should be focused on a more in-depth discussion of a limited number of specific issues drawing on the outcomes (including recommendations) of the relevant workshops. This could be done, by putting one participant of each workshop (e.g. its moderator) on the panel of the respective main session. The format of the main sessions should be as attractive as possible.*

*12.	One set of comments wanted the main sessions to be focused on specific issues or concerns as opposed to being general presentations at the high level. These comments also suggested that the main session descriptions should be simplified, and confirmed much earlier. The contribution also suggested that the issue(s) to be discussed in the main session should be identified in the descriptions.*

*13.	Several comments emphasised the need to enable wider participation by the attendees in the main sessions.*

*14.	It was commented that the main session might be aided if questions and comments were collected before the sessions.*

*15.	Several comments indicated that the success of a session rested on the talents of the moderator.*

*16.	Several contributions indicated that better use should be made of the main sessions. One comment indicated that the main sessions should be used to bring the outcomes of workshops and dynamic coalitions to the wider community.*

*17.	One contribution suggested that the main sessions would be improved if there were pre-sessions on the topics and the production of detailed synthesis papers on each of the themes as discussed in the pre-sessions.*

*18.	One comment suggested the workshops that related to the main themes be clustered and that participants from these workshops be the participants in the main sessions enabling them to "bring in, on a bottom-up basis, some of the ideas, including any recommendations that might be advanced, from the workshops to the broader audience."*

*19.	It was generally felt that the emerging issues session in Rio was a good model that should be used again in 2008.That session was described as interactive, and a valuable opportunity to raise issues that were not discussed during the other main sessions.*

2.	Workshops

Workshops should be designed to explore detailed issues related to the main themes. As such, all interested stakeholders were invited to submit proposals for workshops in a similar way as was done for the previous meetings of the IGF. An

attempt will be made to schedule workshops that relate to the Main Session Debate prior to the debate, as appropriate.

As in Athens and Rio, workshops should be based on the multi-stakeholder principle and, to the extent possible, co-organized by entities representing different stakeholder groups. Governments are encouraged to respond positively to request by entities from other stakeholder groups to lend their support to the organizers of workshops.

Based on the workshop proposals submitted within the 30 April deadline, the MAG identified a general need for merging workshops, as there were many proposals with similar themes and the proposals exceeded the availability of meeting facilities. All proponents of workshops with similar themes were therefore encouraged to contact the IGF Secretariat in view of merging workshops.

The scheduling of these workshops will be determined by the IGF Secretariat on the basis of maintaining a balance across the issues and efficient use of meeting space.

- Each workshop will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
- Duration of workshops: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 3: *Workshops*

20.   *Several comments were made about the need to design the workshops so that the attendees would be enabled to participate and to speak. One contribution suggested that the workshops should become more interactive and one recommended involving youth in the planning of workshops that could take advantage of emerging technologies.*

21.   *Several comments expressed the view that some workshops had too many speakers.*

22.   *Several contributions expressed concerns with workshop reports and one contribution suggested that "these must be short, based on a previously agreed template (who participated, what issues were discussed, what were the main points) and checked before being presented in order to make sure that they truly reflect the discussions. "*

23.   *One contribution suggested that the IGF should serve as a facilitator, providing many opportunities for action-oriented, formal and informal workshops and meetings.*

24.   *There was some concern expressed about too great a number of workshops. There was also a comment that there was too much overlap in the workshops and that more of the workshops in previous IGF meetings should have been merged. One writer suggested that workshop topics should have been chosen after a public consultation and then organized either by a Dynamic*

Coalition devoted to the topic or by a volunteer programme group.

25.   Others held the view that the schedule not limit the number of possible workshops.

26.   One set of comments indicated that consideration should be given to limiting the number of workshops sponsored by any single organization.

27.   Several comments indicated that the viewpoint of the organizers of a workshop should not be allowed to dominate at the expense of other points of view.

28.   One comment indicated that it would be helpful for workshop outcomes to be aggregated to show where emerging consensus was in process.

3.   Open Forums

All major organizations dealing with Internet governance related issues will be given a slot, at their request, to hold an open forum in order to present and discuss their activities. The meetings should focus on the organization's activities during the past 12 months and allow sufficient time for questions and discussions.

- Each Open Forum will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
- Duration of Open Forums: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 4:   Open Forums

29.   It was suggested that forums should provide opportunity for alternative viewpoints to be expressed.

30.   It was commented that Open Forums should have clearly identified speaker lists, and that the topics to be discussed and the speakers list should be advertised in advance as is the case with other forms of workshop.

31.   Some comments indicated that the Open Forums should not be branded as having IGF support and recommended that the IGF Secretariat define a specific disclaimer for use in reports and Web sites indicating that the materials had not be approved by the IGF or the UN.

4.   Best Practice Forums

The aim of these sessions is to demonstrate, in a multi-stakeholder environment, some of the best practices that have been adopted with regard to the key IGF themes in general and to the development and deployment of the Internet in particular. The sessions can have either a thematic or a country focus. The

presentations will be based on a common template. Presentations should not only cover practices that were successful, but also focus on challenges and mistakes. Thus, 'lessons learned' would be an important output of these sessions. They will be moderated by independent experts/hosts and participants will be given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments. The aim is to provide a space to discuss what constitutes a 'best practice' and share relevant information that can be transferred to other situations and strengthen capacity-building activities.

- Each Best Practice Forum will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
- Duration of Best Practice Forum meetings: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 5:   Best Practice Forums

> *32.   While it was recognized that some held the view that the Best Practice Forums should not be included as a separate category from other events, but that best practices should be mainstreamed into other events, it was felt that Best Practice Forums had served a purpose. It was suggested that a database on best practices be established, including toolkits and good practices that are presented or emerge from the workshops. The databank should be made accessible through the IGF Web site.*
>
> *33.   Among those who discussed this category of forum, it was recommended that it should include challenges faced and worst practices, and the lessons that can be learned from initiatives that have been taken. Comments suggested that these Forums should be focused on topics of relevance to the main thematic themes.*
>
> *34.   One commentator pointed out that one important lesson of Best Practice Forums was that one size does not fit all, and that different local conditions may require different policy models.*

5.   Dynamic Coalitions

The meeting will provide space for the dynamic coalitions to meet and further develop their proposals.

All Dynamic Coalitions are requested to present a report on their achievements so far in general and on their activities since the Rio meeting in particular. The reports will be posted on the IGF Web site.

- Duration of these meetings: 90 minutes.
- Deadline for submission of reports: 30 June 2008.
- The reports will be taken into account in the allocation of rooms.

Comment Box 6:   Dynamic Coalitions

> *35.   The point was made that in order to strengthen the Dynamic Coalitions, they should be given more visibility during and between the IGF meetings, and that their work should be better reflected in the meetings during reporting back sessions. There should also be some way for the IGF to promote the outcomes from the dynamic coalitions.*
>
> *36.   One commentator described Dynamic Coalitions as a means toward stimulating debate in the IGF and suggested that they should be given room to*

evolve. As part of this evolution,Dynamic Coalitions should not be institutionalized and should continue to meet IGF criteria for Dynamic Coalitions.

37.   One comment indicated that the IGF should make sure that any reports by Dynamic Coalitions make clear that they are not an official part of the IGF. It was suggested that the IGF Secretariat create a boilerplate for this purpose that would be required on all Dynamic Coalition reports and websites.

38.   It was suggested in one comment that Dynamic Coalitions should be prevented from using the IGF logo or other IGF branding.

39.   It was recommended that Dynamic Coalitions should not require that participants all adopt a similar viewpoint.

40.   One comment indicated that a clear distinction should be made between meetings of a Dynamic Coalition and a workshops sponsored by a Dynamic Coalitions. This contribution expressed the opinion that Dynamic Coalitions should not engage in advocacy.

41.   Some suggested developing more concrete rules under which these coalitions could work, including their rights and obligations to the "core" IGF.

42.   One comment suggested that there should be some criteria under which Dynamic Coalitions could be accredited. The absence of such an accreditation procedure was seen by this writer as a widely-accepted deficit with the IGF.

6.   Other Meetings

Based on comments in the open consultations, the MAG discussed arranging for a single Reporting Back session that will allow for all Individual Workshops and other meetings to report on their meetings in the Main meeting hall to benefit from interpretation, Web casting and real-time transcription. Methods of achieving this goal are still under review.

In general, meeting rooms that are not otherwise booked will be given, as available, to interested stakeholder groups on a first-come-first-served basis. A number of rooms will be reserved to accommodate ad-hoc requests.

Comment Box 7:   Other meetings

43.   Several contributions wrote about the importance of reinstating the Reporting Back Sessions. It was commented that when there many parallel events, the Reporting Back sessions helped in keeping all participants informed.

44.   Several writers commented that the session reports given during the Reporting Back sessions should be short and should be neutral in covering the variety of viewpoints discussed during a session. There was a suggestion that

report be vetted by panellists and moderators before delivery..

45.   One comment indicated that a three minute time limit for Reporting Back should be strictly enforced. This comment also suggests that a template be provided by the IGF Secretariat for this purpose.

46.   One commented indicated that the reports during the reporting back session should be given by the IGF Secretariat.

47.   One comment suggested setting aside some time during the first day for regional meetings to allow the different stakeholder participants from the regions to network among themselves.

48.   Another contributor regretted that no use was made of the speed dialogue format in past meetings.

49.   It was suggested that more effort had to be made to schedule thematic threads that would allow for the in-depth exploration of an issue.

50.   One commentator called for a meeting format that would allow for the IGF multistakeholder community to discuss and make policy recommendations. The writer indicated that this did not require decisions, but that it should be the venue that enabled different views from the status quo to be presented to and to be discussed with those currently responsible for Internet governance.

51.   One submission recommended that the IGF create working groups using either the format of the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG, established during the World Summit on the Information Society), or bodies such as the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) to address complex emerging issues. The recommendations in the paper indicated that these groups should have a more specific charter than the broad thematic Dynamic Coalitions and that they would have higher requirements for transparency and accountability to the IGF. The paper indicated that the working groups would not produce decisions but could produce recommendations that could be communicated to other groups. The paper outlined three areas for working group effort: self and co-regulation in Internet governance, business models for access, and the development agenda for Internet governance.

C.   Format of the Schedule

During the February meeting, two different basic alternatives were discussed for the schedule. These were outlined in the May version of the Programme paper. The draft schedule emerging from the MAG meeting in May combines elements of both previously discussed options. The current plan for the schedule is as follows:

Time	Main Session Area	Other areas

Day 1- 3 December, 2008		
Morning	Main Session Workshops: ● Access ● Multilingualism	Tutorials /Workshops/ Other events
Lunch		
Afternoon	Opening Ceremony	
	Main Session Debate: ● Access ● Multilingualism	Workshops/Other events
Day 2 – 4 December, 2008		
Morning	Main Session Workshops: ● Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime? ● Fostering security, privacy and openness	Workshops/Other events
Lunch		
Afternoon	Main Session Debate: ● Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime? ● Fostering security, privacy and openness	Workshops/Other events
Day 3 - 5 December, 2008		
Morning	Main Session Workshops: ● Transition from IPv4 to IPv6 ● Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional	Workshops/Other events
Lunch		
Afternoon	Main Session Debate: ● Transition from IPv4 to IPv6 ● Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional	Workshops/Other events
Day 4 - 6 December, 2008		
Morning	Main Session: ● Taking Stock and the Way forward	Workshops/Other events
Lunch		
Afternoon	Main Session: ● The Internet of tomorrow: Innovation and the evolution of the Internet.	Workshops/Other events

IV.   Substantive programme

The discussion threads related to the main agenda items are to be considered work in progress. The final wording for the main session workshops and the session notes will be finalized at the open consultations and the MAG meeting in December.

A.   Reaching the Next Billion

The main session workshops under this agenda item will focus on:
- Access
- Multilingualism.

Comment Box 8:   *Reaching the Next Billion*

---

52.   The heading previously under consideration – 'Universalization of the Internet' –was not retained, as it was deemed controversial. "Reaching the next billion" was felt to be more neutral and acceptable by all.

53.   The discussion thread related to access will focus on the promotion of low cost access.

54.   The view was held that accessibility for people with disabilities should also be included in the threads of the main discussion workshops.

55.   Several contributions commented on the continuing importance of the development theme, especially the focus human and institutional capacity building measures that are necessary to strengthen involvement of all stakeholders in Internet governance issues and institutions.

56.   One paper argued that digital literacy and IT training should receive more attention in the discussions in 2008. This paper supported inclusion of a discussion on skills development and the other resources necessary to get the world online.

57.   There was comment that future-oriented themes, "such as opportunities and challenges presented by, for instance, Web 2.0 and the Internet of things that are going to be of importance to millions of Internet users around the world," should be considered when selecting an agenda.

58.   It was felt that the linkages between Internet governance and sustainable development and the inclusion of sustainable development were not yet mature enough in an IGF context to be included as a key theme for the main sessions. These issues should first be further developed in workshops.

59.   The point was made in one comment that the role of the Internet in economic development and the importance of capacity building (i.e. in identifying initiatives that assist in bringing Internet access to developing countries) should remain among the key priorities for discussion for the IGF in all its sessions

60.   One contributor wrote that the discussion on diversity in 2008 should focus on the ability of the Internet and ICTs to enhance diversity with limitless capacity to transmit content. The contribution described the role that user-generated content plays in advancing cultural diversity and noted the promotion of cultural diversity through intellectual property protection and standards that

facilitate the creation of new software applications and tools such as translation technologies.

61.   One comment questioned whether there were codes or norms that could or should be applied to the production of peer produced content.

B.   Promoting cyber-security and trust

The main sessions under this agenda item should focused on the following threads:

- Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime?
- Fostering security, privacy and openness

Comment Box 9:   Promoting cyber security and trust topics

62.   It was commented that discussion of these topics pay careful attention to the "delicate balance to be struck between security, privacy and openness, and the moral, legal and policy choices society will need to make."

63.   It was noted that there was a strong interest in issues related to child protection. Discussion of this issue would also be part of this thread.

64.   Several comments spoke of the importance of not losing the theme of 'openness' in regard to concerns for security. It was pointed out that the term 'openness' also related to open standards.

65.   There was comment that emphasized the importance of seeing things from the perspective of the stability of the Internet.

66.   One comment indicated that safeguarding of the World Wide Web was an important consideration that should be discussed. The comment pointed out that the main threats in this area are cybercrime, use of the Internet for terrorism, and use of the Internet for activities that are incompatible with international safety and security.

67.   One comment discussed the importance of promoting "a human rights culture for the Internet, an Internet in which its governance seeks to secure everyone's enjoyment of a maximum of rights and services, subject to a minimum of restrictions, an Internet which is wrapped in an umbrella of freedom of expression and information and which contains within it a strong will of law dimension, of cybersecurity, privacy and data protection, and the protection of children".

68.   One comment pointed out that debates can highlight where there are differences, and in that way "perhaps enable the participants to understand what the issues are that are at stake in something like the relationship between security, privacy, and openness".

C.	Managing critical Internet resources

The working title for the main session workshops relating to the agenda item 'managing critical Internet resources are the following:

- Transition from IPv4 to IPv6.
- Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional.

*Comment Box 10:	Managing critical Internet resources*

69.	*Different views were held with regard to the respective merits of the proposed themes "Managing the Internet" or "Using the Internet" for the discussion thread related to critical Internet resources.. As the term 'managing' reflected agreed WSIS language, this term was finally retained.*

70.	*It was pointed out that many aspects related to Internet governance were taken care of at the national and regional level. It would therefore be important to look at all these levels when dealing with this issue.*

71.	*One comment included the suggestion that this theme be focused on security and stability of the technical infrastructure of the Internet.*

72.	*One comment included a statement that it is "of paramount importance to look at the functioning of the political infrastructure, the management of the domain name system, addresses, root serial numbers, and internationalization of the management use and governance of the Internet."*

73.	*It was suggested that there should be a better combination of the main Internet governance issues with the developmental aspects so that, for example, the discussions around Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) and Generalized Top Level Domain Names (gTLDs) could be directed into showing the impact these have on development.*

74.	*While there was general agreement on the importance of the discussion on transition from IPv4 to IPv6 it was suggested that the topic of IPv6 be expanded with a focus on the bottom-up management of IP addresses.*

75.	*One contribution indicated that the IGF meeting in Hyderabad should prioritize the area of global Internet policy, especially what was described as "the gaps in and the inadequacy of global policy institutional frameworks and mechanisms in meeting the existing and emerging policy challenges". It was proposed that critical Internet resources be considered as a cross-cutting issue for the IGF, including the implementation of the WSIS principles for Internet governance in all forums involved in Internet governance. Developing a code for public participation in Internet regulation was also mentioned in this regard.*

D.   Taking Stock and the Way Forward

The 'Taking Stock and the Way Forward' will allow participants to comment on the Hyderabad meeting and reflect on 'lessons learned'. In addition, the session could include a preliminary evaluation of the IGF in regard to its mandate.

> *76.   One contribution recommended against doing a debate for the Taking Stock and the Way Forward session. This contribution explained that a discussion would do more to build awareness and deeper understanding and went on to argue that in general the purpose of the IGF was to spread information through discussion and dialogue as opposed to debate.*
>
> *77.   It was suggested creating a space for the announcement of commitments, initiatives and partnerships as it might help make the IGF more attractive for leaders to participate and also for the media to report on it.*
>
> *78.   One contribution referred to Tunis Agenda 72(g) and recommended that after the conclusion of the forum in Hyderabad the community at large should be given specific recommendations and guidelines.*
>
> *79.   Another contribution wrote that whatever proceedings where produced after the Hyderabad meeting, the principle of no official outcomes should be preserved.*

E.   Emerging Issues

- The Internet of tomorrow - Innovation and the evolution of the Internet.

> *80.   Various issues were considered under this agenda item. The MAG agreed to approach this theme under the aspect of innovation and its impact on the evolution of the Internet.*
>
> *81.   It was suggested that the IGF should make an effort to help participants to explore how the innovation potential of the Internet and its governance can be better explored by small and medium businesses, especially from the developing world.*

V   Logistics

A.   Meeting rooms

The following meeting rooms will be available:

i. Main Meeting Hall, for opening and closing ceremony and main sessions, seating 1800 participants in a mixed classroom and theatre-style setting. All proceedings in this room will be Web cast, interpreted in all six UN languages, and rendered in

real-time transcription. A public remote chat capability will be provided for the Main Meeting Hall.

ii. Four major Individual Workshop Rooms, seating around 250-300 participants in a theatre-style setting. All proceedings will be Audio cast. A public remote chat capability should be provided for the Workshop Rooms. One Workshop Room will have facilities for interpretation (interpreters can be provided by workshop organizers, if desired). A public remote chat capability will be provided for all workshop rooms in a bid to encourage remote interaction.

iii. Several smaller rooms for workshops, forums, dynamic coalitions meetings and other meetings seating 100-250 participants in a theatre-style setting. All proceedings will be Audio cast.

B. Other facilities

i. A fully equipped AV-studio to record prepared statements. The studio can also be reserved for TV interviews.

ii. A media centre, with a room for media conferences, seating 250 journalists in theatre style setting and work space for journalists

iii. An "IGF village", located next to the Main Meeting Hall, to allow interested entities to present themselves for free and have meetings and poster sessions. The village will include squares (with chairs and rostrum) for ad-hoc meetings and poster sessions. This "IGF village" will be organized in the form of different "neighbourhoods" or thematic clusters (e.g. according to the five main themes and also the cross-cutting priorities. The "IGF Village" will also contain the cyber-café.

iv. Restaurants/refreshments:
- A buffet with will be organized
- Coffee will be served in the conference premises.
- A restaurant is located in the hotel adjoining the conference centre.

The meeting facilities in Hyderabad will leave room for some innovations.

Event organizers and participants with special needs are requested to contact the Secretariat and communicate their requirements 30 September.

Comment Box 13:   *Logistics*

---

82.   One set of comments wrote of the importance of the logistics for the meeting in Hyderabad and requested that additional details regarding logistical arrangements including visas, registration and hotel booking, Internet access (at the event venue and in the main recommended hotels), and on the ground transportation be made public by May 2008. This contribution also noted that the Indian hosts' efforts to ensure that there are reasonably priced hotels and other accommodations were greatly appreciated.

83.   Several comments indicated that the Village Square was very useful

and important for networking between groups and for informing individuals.

84.   It was requested that information concerning the opportunity for broadcast of prepared statements be made public by September 2008.

85.   Several authors felt that it was very important that the IGF invest more effort and resources in creating an active and useable online forum that can be used throughout the year for continuing discussions on a multitude of themes.

VI.   Deadlines

The following deadlines were set for the next months:

30 June:

- Proposals for Open Forums.
- Proposals for Dynamic Coalition meetings.
- Requests for a booth in the IGF village.
- Revision of workshop proposals/merging of workshops.

12 September:

- Submission of final programme for all workshops, best practice forums, open forums and Dynamic Coalition meetings.
- Submission of papers as an input for the Hyderabad meeting. (All papers submitted by that date will be reflected in a synthesis paper prepared by the Secretariat for the Hyderabad meeting.)

30 September

- Event organizers and participants with special needs are requested to contact the Secretariat and communicate their requirements 30 September.

VII   Other issues discussed in contributor's comments

Comment Box 14:   Other comments

86.   There was a general feeling that care should be taken to correct the gender imbalance of the first two meetings and make sure that women play a more prominent role in all main sessions and are better represented on the panels of workshops and other events.

87.   Several comments held the view that the success of the IGF depended upon the fact that the IGF remained multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent, and that it was neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding – consistent with the Tunis Agenda guidelines.

88.   The view was held that the IGF was not meeting the following parts of the mandate as contained in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, specifically: "advise all stakeholders" (e), "make recommendations" (g), "help to find solutions" (k) and to "promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes". The commentator recommended the formation of working groups with a formal link to the IGF's main body, which would be empowered to formulate concrete proposals on a multi-stakeholder basis and to present those with a recommendation for adoption by consensus by the main body.

89.   It was suggested that pre-meetings be encouraged for interested stakeholders as part of the preparations for the IGF meeting in India. One contribution mentions that regional IGF meetings should be convened for "the purpose of defining regional priorities and enabling greater participation from multiple stakeholders at regional level."

90.   One comment stated that "the IGF should offer an opportunity for leading Internet experts from around the world to share experiences and offer visions."

91.   Several contributors felt that the IGF Secretariat needed more resources. One paper held the view that the United Nations should recognize that the IGF was the outcome of a UN process and should ensure that it had the resources it needed to fulfil its mandate as defined at the Tunis Summit in 2005.

92.   There were several comments that the Secretariat should be lightweight and should "continue to be small, with the mission to support the smooth functioning of the IGF and to facilitate broad participation in the events."

93.   One writer suggested that there should be active sharing of lessons learned by previous hosts with the next host country of the IGF. It was proposed that this process should include representatives of all stakeholder groups.

(Writer H)

Thank you very much for the new programme. It's looking good.

I've a few comments. I am not completely sure I
can remember all we discussed and agreed,
apologies if I go back over something I
misremember.

General question. When will the programme go to

the Secretary General for his consideration and inclusion when he send initiations to the IGF?

Lunch break, 13:00 to 14:00. Is one hour enough? There's a comment about a buffet (V. Logistics, B. iv.) but not clear what it means. We had problems in both Athens and Rio with lack of quick and easy food. 90 minutes, would give people a little more time to sit and relax.

Will food be affordable, hotels tend not to be. Could we find an organization interested in sponsoring lunch!

About the AV studio for prepared statements. As I expect we've all seen, OECD is using YouTube to share comments for the ministerial meeting on Seoul <http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_34223_40713859_1_1_1_1,00.html> Could we try something similar in Hyderabad. I am sure the OECD would share their experience, etc.

Section B. Meeting Types, main sessions.

Suggest adding a sentence or two at the end of the first paragraph to say that "Remote participants will be able to submit questions and comments by email in any of the six UN languages. A public remote chat capability will be provided for the Main Meeting Hall and other facilities for remote access will be announced by the end of September 2008."

(b) Main Session Debates

Speakers or not? I thought we left it open that there might be more than just the two workshop "chairs" on stage. I think it might be useful to have 3 or 4 experts.

If no speakers in the debates then there'll be pressure to get balance (stakeholder/point of view, gender, region) in the Main Session Workshop. Groups we're asking to help organize these workshops would need to be aware of this.

Don't think we need to say "chairs". I think we can let the workshop organizers (and MAG of course) decide who will be the best person to present their workshop, e.g. "The debates will be introduced by a brief presentation on the content of morning workshops."

If the debates are as flat as the sessions in Rio then we'll need a few people to keep them moving. I would also like us make an open call for questions/comments starting about 1 month before the meeting (it could run in parallel with any YouTube comment activity, if we adopt that.) See if we can get a sense of the issues people are interested in, seed the discussion (and also provide input for the workshops.)

2. Workshops

Suggest adding the deadline for revising and merging proposals in this section (June 30). Makes it clearer.

How are we going to begin suggesting merging, and also possible Main Session Workshop candidates?

3. Open Forums

Were any proposed during the workshop call?

I don't see the value of these forums, they seem at odds with the multi-stakeholder approach. I'd prefer if the IGF Village were used for this kind of session. But if they go ahead I'd like to see points 29-31 adopted in some form: they should all allow for a comment period/open mic so other views can be expressed, speaker list etc should be submitted by September 12, and include a disclaimer about them not being branded as having IGF/MAG support.

4. Best Practice Forums

Again, ask for complete information by September 12. Says 90 minutes, weren't most of these

sessions shared in Rio, i.e. 45 minutes each?

5. Dynamic Coalitions

I think we had an action item from last year to
come up with a process for accepting Dynamic
Coalitions. There are now 13 on the website
<http://www.intgovforum.org/Dynamic%20Coalitions.php>.
Just wonder how many are active. Not suggesting
we try to devalue the Coalitions, if there's time
and space on the agenda it won't be a problem to
accept all Dynamic Coalitions sessions. But
perhaps best to close the list now and say new
Coalitions for Hyderabad won't be accepted after
the date the paper's published (i.e. June 5.)

C. Format of the Schedule

Unfortunate there will be less time for the lead
issue "Reaching the Next Billion".

V Logistics

A. i. Mention email for remote access?
B. iii. Will there be more information about the
IGF Village, information about booth size and
other space available, or is this an initial
expression of interest?
B. iv. correct the note about the buffet.

VI Deadlines.

No deadline for best practices.

Any information for people requesting to hold
side events, or will these be limited and already
agreed (I imagine GigaNet.)

(Markus Kummer)

Dear Writer H,

Many thanks for your suggestions and for getting the discussion started. We will incorporate most of them in the final version. There was also an error with regard to a future consultation that needed to be corrected (it referred to a 'December meeting' instead of 'September meeting').

The paper tries to recapture our discussions, but it is clear that in many areas we need to refine further the concept. The paper is a work in progress and will be updated taking into account our future discussions. Please find below my comments embedded in your email below.

Best regards
Markus

>
> General question. When will the programme go to
> the Secretary General for his consideration and
> inclusion when he send initiations to the IGF?

We have submitted the agenda for inclusion into the Secretary-General's invitation. Hopefully, it will be issued in early July.
>
> Lunch break, 13:00 to 14:00. Is one hour enough?

The one hour is the meeting-free time that was requested by many. We can also call it 'networking time'. The buffet will be open for more than one hour, as we will have to stagger the more than 1000 participants. Some meetings will end at 12:30 while others start at 14:30. We will discuss the details with the catering staff during our next planning mission.

> There's a comment about a buffet (V. Logistics,
> B. iv.) but not clear what it means. We had
> problems in both Athens and Rio with lack of
> quick and easy food. 90 minutes, would give
> people a little more time to sit and relax.
>
> Will food be affordable, hotels tend not to be.
> Could we find an organization interested in
> sponsoring lunch!

This will be part of the Host Country hospitality offer, as our Indian hosts kindly and generously offer the buffet to all participants free of charge. Details will be made available in due course.
>
> About the AV studio for prepared statements. As I
> expect we've all seen, OECD is using YouTube to
> share comments for the ministerial meeting on

> Seoul
>
<http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_34223_40713859_1_1_1_1,00.html
> >
> Could we try something similar in Hyderabad. I
> am sure the OECD would share their experience,
> etc.

It is true that our AV studio was not used as much as it could have been in Rio and we
happily look in the OECD experience at the Seoul Ministerial.

> Section B. Meeting Types, main sessions.
>
> Suggest adding a sentence or two at the end of
> the first paragraph to say that "Remote
> participants will be able to submit questions and
> comments by email in any of the six UN languages.
> A public remote chat capability will be provided
> for the Main Meeting Hall and other facilities
> for remote access will be announced by the end of
> September 2008."

We can add a sentence to this effect, but I doubt whether we will be able to do this in all
six UN languages. English, French and Spanish should be possible.
>
> (b) Main Session Debates
>
> Speakers or not? I thought we left it open that
> there might be more than just the two workshop
> "chairs" on stage. I think it might be useful to
> have 3 or 4 experts.
>
> If no speakers in the debates then there'll be
> pressure to get balance (stakeholder/point of
> view, gender, region) in the Main Session
> Workshop. Groups we're asking to help organize
> these workshops would need to be aware of this.
>
> Don't think we need to say "chairs". I think we
> can let the workshop organizers (and MAG of
> course) decide who will be the best person to
> present their workshop, e.g. "The debates will be
> introduced by a brief presentation on the content
> of morning workshops."

This clearly will need to be refined further. Your suggestion is very helpful, as it leaves open a final decision.
>
> If the debates are as flat as the sessions in Rio
> then we'll need a few people to keep them moving.
> I would also like us make an open call for
> questions/comments starting about 1 month before
> the meeting (it could run in parallel with any
> YouTube comment activity, if we adopt that.) See
> if we can get a sense of the issues people are
> interested in, seed the discussion (and also
> provide input for the workshops.)

This suggestion was made, I seem to remember, both in the open consultation and the MAG meeting. My feeling is that we should start somewhat earlier with such a call, maybe after the September meeting?
>
> 2. Workshops
>
> Suggest adding the deadline for revising and
> merging proposals in this section (June 30).
> Makes it clearer.
>
> How are we going to begin suggesting merging, and
> also possible Main Session Workshop candidates?

We are in the process of approaching workshop organizers. Your input is welcome, both in terms of who should merge and who should provide input into the Main Session Workshops.
>
> 3. Open Forums
>
> Were any proposed during the workshop call?

So far, the OECD has asked for a slot to present the outcome of the Seoul Ministerial meeting. But as far as I know, other organizations are also interested. Admittedly, they are not multistakeholder, but they add value, as most IGF participants are familiar with one particular organization, but not the broad panoply of all the organizations who are involved with the IGF. There is room for improvement in their presentations, as was suggested. The Open Forums should not be beauty contests.
>
> I don't see the value of these forums, they seem
> at odds with the multi-stakeholder approach. I'd
> prefer if the IGF Village were used for this kind
> of session. But if they go ahead I'd like to see
> points 29-31 adopted in some form: they should

> all allow for a comment period/open mic so other
> views can be expressed, speaker list etc should
> be submitted by September 12, and include a
> disclaimer about them not being branded as having
> IGF/MAG support.
>
> 4. Best Practice Forums
>
> Again, ask for complete information by September
> 12. Says 90 minutes, weren't most of these
> sessions shared in Rio, i.e. 45 minutes each?

The country presentations were 45 minutes each.
>
> 5. Dynamic Coalitions
>
> I think we had an action item from last year to
> come up with a process for accepting Dynamic
> Coalitions. There are now 13 on the website
> <http://www.intgovforum.org/Dynamic%20Coalitions.php>.
> Just wonder how many are active. Not suggesting
> we try to devalue the Coalitions, if there's time
> and space on the agenda it won't be a problem to
> accept all Dynamic Coalitions sessions. But
> perhaps best to close the list now and say new
> Coalitions for Hyderabad won't be accepted after
> the date the paper's published (i.e. June 5.)

Last year it was felt that we should continue to be flexible, but I agree, we need to
develop clearer criteria. I suggest putting it on the agenda of the September meeting -
both Open Consultations and MAG meeting. I am not too sure whether your suggestion
to close the list now would be acceptable, as we would change the rules without
consulting the broader community first.

> C. Format of the Schedule
>
> Unfortunate there will be less time for the lead
> issue "Reaching the Next Billion".
>
> V Logistics
>
> A. i. Mention email for remote access?
> B. iii. Will there be more information about the
> IGF Village, information about booth size and
> other space available, or is this an initial
> expression of interest?

It is a call for an initial expression of interest. The details will be determined in light of the demand and made public after our next planning mission in July.

> B. iv. correct the note about the buffet.
>
> VI Deadlines.
>
> No deadline for best practices.
>
> Any information for people requesting to hold
> side events, or will these be limited and already
> agreed (I imagine GigaNet.)

We are not advertising the possibility of holding pre-events, as we cannot have a full schedule of meetings already on 2 December. There will be some, including GigaNet. We are trying to accommodate people who approach us,

---

(Writer D)

Many thanks for the significant amount of work that's been put into creating this detailed and useful document. I used the comments and track changes tools in the document to make a few corrections or other simple suggestions. In a few places I have flagged below where I think there are serious issues raised by the document.
On 3-Jun-08, at 11:07 AM, Markus KUMMER wrote:
> Dear Writer H,
>
> Many thanks for your suggestions and for getting the discussion
> started. We will incorporate most of them in the final version.
> There was also an error with regard to a future consultation that
> needed to be corrected (it referred to a 'December meeting' instead
> of 'September meeting').
>
> The paper tries to recapture our discussions, but it is clear that
> in many areas we need to refine further the concept. The paper is a
> work in progress and will be updated taking into account our future
> discussions. Please find below my comments embedded in your email
> below.
>
> Best regards
> Markus
>

>>
>> General question. When will the programme go to
>> the Secretary General for his consideration and
>> inclusion when he send initiations to the IGF?
>
> We have submitted the agenda for inclusion into the Secretary-
> General's invitation. Hopefully, it will be issued in early July.
>>
>> Lunch break, 13:00 to 14:00. Is one hour enough?
>
> The one hour is the meeting-free time that was requested by many. We
> can also call it 'networking time'. The buffet will be open for more
> than one hour, as we will have to stagger the more than 1000
> participants. Some meetings will end at 12:30 while others start at
> 14:30. We will discuss the details with the catering staff during
> our next planning mission.
>
>> There's a comment about a buffet (V. Logistics,
>> B. iv.) but not clear what it means. We had
>> problems in both Athens and Rio with lack of
>> quick and easy food. 90 minutes, would give
>> people a little more time to sit and relax.
>>
>> Will food be affordable, hotels tend not to be.
>> Could we find an organization interested in
>> sponsoring lunch!
>
> This will be part of the Host Country hospitality offer, as our
> Indian hosts kindly and generously offer the buffet to all
> participants free of charge. Details will be made available in due
> course.
>>
>> About the AV studio for prepared statements. As I
>> expect we've all seen, OECD is using YouTube to
>> share comments for the ministerial meeting on
>> Seoul
>>
<http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_34223_40713859_1_1_1_1,00.html
>>>
>> Could we try something similar in Hyderabad. I
>> am sure the OECD would share their experience,
>> etc.
>
> It is true that our AV studio was not used as much as it could have
> been in Rio and we happily look in the OECD experience at the Seoul
> Ministerial.

>

I very much like Writer H's YouTube idea if practical. My only concern
about the AV studio is about the cost/benefit. I'd recommend that if
it doesn't get well used this year we cut it.

>
>
> > Section B. Meeting Types, main sessions.
> >
> > Suggest adding a sentence or two at the end of
> > the first paragraph to say that "Remote
> > participants will be able to submit questions and
> > comments by email in any of the six UN languages.
> > A public remote chat capability will be provided
> > for the Main Meeting Hall and other facilities
> > for remote access will be announced by the end of
> > September 2008."
>
> We can add a sentence to this effect, but I doubt whether we will be
> able to do this in all six UN languages. English, French and Spanish
> should be possible.
>

I think it important that the MAG be identified as taking
responsibility for the main session workshops unless I badly
misunderstood what we were agreeing to in our last meeting. I
definitely think we agreed that the MAG was to at a minimum oversee
development of the main session workshop, or more likely, serving as
the main organizer. Those who proposed workshops on the main themes
should be invited to work together under MAG supervision to create a
balanced program. But because it is central to the credibility and
viability of IGF that the main sessions maintain balance and focus, I
do not believe we can hand over responsibility for and ownership of
the main session workshops. The last sentence in the text (section B.
1.a) hints at the requirements, but does not establish MAG
responsibility clearly enough.

>
> >
> > (b) Main Session Debates
> >
> > Speakers or not? I thought we left it open that
> > there might be more than just the two workshop
> > "chairs" on stage. I think it might be useful to
> > have 3 or 4 experts.
> >
> > If no speakers in the debates then there'll be

> > pressure to get balance (stakeholder/point of
> > view, gender, region) in the Main Session
> > Workshop. Groups we're asking to help organize
> > these workshops would need to be aware of this.
> >
> > Don't think we need to say "chairs". I think we
> > can let the workshop organizers (and MAG of
> > course) decide who will be the best person to
> > present their workshop, e.g. "The debates will be
> > introduced by a brief presentation on the content
> > of morning workshops."
>
> This clearly will need to be refined further. Your suggestion is
> very helpful, as it leaves open a final decision.
> >
> > If the debates are as flat as the sessions in Rio
> > then we'll need a few people to keep them moving.
> > I would also like us make an open call for
> > questions/comments starting about 1 month before
> > the meeting (it could run in parallel with any
> > YouTube comment activity, if we adopt that.) See
> > if we can get a sense of the issues people are
> > interested in, seed the discussion (and also
> > provide input for the workshops.)
>
> This suggestion was made, I seem to remember, both in the open
> consultation and the MAG meeting. My feeling is that we should start
> somewhat earlier with such a call, maybe after the September meeting?
> >
> > 2. Workshops
> >
>
Where it says "Governments are encouraged to respond positively to
requests by entities from other stakeholder groups to lend their
support to the organizers of workshops.", does this mean "to engage
with others in organizing workshops"?
>
> > Suggest adding the deadline for revising and
> > merging proposals in this section (June 30).
> > Makes it clearer.
> >
> > How are we going to begin suggesting merging, and
> > also possible Main Session Workshop candidates?
>
> We are in the process of approaching workshop organizers. Your input
> is welcome, both in terms of who should merge and who should provide

> input into the Main Session Workshops.
> >
> > 3. Open Forums
> >
> > Were any proposed during the workshop call?
>
> So far, the OECD has asked for a slot to present the outcome of the
> Seoul Ministerial meeting. But as far as I know, other organizations
> are also interested. Admittedly, they are not multistakeholder, but
> they add value, as most IGF participants are familiar with one
> particular organization, but not the broad panoply of all the
> organizations who are involved with the IGF. There is room for
> improvement in their presentations, as was suggested. The Open
> Forums should not be beauty contests.
> >
> > I don't see the value of these forums, they seem
> > at odds with the multi-stakeholder approach. I'd
> > prefer if the IGF Village were used for this kind
> > of session. But if they go ahead I'd like to see
> > points 29-31 adopted in some form: they should
> > all allow for a comment period/open mic so other
> > views can be expressed, speaker list etc should
> > be submitted by September 12, and include a
> > disclaimer about them not being branded as having
> > IGF/MAG support.
>
I don't think every event has to be multistakeholder, but the open
forum sessions need to be open to alternative viewpoints (per point
29). These sessions should essentially be educational in nature. If
there is a way to accommodate them in the IGF Village, good -- maybe
create a "speakers' corner"? It seems to me possible that some groups
would like to present what they are doing for 1 or 1.5 hours, but not
for 3 to 4 days, as would be required if they were to get a space in
the Village.

>
> >
> > 4. Best Practice Forums
> >
> > Again, ask for complete information by September
> > 12. Says 90 minutes, weren't most of these
> > sessions shared in Rio, i.e. 45 minutes each?
>
> The country presentations were 45 minutes each.
> >
> > 5. Dynamic Coalitions

> >
> > I think we had an action item from last year to
> > come up with a process for accepting Dynamic
> > Coalitions. There are now 13 on the website
> > <http://www.intgovforum.org/Dynamic%20Coalitions.php>.
> > Just wonder how many are active. Not suggesting
> > we try to devalue the Coalitions, if there's time
> > and space on the agenda it won't be a problem to
> > accept all Dynamic Coalitions sessions. But
> > perhaps best to close the list now and say new
> > Coalitions for Hyderabad won't be accepted after
> > the date the paper's published (i.e. June 5.)
>
> Last year it was felt that we should continue to be flexible, but I
> agree, we need to develop clearer criteria. I suggest putting it on
> the agenda of the September meeting - both Open Consultations and
> MAG meeting. I am not too sure whether your suggestion to close the
> list now would be acceptable, as we would change the rules without
> consulting the broader community first.
>
Could Writer H please clarify what list he believe should close on June
5? The list of existing dynamic coalitions? (if so, yes) The list of
DCs requesting space and time to present? (if so, no, for the reason
Marcus states above)
>
6. Other Meetings

Could the reporting back not be done in writing? Despite the evidence
that some people wanted these, in practice attendance was poor and
there was little to no interaction: perfect qualifications for
reporting back in writing, or in at most 3 minutes.
>
> > C. Format of the Schedule
> >
> > Unfortunate there will be less time for the lead
> > issue "Reaching the Next Billion".
>
agreed, and this is the theme where I can most clearly see the linkage
to the cross-cutting themes of development and capacity building.

I'd also like to reiterate a concern about the session on "transition
from IPv4 to IPv6" -- this is a topic being discussed in a vast number
of forums at the moment, and even being dealt with in some. It is
important that we take care to ensure this session is factual and
focuses on the management issues referred to in the title for the
agenda item without becoming duplicative of other efforts.

>
> >
> > V Logistics
> >
> > A. i. Mention email for remote access?
>

In section A, it would be useful to state the total number of meeting
rooms available for sessions outside the main meeting hall, as well
as the total number of sessions that can be accommodated using a
reasonable set of assumptions about how many meetings can be held in
each room each day, if that is known
>
> > B. iii. Will there be more information about the
> > IGF Village, information about booth size and
> > other space available, or is this an initial
> > expression of interest?
>
> It is a call for an initial expression of interest. The details will
> be determined in light of the demand and made public after our next
> planning mission in July.
>
This is good -- let's hope it is successful. Is it possible to
promote the Village more prominently on the web site perhaps?
>
>
> > B. iv. correct the note about the buffet.
> >
> > VI Deadlines.
> >
> > No deadline for best practices.
> >
> > Any information for people requesting to hold
> > side events, or will these be limited and already
> > agreed (I imagine GigaNet.)
>
> We are not advertising the possibility of holding pre-events, as we
> cannot have a full schedule of meetings already on 2 December. There
> will be some, including GigaNet. We are trying to accommodate people
> who approach us,
>
With all respect to those who may want to organize pre-IGF meetings,
why is this something that needs to occupy Secretariat time and
attention? I appreciate that useful meetings have been held by
GigaNet, APC, and others, and would not want to discourage them. But
the process for getting any sort of aid from the IGF organizers (hosts

or Secretariat) has been rather ad hoc so far. If people do want to
organize meetings in Hyderabad before December 3, why can they not be
gently encouraged to make their own arrangements. I say this because
I am aware of other groups interested in pre-IGF events. It makes
good sense to me that they do so to make maximum use of the travel
time and expense involved in people's travel to the IGF. But I worry
about the possible expansion of demand on the time and good will of
both hosts and Secretariat.

ATTACHMENT

Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Programme, Agenda and Format of the Hyderabad Meeting
11 June 2008

I.   Introduction

This paper aims to provide an update to the planning on programme, agenda and format
of the third IGF meeting, which is to take place in Hyderabad on 3 – 6 December 2008.
The paper is conceived as a rolling document and will be updated as appropriate.

The current update reflects the open round of consultations, held on 13 May 2008, and
the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) meeting, held on 14-15 May, 2008. It
gives a reworked draft programme outline and incorporates relevant content from the
following papers:

- The paper reflecting a synthesis of all contributions for the open consultations on
  26 February 2008;
- The summary report of the MAG meeting on 27-28 February;
- The paper with a draft programme outline, posted on the IGF Web site on 31
  March 2008.
- Comments and views on the Hyderabad meeting to the IGF Secretariat submitted
  by stakeholders regard to the preparation of the 2008 meeting after the February
  2008 consultations.
- Additional comments made during the open consultations of 13 May 2008.
- Summary report of the MAG meting held 14-15 May 2008.
- Comments made on the IGF Forum site.

All contributions and open consultation transcripts are posted on the IGF Web site. The
readers of this paper are encouraged to read those contributions and the open
consultations transcripts for further details and in depth discussions.

Comments have been numbered and boxed for ease of reference. The goal in this document is to layer the comments into the appropriate spot within the general document describing the programme and agenda of the Hyderabad meeting. Some earlier comments were left out, as they were either taken on board or were overtaken by events. Other comments reflect the MAG discussions. A general comment was that the written contributions to the IGF should receive greater recognition and acknowledgement.

II.   Agenda

The planning for 2008 takes into account the Chairman's Summary of the Rio meeting and looks at the lessons learned and issues raised in the previous meetings. The agenda setting process commenced with the open consultations and MAG meetings of February 2008 and continued on to the open consultations and MAG meeting held in May 2008.

Building on the comments made during the open consultations, the MAG recommended that the overall theme for the Hyderabad meeting be: <u>Internet for All</u>.

94.   'Internet for All' was chosen as the overall theme for the Hyderabad meting in analogy with UNESCO's 'Education for All'.

The MAG proposed the following agenda:

- Reaching the Next Billion
- Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust
- Managing Critical Internet Resources
- Taking Stock and the Way Forward
- Emerging Issues

Each of these agenda items is discussed further in the following sections.

III.   Programme

This section aims to provide an update after the open round of consultations on 13 May 2008 and the MAG meeting on 14-15 May 2008 on the programme for the third meeting of the IGF in Hyderabad. It gives a revised draft programme outline. The draft programme outline tries to make best possible use of the facilities that are available at the conference venue. It also takes into account the fact that participation at the first meetings in Athens and Rio de Janeiro exceeded expectations and that as many, if not more people, are expected to attend the Hyderabad meeting.

A.   Basic structure for the Hyderabad meeting

The proposed meeting structure builds on the Athens and Rio meetings and takes into account the comments made in the consultations in February and in May 2008 as well as the written comments. As was the case in Rio de Janeiro, the Hyderabad meeting will not be merely repeating the structure of the inaugural meeting, but will have its own character and will go beyond the formats used previously. The informal, interactive multistakeholder format was generally seen as one of the key factors for the success of the first two meetings and should be maintained and reinforced as a guiding principle. Participation will follow the format used at the previous meetings and all entities and persons with proven expertise and experience in matters related to Internet governance may apply to register as participants.

The MAG discussed various ways of organizing the agenda and the programme of the Hyderabad meeting and agreed to recommend two types of main sessions:

- Main Session Workshops;

- Main Session Debates.

While the basic format of the previous meetings, with main sessions and workshops, has been maintained, the current recommendation includes a tighter linkage between the workshops and the main sessions. The ground for each of the thematic threads should be prepared by Main Session Workshops. There will be two main session workshops in the morning of the first three days dealing with each of the sub-themes under the main threads. They will be of 90 minutes duration. Other workshops can also provide input into the Main Session Debates, as appropriate.

The Main Session Debates, of three hours duration, will be held in the afternoon of the first three days. The debates will be moderated. Both the Main Session Workshops and the Main Session Debates will be held in the main session hall, benefiting from interpretation and real-time transcription.

In addition, there will be workshops, best practice forums, open forums and meetings of the Dynamic Coalitions.

The programme should be finalized at the next consultations and MAG meeting on 16 and 17-18 September 2008. The written detailed programme should be published immediately thereafter.

The MAG also agreed on the following:

- Other workshops will be scheduled in parallel to the main session workshops and main session debates, depending on the quantity and quality of the proposals.
- All organizers of official events (workshops, best practices etc) will be asked to commit themselves to submit a report on their event. Non-submission of a report will disqualify the organizer from scheduling an event for the following year.
- Scheduling preference will be given in 2008 to those who did submit a report for 2007. (Submission of reports is still possible and encouraged.)

- Discussion is ongoing on a method for scheduling a reporting back session, though it is unlikely that daily reporting back session will be scheduled.
- No official events should start after 1800 hours.
- No official events will be held during the lunch-break between 1300-1400 hours.
- Further efforts will be made to enable effective and interactive remote participation.

The objective is to maximize the opportunity of open dialogue and the exchange of ideas; to try and create feedback loops between the different types of sessions; to create opportunities to share best practices and experiences; to listen, debate and learn as well as to identify key themes that would, in the future, benefit from the multistakeholder perspective of the IGF.

There will be no prepared statements read out during the main sessions. However, prepared statements will be recorded in a specially equipped AV-studio and shown in a loop in selected areas of the conference venue as well as made available on the IGF Web site. Efforts will be made to improve the promotion of this possibility. Prepared statements can be submitted in advance to the IGF Secretariat.

Comment Box 15:   General meeting structure and planning

95.   The point was made that if the wide range of different formats were to be kept (workshops, open forums, best practice forums, etc.), the difference between them and their concrete structure and participants had to be presented more clearly, so that participants would know better in advance what to expect from an individual event. .

96.   Some comments recommended that the number of parallel events be limited especially during main sessions.

97.   Some commented on the importance of including more opportunities for social networking. It was pointed out that for business participants this was a real "value add" and that it was a necessary outcome of the IGF meetings.

98.   Many contributions discussed the importance of facilities for remote participation and the need for the arrangements to be determined by September 2008 so that participants could prepare.

99.   One contribution suggested that if the IGF secretariat gave the same priority toward organizing remote communications as it did on planning the annual meeting the "IGF's facilities for remote participation could be second to none."

100.   One comment wrote that while some of the minor improvements being made in the programme deserved some credit, it was regrettable that further changes had not been made to make the IGF a deliberative forum as opposed to

a conference. The author regretted that the IGF had not embraced a more deliberative and democratic form of discussion.

*101.	Severals comment praised the inclusion of debates in the schedule as debate are a common form of public discourse and encourage the expression of diverse opinion and tend to bring out the pros and cons of an issue.*

## B.	Meeting types

### 1.	Main Sessions

The main focus of the meeting will be on the main sessions. The main sessions will be of two types: Main Session Workshops and Main Session Debates. All of the main sessions will take place in the main meeting hall and they will be organized around the focal themes. In addition, there will be an opening and a closing ceremony in the same meeting hall. Interpretation will be provided in the into all six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) for all meetings taking place in the main hall. The Main Sessions will be Web cast and will be rendered in real-time transcription.

### (a)	Main Session Workshops

The Main Session Workshops will be scheduled before the Main Session Debates on the same theme, thereby allowing the workshop results to be fed into that session. The focus should be on learning from experiences and sharing of best practices. The Main Session Workshops will be held in the morning of each day, except on the last day. It was suggested that the main sessions be prepared in co-operation by the MAG and the workshop organizers and other relevant institutions, as appropriate.. They should communicate their interest to the IGF Secretariat. These workshops will be supported/facilitated by the MAG and IGF Secretariat, but organized by the sponsors of the workshop. Workshop sponsors whose workshop proposals fit within the topics recommended by the MAG are invited to contact the IGF Secretariat if they wish to have their workshop considered as Main Session Workshops. However, they should not be prevented from holding their separate workshop if they prefer, depending on the availability of meeting rooms. One of the important considerations in choosing Main Session Workshops as well as individual workshops remains the need for a multistakeholder approach and the need to present different perspectives on the issue under discussion. As with individual workshops, there may be reason to combine several similar workshop proposals into a single Main Session Workshop.

### (b)	Main Session Debates

The MAG recommends that the afternoon main sessions be planned as participant debates. The debates will be introduced by a brief presentation by the Main Session Workshop chairs on the content of morning workshops. The Main Session debates will be moderated. The afternoon main sessions will have neither panellists nor designated respondents. The goal of these debates will be to bring as many participants into the

dialogue as is possible and will allow for a debate with maximum interaction with participants. On the fourth, one session will be devoted to 'Emerging Issues' and another session devoted to 'Taking Stock and the Way Forward'.

Duration of all the main sessions will be three hours.

In the case of the Main Session Workshops, each workshop will be allocated half of the meeting time, that is 90 minutes, without a scheduled break except for the minimum necessary to change panellists between the workshops.

Comment Box 16: Main Sessions

102. It was recommended that the cross-cutting themes, especially the specific issues of concern to developing country participants, should be linked into the main sessions.

103. One contribution brought out the importance of retaining the five themes, access, openness, security, diversity and critical Internet resources from the Second IGF meeting even if these themes were not to be dealt with in individual sessions as had been done in the past. This contribution went on to explain that it was important that the main sessions be focused in such as way as to make the connection with the original themes very clear.

104. The view was held that the main sessions should be focused on a more in-depth discussion of a limited number of specific issues drawing on the outcomes (including recommendations) of the relevant workshops. This could be done, by putting one participant of each workshop (e.g. its moderator) on the panel of the respective main session. The format of the main sessions should be as attractive as possible.

105. One set of comments wanted the main sessions to be focused on specific issues or concerns as opposed to being general presentations at the high level. These comments also suggested that the main session descriptions should be simplified, and confirmed much earlier. The contribution also suggested that the issue(s) to be discussed in the main session should be identified in the descriptions.

106. Several comments emphasised the need to enable wider participation by the attendees in the main sessions.

107. It was commented that the main session might be aided if questions and comments were collected before the sessions.

108. Several comments indicated that the success of a session rested on the talents of the moderator.

109. Several contributions indicated that better use should be made of the main sessions. One comment indicated that the main sessions should be used to bring the outcomes of workshops and dynamic coalitions to the wider

community.

*110.	One contribution suggested that the main sessions would be improved if there were pre-sessions on the topics and the production of detailed synthesis papers on each of the themes as discussed in the pre-sessions.*

*111.	One comment suggested the workshops that related to the main themes be clustered and that participants from these workshops be the participants in the main sessions enabling them to "bring in, on a bottom-up basis, some of the ideas, including any recommendations that might be advanced, from the workshops to the broader audience."*

*112.	It was generally felt that the emerging issues session in Rio was a good model that should be used again in 2008.That session was described as interactive, and a valuable opportunity to raise issues that were not discussed during the other main sessions.*

2.	Workshops

Workshops should be designed to explore detailed issues related to the main themes. As such, all interested stakeholders were invited to submit proposals for workshops in a similar way as was done for the previous meetings of the IGF. As far as possible, an attempt will be made to schedule workshops that relate to the topics of the Main Session Debates prior to the debate.

As in Athens and Rio, workshops should be based on the multi-stakeholder principle and, to the extent possible, co-organized by entities representing different stakeholder groups. Governments are encouraged to respond positively to requests by entities from other stakeholder groups to lend their support to the organizers of workshops.

Based on the workshop proposals submitted within the 30 April deadline, the MAG identified a general need for merging workshops, as there were many proposals with similar themes and the number of proposals exceeded the availability of meeting facilities. All proponents of workshops with similar themes were therefore encouraged to contact the IGF Secretariat in view of merging workshops.

The scheduling of these workshops will be determined by the IGF Secretariat on the basis of maintaining a balance across the issues and efficient use of meeting space.

● Each workshop will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
● Duration of workshops: 90 minutes.

*Comment Box 17:	Workshops*

*113.	Several comments were made about the need to design the workshops*

so that the attendees would be enabled to participate and to speak. One contribution suggested that the workshops should become more interactive and one recommended involving youth in the planning of workshops that could take advantage of emerging technologies.

114.   Several comments expressed the view that some workshops had too many speakers.

115.   Several contributions expressed concerns with workshop reports and one contribution suggested that "these must be short, based on a previously agreed template (who participated, what issues were discussed, what were the main points) and checked before being presented in order to make sure that they truly reflect the discussions. "

116.   One contribution suggested that the IGF should serve as a facilitator, providing many opportunities for action-oriented, formal and informal workshops and meetings.

117.   There was some concern expressed about too great a number of workshops. There was also a comment that there was too much overlap in the workshops and that more of the workshops in previous IGF meetings should have been merged. One writer suggested that workshop topics should have been chosen after a public consultation and then organized either by a Dynamic Coalition devoted to the topic or by a volunteer programme group.

118.   Others held the view that the schedule not limit the number of possible workshops.

119.   One set of comments indicated that consideration should be given to limiting the number of workshops sponsored by any single organization.

120.   Several comments indicated that the viewpoint of the organizers of a workshop should not be allowed to dominate at the expense of other points of view.

121.   One comment indicated that it would be helpful for workshop outcomes to be aggregated to show where emerging consensus was in process.

3.   Open Forums

All major organizations dealing with Internet governance related issues will be given a slot, at their request, to hold an open forum in order to present and discuss their activities. The meetings should focus on the organization's activities during the past 12 months and allow sufficient time for questions and discussions.

- Each Open Forum will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
- Duration of Open Forums: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 18:   Open Forums

---

122.   It was suggested that forums should provide opportunity for alternative viewpoints to be expressed.

123.   It was commented that Open Forums should have clearly identified speaker lists, and that the topics to be discussed and the speakers list should be advertised in advance as is the case with other forms of workshop.

124.   Some comments indicated that the Open Forums should not be branded as having IGF support and recommended that the IGF Secretariat define a specific disclaimer for use in reports and Web sites indicating that the materials had not be approved by the IGF or the UN.

---

4.   Best Practice Forums

The aim of these sessions is to demonstrate, in a multi-stakeholder environment, some of the best practices that have been adopted with regard to the key IGF themes in general and to the development and deployment of the Internet in particular. The sessions can have either a thematic or a country focus. The presentations will be based on a common template. Presentations should not only cover practices that were successful, but also focus on challenges and mistakes. Thus, 'lessons learned' would be an important output of these sessions. They will be moderated by independent experts/hosts and participants will be given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments. The aim is to provide a space to discuss what constitutes a 'best practice' and share relevant information that can be transferred to other situations and strengthen capacity-building activities.

   ● Each Best Practice Forum will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
   ● Duration of Best Practice Forum meetings: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 19:   Best Practice Forums

125.   While it was recognized that some held the view that the Best Practice Forums should not be included as a separate category from other events, but that best practices should be mainstreamed into other events, it was felt that Best Practice Forums had served a purpose. It was suggested that a database on best practices be established, including toolkits and good practices that are presented or emerge from the workshops. The databank should be made accessible through the IGF Web site.

126.   Among those who discussed this category of forum, it was recommended that it should include challenges faced and worst practices, and the lessons that can be learned from initiatives that have been taken. Comments suggested that these Forums should be focused on topics of relevance to the main thematic themes.

127.   One commentator pointed out that one important lesson of Best Practice Forums was that one size does not fit all, and that different local conditions may require different policy models.

5.   Dynamic Coalitions

The meeting will provide space for the dynamic coalitions to meet and further develop their proposals.

All Dynamic Coalitions are requested to present a report on their achievements so far in general and on their activities since the Rio meeting in particular. The reports will be posted on the IGF Web site.

- Duration of these meetings: 90 minutes.
- Deadline for submission of reports: 30 June 2008.
- The reports will be taken into account in the allocation of rooms.

Comment Box 20:   Dynamic Coalitions

128.   The point was made that in order to strengthen the Dynamic Coalitions, they should be given more visibility during and between the IGF meetings, and that their work should be better reflected in the meetings during reporting back sessions. There should also be some way for the IGF to promote the outcomes from the dynamic coalitions.

129.   One commentator described Dynamic Coalitions as a means toward stimulating debate in the IGF and suggested that they should be given room to

evolve. As part of this evolution,Dynamic Coalitions should not be institutionalized and should continue to meet IGF criteria for Dynamic Coalitions.

130.   One comment indicated that the IGF should make sure that any reports by Dynamic Coalitions make clear that they are not an official part of the IGF. It was suggested that the IGF Secretariat create a boilerplate for this purpose that would be required on all Dynamic Coalition reports and websites.

131.   It was suggested in one comment that Dynamic Coalitions should be prevented from using the IGF logo or other IGF branding.

132.   It was recommended that Dynamic Coalitions should not require that participants all adopt a similar viewpoint.

133.   One comment indicated that a clear distinction should be made between meetings of a Dynamic Coalition and a workshops sponsored by a Dynamic Coalitions. This contribution expressed the opinion that Dynamic Coalitions should not engage in advocacy.

134.   Some suggested developing more concrete rules under which these coalitions could work, including their rights and obligations to the "core" IGF.

135.   One comment suggested that there should be some criteria under which Dynamic Coalitions could be accredited. The absence of such an accreditation procedure was seen by this writer as a widely-accepted deficit with the IGF.

6.   Other Meetings

Based on comments in the open consultations, the MAG discussed arranging for a single Reporting Back session that will allow for all Individual Workshops and other meetings to report on their meetings in the Main meeting hall to benefit from interpretation, Web casting and real-time transcription. Methods of achieving this goal are still under review.

In general, meeting rooms that are not otherwise booked will be given, as available, to interested stakeholder groups on a first-come-first-served basis. A number of rooms will be reserved to accommodate ad-hoc requests.

Comment Box 21:   Other meetings

136.   Several contributions wrote about the importance of reinstating the Reporting Back Sessions. It was commented that when there many parallel events, the Reporting Back sessions helped in keeping all participants informed.

137.   Several writers commented that the session reports given during the Reporting Back sessions should be short and should be neutral in covering the variety of viewpoints discussed during a session. There was a suggestion that

report be vetted by panellists and moderators before delivery..

138.   One comment indicated that a three minute time limit for Reporting Back should be strictly enforced. This comment also suggests that a template be provided by the IGF Secretariat for this purpose.

139.   One commented indicated that the reports during the reporting back session should be given by the IGF Secretariat.

140.   One comment suggested setting aside some time during the first day for regional meetings to allow the different stakeholder participants from the regions to network among themselves.

141.   Another contributor regretted that no use was made of the speed dialogue format in past meetings.

142.   It was suggested that more effort had to be made to schedule thematic threads that would allow for the in-depth exploration of an issue.

143.   One commentator called for a meeting format that would allow for the IGF multistakeholder community to discuss and make policy recommendations. The writer indicated that this did not require decisions, but that it should be the venue that enabled different views from the status quo to be presented to and to be discussed with those currently responsible for Internet governance.

144.   One submission recommended that the IGF create working groups using either the format of the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG, established during the World Summit on the Information Society), or bodies such as the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) to address complex emerging issues. The recommendations in the paper indicated that these groups should have a more specific charter than the broad thematic Dynamic Coalitions and that they would have higher requirements for transparency and accountability to the IGF. The paper indicated that the working groups would not produce decisions but could produce recommendations that could be communicated to other groups. The paper outlined three areas for working group effort: self and co-regulation in Internet governance, business models for access, and the development agenda for Internet governance.

C.   Format of the Schedule

During the February meeting, two different basic alternatives were discussed for the schedule. These were outlined in the May version of the Programme paper. The draft schedule emerging from the MAG meeting in May combines elements of both previously discussed options. The current plan for the schedule is as follows:

Time	Main Session Area	Other areas

	Day 1- 3 December, 2008	
Morning	Main Session Workshops: • Access • Multilingualism	Tutorials /Workshops/ Other events
	Lunch	
Afternoon	Opening Ceremony	
	Main Session Debate: • Access • Multilingualism	Workshops/Other events
	Day 2 – 4 December, 2008	
Morning	Main Session Workshops: • Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime? • Fostering security, privacy and openness	Workshops/Other events
	Lunch	
Afternoon	Main Session Debate: • Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime? • Fostering security, privacy and openness	Workshops/Other events
	Day 3 - 5 December, 2008	
Morning	Main Session Workshops: • Transition from IPv4 to IPv6 • Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional	Workshops/Other events
	Lunch	
Afternoon	Main Session Debate: • Transition from IPv4 to IPv6 • Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional	Workshops/Other events
	Day 4 - 6 December, 2008	
Morning	Main Session: • Taking Stock and the Way forward	Workshops/Other events
	Lunch	
Afternoon	Main Session: • The Internet of tomorrow: Innovation and the evolution of the Internet.	Workshops/Other events

IV.   Substantive programme

The discussion threads related to the main agenda items are to be considered work in progress. The final wording for the main session workshops and the session notes will be finalized at the open consultations and the MAG meeting in December.

A.   Reaching the Next Billion

The main session workshops under this agenda item will focus on:
- Access
- Multilingualism.

Comment Box 22:   Reaching the Next Billion

145.   *The heading previously under consideration – 'Universalization of the Internet' –was not retained, as it was deemed controversial. "Reaching the next billion" was felt to be more neutral and acceptable by all.*

146.   *The discussion thread related to access will focus on the promotion of low cost access.*

147.   *The view was held that accessibility for people with disabilities should also be included in the threads of the main discussion workshops.*

148.   *Several contributions commented on the continuing importance of the development theme, especially the focus human and institutional capacity building measures that are necessary to strengthen involvement of all stakeholders in Internet governance issues and institutions.*

149.   *One paper argued that digital literacy and IT training should receive more attention in the discussions in 2008. This paper supported inclusion of a discussion on skills development and the other resources necessary to get the world online.*

150.   *There was comment that future-oriented themes, "such as opportunities and challenges presented by, for instance, Web 2.0 and the Internet of things that are going to be of importance to millions of Internet users around the world," should be considered when selecting an agenda.*

151.   *It was felt that the linkages between Internet governance and sustainable development and the inclusion of sustainable development were not yet mature enough in an IGF context to be included as a key theme for the main sessions. These issues should first be further developed in workshops.*

152.   *The point was made in one comment that the role of the Internet in economic development and the importance of capacity building (i.e. in identifying initiatives that assist in bringing Internet access to developing countries) should remain among the key priorities for discussion for the IGF in all its sessions*

153.   *One contributor wrote that the discussion on diversity in 2008 should focus on the ability of the Internet and ICTs to enhance diversity with limitless capacity to transmit content. The contribution described the role that user-generated content plays in advancing cultural diversity and noted the promotion of cultural diversity through intellectual property protection and standards that*

facilitate the creation of new software applications and tools such as translation technologies.

154.   One comment questioned whether there were codes or norms that could or should be applied to the production of peer produced content.

B.   Promoting cyber-security and trust

The main sessions under this agenda item should focused on the following threads:

- Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime?
- Fostering security, privacy and openness

Comment Box 23:   Promoting cyber security and trust topics

155.   It was commented that discussion of these topics pay careful attention to the "delicate balance to be struck between security, privacy and openness, and the moral, legal and policy choices society will need to make."

156.   It was noted that there was a strong interest in issues related to child protection. Discussion of this issue would also be part of this thread.

157.   Several comments spoke of the importance of not losing the theme of 'openness' in regard to concerns for security. It was pointed out that the term 'openness' also related to open standards.

158.   There was comment that emphasized the importance of seeing things from the perspective of the stability of the Internet.

159.   One comment indicated that safeguarding of the World Wide Web was an important consideration that should be discussed. The comment pointed out that the main threats in this area are cybercrime, use of the Internet for terrorism, and use of the Internet for activities that are incompatible with international safety and security.

160.   One comment discussed the importance of promoting "a human rights culture for the Internet, an Internet in which its governance seeks to secure everyone's enjoyment of a maximum of rights and services, subject to a minimum of restrictions, an Internet which is wrapped in an umbrella of freedom of expression and information and which contains within it a strong will of law dimension, of cybersecurity, privacy and data protection, and the protection of children".

161.   One comment pointed out that debates can highlight where there are differences, and in that way "perhaps enable the participants to understand what the issues are that are at stake in something like the relationship between security, privacy, and openness".

C.	Managing critical Internet resources

The working title for the main session workshops relating to the agenda item 'managing critical Internet resources' are the following:

- Transition from IPv4 to IPv6.
- Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional.

Comment Box 24:   *Managing critical Internet resources*

---

162.   Different views were held with regard to the respective merits of the proposed themes "Managing the Internet" or "Using the Internet" for the discussion thread related to critical Internet resources.. As the term 'managing' reflected agreed WSIS language, this term was finally retained.

163.   It was pointed out that many aspects related to Internet governance were taken care of at the national and regional level. It would therefore be important to look at all these levels when dealing with this issue.

164.   One comment included the suggestion that this theme be focused on security and stability of the technical infrastructure of the Internet.

165.   One comment included a statement that it is "of paramount importance to look at the functioning of the political infrastructure, the management of the domain name system, addresses, root serial numbers, and internationalization of the management use and governance of the Internet."

166.   It was suggested that there should be a better combination of the main Internet governance issues with the developmental aspects so that, for example, the discussions around Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) and Generalized Top Level Domain Names (gTLDs) could be directed into showing the impact these have on development.

167.   While there was general agreement on the importance of the discussion on transition from IPv4 to IPv6 it was suggested that the topic of IPv6 be expanded with a focus on the bottom-up management of IP addresses.

168.   One contribution indicated that the IGF meeting in Hyderabad should prioritize the area of global Internet policy, especially what was described as "the gaps in and the inadequacy of global policy institutional frameworks and mechanisms in meeting the existing and emerging policy challenges". It was proposed that critical Internet resources be considered as a cross-cutting issue for the IGF, including the implementation of the WSIS principles for Internet governance in all forums involved in Internet governance. Developing a code for public participation in Internet regulation was also mentioned in this regard.

D.   Taking Stock and the Way Forward

The 'Taking Stock and the Way Forward' will allow participants to comment on the Hyderabad meeting and reflect on 'lessons learned'. In addition, the session could include a preliminary evaluation of the IGF in regard to its mandate. Taking Stock and the Way Forward

> 169.   One contribution recommended against doing a debate for the Taking Stock and the Way Forward session. This contribution explained that a discussion would do more to build awareness and deeper understanding and went on to argue that in general the purpose of the IGF was to spread information through discussion and dialogue as opposed to debate.
>
> 170.   It was suggested creating a space for the announcement of commitments, initiatives and partnerships as it might help make the IGF more attractive for leaders to participate and also for the media to report on it.
>
> 171.   One contribution referred to Tunis Agenda 72(g) and recommended that after the conclusion of the forum in Hyderabad the community at large should be given specific recommendations and guidelines.
>
> 172.   Another contribution wrote that whatever proceedings where produced after the Hyderabad meeting, the principle of no official outcomes should be preserved.

E.   Emerging Issues

- The Internet of tomorrow - Innovation and the evolution of the Internet.

Comment Box 25:   Emerging Issues

> 173.   Various issues were considered under this agenda item. The MAG agreed to approach this theme under the aspect of innovation and its impact on the evolution of the Internet.
>
> 174.   It was suggested that the IGF should make an effort to help participants to explore how the innovation potential of the Internet and its governance can be better explored by small and medium businesses, especially from the developing world.

V   Logistics

A.   Meeting rooms

The following meeting rooms will be available:

iv. Main Meeting Hall, for opening and closing ceremony and main sessions, seating 1800 participants in a mixed classroom and theatre-style setting. All proceedings in this room will be Web cast, interpreted in all six UN languages, and rendered in real-time transcription. A public remote chat capability will be provided for the Main Meeting Hall.

v. Four major Individual Workshop Rooms, seating around 250-300 participants in a theatre-style setting. All proceedings will be Audio cast. A public remote chat capability should be provided for the Workshop Rooms. One Workshop Room will have facilities for interpretation (interpreters can be provided by workshop organizers, if desired). A public remote chat capability will be provided for all workshop rooms in a bid to encourage remote interaction.

vi. Several smaller rooms for workshops, forums, dynamic coalitions meetings and other meetings seating 100-250 participants in a theatre-style setting. All proceedings will be Audio cast.

B.   Other facilities

v.   A fully equipped AV-studio to record prepared statements. The studio can also be reserved for TV interviews.

vi.   A media centre, with a room for media conferences, seating 250 journalists in theatre style setting and work space for journalists

vii.   An "IGF village", located next to the Main Meeting Hall, to allow interested entities to present themselves for free and have meetings and poster sessions. The village will include squares (with chairs and rostrum) for ad-hoc meetings and poster sessions. This "IGF village" will be organized in the form of different "neighbourhoods" or thematic clusters (e.g. according to the five main themes and also the cross-cutting priorities. The "IGF Village" will also contain the cyber-café.

viii.   Restaurants/refreshments:
   • A buffet with will be organized
   • Coffee will be served in the conference premises.
   • A restaurant is located in the hotel adjoining the conference centre.

The meeting facilities in Hyderabad will leave room for some innovations.

Event organizers and participants with special needs are requested to contact the Secretariat and communicate their requirements 30 September.

Comment Box 26:   Logistics

175.   One set of comments wrote of the importance of the logistics for the meeting in Hyderabad and requested that additional details regarding logistical arrangements including visas, registration and hotel booking, Internet access (at the event venue and in the main recommended hotels), and on the ground transportation be made public by May 2008. This contribution also noted that the

Indian hosts' efforts to ensure that there are reasonably priced hotels and other accommodations were greatly appreciated.

176.   Several comments indicated that the Village Square was very useful and important for networking between groups and for informing individuals.

177.   It was requested that information concerning the opportunity for broadcast of prepared statements be made public by September 2008.

178.   Several authors felt that it was very important that the IGF invest more effort and resources in creating an active and useable online forum that can be used throughout the year for continuing discussions on a multitude of themes.

VI.   Deadlines

The following deadlines were set for the next months:

<u>30 June:</u>

- Proposals for Open Forums.
- Proposals for Dynamic Coalition meetings.
- Requests for a booth in the IGF village.
- Revision of workshop proposals/merging of workshops.

<u>12 September</u>:

- Submission of final programme for all workshops, best practice forums, open forums and Dynamic Coalition meetings.
- Submission of papers as an input for the Hyderabad meeting. (All papers submitted by that date will be reflected in a synthesis paper prepared by the Secretariat for the Hyderabad meeting.)

<u>30 September</u>

- Event organizers and participants with special needs are requested to contact the Secretariat and communicate their requirements 30 September.

VII   Other issues discussed in contributor's comments

Comment Box 27:   Other comments

179.   There was a general feeling that care should be taken to correct the gender imbalance of the first two meetings and make sure that women play a more prominent role in all main sessions and are better represented on the panels of workshops and other events.

180.   Several comments held the view that the success of the IGF depended

upon the fact that the IGF remained multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent, and that it was neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding – consistent with the Tunis Agenda guidelines.

181.   The view was held that the IGF was not meeting the following parts of the mandate as contained in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, specifically: "advise all stakeholders" (e), "make recommendations" (g), "help to find solutions" (k) and to "promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes". The commentator recommended the formation of working groups with a formal link to the IGF's main body, which would be empowered to formulate concrete proposals on a multi-stakeholder basis and to present those with a recommendation for adoption by consensus by the main body.

182.   It was suggested that pre-meetings be encouraged for interested stakeholders as part of the preparations for the IGF meeting in India. One contribution mentions that regional IGF meetings should be convened for "the purpose of defining regional priorities and enabling greater participation from multiple stakeholders at regional level."

183.   One comment stated that "the IGF should offer an opportunity for leading Internet experts from around the world to share experiences and offer visions."

184.   Several contributors felt that the IGF Secretariat needed more resources. One paper held the view that the United Nations should recognize that the IGF was the outcome of a UN process and should ensure that it had the resources it needed to fulfil its mandate as defined at the Tunis Summit in 2005.

185.   There were several comments that the Secretariat should be lightweight and should "continue to be small, with the mission to support the smooth functioning of the IGF and to facilitate broad participation in the events."

186.   One writer suggested that there should be active sharing of lessons learned by previous hosts with the next host country of the IGF. It was proposed that this process should include representatives of all stakeholder groups.

(Writer H)

Dear Markus,

Thank you. Some more comments below:

At 5:07 PM +0200 6/3/08, Markus KUMMER wrote:
>Dear Writer H,
>
>Many thanks for your suggestions and for getting
>the discussion started. We will incorporate most
>of them in the final version. There was also an
>error with regard to a future consultation that
>needed to be corrected (it referred to a
>'December meeting' instead of 'September
>meeting').
>
>The paper tries to recapture our discussions,
>but it is clear that in many areas we need to
>refine further the concept. The paper is a work
>in progress and will be updated taking into
>account our future discussions. Please find
>below my comments embedded in your email below.
>
>Best regards
>Markus
>
>>
>> General question. When will the programme go to
>> the Secretary General for his consideration and
>> inclusion when he send initiations to the IGF?
>
>We have submitted the agenda for inclusion into
>the Secretary-General's invitation. Hopefully,
>it will be issued in early July.
>>
>> Lunch break, 13:00 to 14:00. Is one hour enough?
>
>The one hour is the meeting-free time that was
>requested by many. We can also call it
>'networking time'. The buffet will be open for
>more than one hour, as we will have to stagger
>the more than 1000 participants. Some meetings
>will end at 12:30 while others start at 14:30.
>We will discuss the details with the catering
>staff during our next planning mission.

My misunderstanding, I thought the paper was
suggesting lunch would be 13:00 - 14:00.   Could
you add a note about the length of anticipated
mid-day break.

> > There's a comment about a buffet (V. Logistics,
>> B. iv.) but not clear what it means. We had
>> problems in both Athens and Rio with lack of
>> quick and easy food. 90 minutes, would give
>> people a little more time to sit and relax.
>>
>> Will food be affordable, hotels tend not to be.
>> Could we find an organization interested in
>> sponsoring lunch!
>
>This will be part of the Host Country
>hospitality offer, as our Indian hosts kindly
>and generously offer the buffet to all
>participants free of charge.

Oh, this is very kind -- thank you hosts.

>Details will be made available in due course.
>>
>> About the AV studio for prepared statements. As I
>> expect we've all seen, OECD is using YouTube to
>> share comments for the ministerial meeting on
>> Seoul
>>
>><<http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_34223_40713859_1_1_1_1,00.html>http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_34223_40713859_1_1_1_1,00.html
>> >
>> Could we try something similar in Hyderabad. I
>> am sure the OECD would share their experience,
>> etc.
>
>It is true that our AV studio was not used as
>much as it could have been in Rio and we happily
>look in the OECD experience at the Seoul
>Ministerial.

We can see how it goes in Seoul -- how many of us
will be at the OECD meeting? I will, and
understand Writer D will be.

> > Section B. Meeting Types, main sessions.
>>
>> Suggest adding a sentence or two at the end of
>> the first paragraph to say that "Remote
>> participants will be able to submit questions and
>> comments by email in any of the six UN languages.
>> A public remote chat capability will be provided
>> for the Main Meeting Hall and other facilities
>> for remote access will be announced by the end of
>> September 2008."
>
>We can add a sentence to this effect, but I
>doubt whether we will be able to do this in all
>six UN languages. English, French and Spanish
>should be possible.

In Rio, MAG members monitored English, Spanish,
French and Portuguese email addresses during each
main session. So long as the web-based mail
software can handle the scripts (Chinese, Arabic,
Russian) I hope we could find a MAG member to
help (or find some volunteer help) with other
languages.

> >
>> (b) Main Session Debates
>>
>> Speakers or not? I thought we left it open that
>> there might be more than just the two workshop
>> "chairs" on stage. I think it might be useful to
> > have 3 or 4 experts.
> >
>> If no speakers in the debates then there'll be
>> pressure to get balance (stakeholder/point of
>> view, gender, region) in the Main Session
>> Workshop. Groups we're asking to help organize
>> these workshops would need to be aware of this.
>>
>> Don't think we need to say "chairs". I think we
>> can let the workshop organizers (and MAG of
>> course) decide who will be the best person to
>> present their workshop, e.g. "The debates will be

>> introduced by a brief presentation on the content
>> of morning workshops."
>
>This clearly will need to be refined further.
>Your suggestion is very helpful, as it leaves
>open a final decision.
>>
>> If the debates are as flat as the sessions in Rio
>> then we'll need a few people to keep them moving.
>> I would also like us make an open call for
>> questions/comments starting about 1 month before
>> the meeting (it could run in parallel with any
>> YouTube comment activity, if we adopt that.) See
>> if we can get a sense of the issues people are
>> interested in, seed the discussion (and also
>> provide input for the workshops.)
>
>This suggestion was made, I seem to remember,
>both in the open consultation and the MAG
>meeting. My feeling is that we should start
>somewhat earlier with such a call, maybe after
>the September meeting?

Fine by me.

> >
>> 2. Workshops
>>
>> Suggest adding the deadline for revising and
>> merging proposals in this section (June 30).
>> Makes it clearer.
>>
>> How are we going to begin suggesting merging, and
>> also possible Main Session Workshop candidates?
>
>We are in the process of approaching workshop
>organizers. Your input is welcome, both in terms
>of who should merge and who should provide input
>into the Main Session Workshops.

Will look at the proposals again. But by picking
out workshops to support the main sessions we are
getting into the meat of what the main sessions

will address. Need to do this carefully and
together I think.

> >
>> 3. Open Forums
>>
>> Were any proposed during the workshop call?
>
>So far, the OECD has asked for a slot to present
>the outcome of the Seoul Ministerial meeting.
>But as far as I know, other organizations are
>also interested. Admittedly, they are not
>multistakeholder, but they add value, as most
>IGF participants are familiar with one
>particular organization, but not the broad
>panoply of all the organizations who are
>involved with the IGF. There is room for
>improvement in their presentations, as was
>suggested. The Open Forums should not be beauty
>contests.
>>
>> I don't see the value of these forums, they seem
>> at odds with the multi-stakeholder approach. I'd
>> prefer if the IGF Village were used for this kind
>> of session. But if they go ahead I'd like to see
>> points 29-31 adopted in some form: they should
>> all allow for a comment period/open mic so other
>> views can be expressed, speaker list etc should
>> be submitted by September 12, and include a
>> disclaimer about them not being branded as having
>> IGF/MAG support.
>>
>> 4. Best Practice Forums
>>
>> Again, ask for complete information by September
>> 12. Says 90 minutes, weren't most of these
>> sessions shared in Rio, i.e. 45 minutes each?
>
>The country presentations were 45 minutes each.

Of course. Thanks.

> >
>> 5. Dynamic Coalitions
>>
>> I think we had an action item from last year to
>> come up with a process for accepting Dynamic
>> Coalitions. There are now 13 on the website
>>
>><<http://www.intgovforum.org/Dynamic%20Coalitions.php>http://www.intgovforum.
org/Dynamic%20Coalitions.php>.
>> Just wonder how many are active. Not suggesting
>> we try to devalue the Coalitions, if there's time
>> and space on the agenda it won't be a problem to
>> accept all Dynamic Coalitions sessions. But
>> perhaps best to close the list now and say new
>> Coalitions for Hyderabad won't be accepted after
>> the date the paper's published (i.e. June 5.)
>
>Last year it was felt that we should continue to
>be flexible, but I agree, we need to develop
>clearer criteria. I suggest putting it on the
>agenda of the September meeting - both Open
>Consultations and MAG meeting. I am not too sure
>whether your suggestion to close the list now
>would be acceptable, as we would change the
>rules without consulting the broader community
>first.
>

My concern is we are leaving it very open ended,
there might be one new coalition between now and
September, there might be 20 (I know unlikely...)
The opportunity to present at the IGF is
valuable, and should be earned in some way.

A moratorium on accepting new coalitions until
we have had comments from the community?

> > C. Format of the Schedule
>>
>> Unfortunate there will be less time for the lead
>> issue "Reaching the Next Billion".
>>
>> V Logistics
>>

>> A. i. Mention email for remote access?
>> B. iii. Will there be more information about the
>> IGF Village, information about booth size and
>> other space available, or is this an initial
>> expression of interest?
>
>It is a call for an initial expression of
>interest. The details will be determined in
>light of the demand and made public after our
>next planning mission in July.
>
>> B. iv. correct the note about the buffet.
>>
>> VI Deadlines.
>>
>> No deadline for best practices.
>>
>> Any information for people requesting to hold
>> side events, or will these be limited and already
>> agreed (I imagine GigaNet.)
>
>We are not advertising the possibility of
>holding pre-events, as we cannot have a full
>schedule of meetings already on 2 December.
>There will be some, including GigaNet. We are
>trying to accommodate people who approach us,

Thank you,

(Writer J)

I will start by joining my colleagues in congratulating our Chair,
Markus and the secretariat team, and of course all my colleagues and
special advisors.

Regarding this part Markus, I will be happy to help for Monitoring
Arabic email addresses (if any).

(Writer F)

>> It is true that our AV studio was not used as
>> much as it could have been in Rio and we happily
>> look in the OECD experience at the Seoul
>> Ministerial.
>
>
> We can see how it goes in Seoul -- how many of us
> will be at the OECD meeting? I will, and
> understand Writer D will be.

FWIW: I have decided to NOT be at the OECD meeting although I am from
[INSTITUTIONS] side watching what is happening. ICANN week after OECD,
and then later IETF and IGF is enough for my calendar.

(Writer F)

Markus, thanks for the paper which I think is of very high quality. I
also think both questions and answers on this list have made sense (of
course).

I must though emphasize comment 82 (about Logistics) that request more
information about specifically Internet Access at the main and
secondary venues. As we all remember, the situation in Athens was not
optimal, while Rio was a great success regarding access. I know our
friendly hosts from India has ensured Internet access for participants
also in Hyderabad, but it would be good if details where provided in
the announcements. Everything from simple things like what kind of
electricity outlets are in use, to whether it is suggested that people
bring extension cords, to whether Internet Access is negotiated to be
included in the hotel rates or not is interesting.

What also could be interesting are things like whether the hosts plan
having enough quality of the Internet Access so that participants can
download mail etc on site, or whether one should plan for doing that
at the hotel where one stay.

And other things that will make "life in Hyderabad" easier for those
of us that depend on having Internet access at least once a day -- and
all of the day if possible.

As in Athens and Rio, I am happy to help with the planning, and share
my personal experiences from those conferences as well as others with

the local host.

I am at your service.

(Writer K)

Dear Markus and colleagues,

happy to be joining in the congratulations to all and in volunteering to monitor German contributions. I'm sure writers A and L would also be able and willing to help.

Best regards

(Writer L)

of course

(Writer B)

I support the flexibilty regarding the debate sessions that Writer H has proposed. In particular, "The debates will be introduced by a brief presentation on the content of morning workshops." is a good formulation and deleting the term "chair(s)" will allow for the most appropriate person from the main session workshop(s) in the morning to be designated to help set the stage for the afternoon main session debate/discussion on the particular issues from the morning workshop session.

(Writer D)

Just confirming that I will be there. Looking forward to getting a
chance to catch up.

>>> It is true that our AV studio was not used as
>>> much as it could have been in Rio and we happily

(Writer M)

Likewise will be at the OECD meeting. Look forward to seeing those there who are likewise attending.

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

Your raised many important and also fairly detailed questions - some of them we can answer already, while others will have to wait until after our next planning mission in July.

As these questions are of interest to a wider community, we are trying to group them on a FAQ page that we will post on our Web site (instead of trying to answer all of them in our list discussion). The FAQ page will also need to be conceived as a rolling document and updated and completed as the planning advances.

Best regards
Markus

(Writer A)

ditto.

Writer L wrote:
>
> of course