

The following text is excerpted from an ongoing discussion on the IGF Advisory Group mailing list thread on its own future. The only changes made relate to an effort to anonymize the comments in respect of the Chatham House rule. The discussion took place between 18-24 February, 2008.

(Markus Kummer:)

Dear colleagues,

We have posted a draft agenda for next week's consultations on our Web site:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/26FebAgenda.htm>

I would like to remind you that when registering you may have to remind the security staff that you will need a badge for all three days, from 26-28 February. There should be no problem, as your name will be on a list at the visitors' entrance of the Palais des Nations, the so-called Pregny Gate.

You may not yet have received a confirmation of your registration, but we are in the process of approving the applications and you should be notified within the next couple of days.

The meeting on 26 February will take place in Room XIX and on 27-28 February in Room XXIV. Meeting times on both days: 1000-1300 and 1500-1800 hours.

Best regards

Markus

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

A synthesis paper that reflects the contributions we received is now available on our Web site: http://www.intgovforum.org/rio_reports/Feb.synth.paper.rev.1.pdf

You will note that we have changed the language for the announcement of the 2008 meeting in India. We have received many questions with regard to the date, as concerns were expressed regarding the clash of dates with the Islamic holiday Eid El-Adha. The Indian hosts are looking for alternatives, to accommodate our Islamic stakeholders. A solution is in the pipeline, but needs formal Ministerial approval before it can be announced. We were assured that they would be ready to do so shortly. The new language on our Web site reflects this evolving situation.

Best regards
Markus

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

A reminder to urge you to make sure that you register for both the consultations and the meeting of the Advisory Group for all three days from 26-28 February.

You can do so through the special form we created for the Advisory Group you can access through the following url: http://info.intgovforum.org/reg_ag.php

By registering through this url you will automatically be issued a badge for all three days. We noticed that some of you registered through the generic form for the open consultations on 26 February (accessible via the front page of our website) and not the above mentioned form. A second registration on the 'right form' will give you the 'right badge'.

Best regards

Markus

(Writer A)

I registered twice. First time through the public form and second through the one that you linked.

I hope it will not be a problem

See you in Geneva.

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

Our Indian friends inform me that the Government of India is pleased to host the 2008 IGF meeting in Hyderabad from 3-6 December 2008. The Hyderabad International Convention Center (HICC) was chosen as the venue for the meeting.

We are very happy with this decision. We were on a planning mission in India last week and also visited Hyderabad. The HICC is a brand-new state of the art convention center with all the technological infrastructure necessary for hosting an Internet related meeting.

We also looked at the hotel situation there and found plenty of affordable and adequate hotels, from four and five star hotel to clean and neat budget accommodation for USD 100 or less (most of them with free WiFi!). There are also serviced appartments and houses as an attractive alternative.

As regards transportation, a new airport will be opened in Hyerabad next month. There are sufficient sufficient direct international flights to Hyderabad from the major hubs in Asia, the Middle East, Europe and North America.

Last but not least, Hyderabad is a fast growing IT center with all the major international companies implanted there (a growth rate of 50% a year in the IT sector) and therefore highly suited as a venue for the IGF. As our guiding theme is Internet Governance for Development, it is good to see that development in action in Hyderabad!

Our Indian hosts will give us a presentation of the venue at the consultations Tuesday.

Markus

(Writer B)

Karen banks asked me to forward to the advisory group.

Hope of interest,

>

>dear all

>

>Please find attached a paper

>

>"Building Consensus on Internet Access at the Internet Governance Forum"

>

>which identifies and documents the main areas of

>discussions and "recommendations" that were

>generated under the Access theme at the second

>Internet Governance Forum in Rio De Janeiro,

>November 2007.

>

>We gratefully acknowledge the support, financial

>and otherwise, from IDRC, for both our access

>related work in the IGF last year, and the
>production of this preliminary report.

>
>The recommendations are noted in the first two
>pages - but are included below as text here for
>ease of reference. The paper is 12 pages long in
>total.

>
>The document notes willie currie as the contact
>person in general, but if you would like to
>discuss aspects of the paper and it's
>recommendations next week in geneva, please note
>that Anriette Esterhuysen, APC's Executive
>Director, will be our representative at the
>meetings.

>
>For personal reasons, i won't be able to make it
>to the consultations next week, but wish you all
>the very best and look forward to staying in
>touch remotely.

>
>karen

>
>Building Consensus on Internet Access at the Internet Governance Forum

>=====

>
>This paper identifies and documents the main
>areas of discussions and "recommendations" that
>were generated under the Access theme at the
>second Internet Governance Forum in Rio De
>Janeiro, November 2007.

>
>Whilst recognising that the IGF is currently
>viewed and operates primarily as a space for
>discussion, the paper finds that (specifically
>in the case of Access) it is also a space in
>which commonality of opinion occurs to the level
>at which 'recommendations' can be made and
>repeatedly asserted independently/individually
>in the workshops, and strategically reinforced
>at different levels of the IGF.

>
>The levels addressed in the paper include:

>
>- the three 'thematic' workshops on access
>- the reporting back session

>- and the main access plenary
>
>The paper finds the generation and articulation
>of recommendations to be in line with the
>mandate of the IGF, specifically:
>
>"Advising all stakeholders in proposing ways and
>means to accelerate the availability and
>affordability of the Internet in the developing
>world."
>
>Whilst a variety of recommendations were made,
>these can be categorised into the following
>broad areas:
>
>* Enhancement of the development of and access
>to infrastructure -- in recognising that the
>availability of internet infrastructure needs to
>be considered hand-in-hand with the
>affordability of the infrastructure, this
>recommendation calls for the consistent
>implementation of competitive regimes and the
>creation of incentives that facilitate the
>co-existence of competitive and collaborative
>models for providing and/or improving access.
>
>* Localisation of ICT and Telecom policies and
>regulation -- refers to calls for a review of
>the ways in which access issues are articulated
>and ICT/Telecom policy and regulation is
>formulated. It asks that the
>translation/customisation of largely
>urban-centric policies be challenged and that
>greater emphasis be given to demand-side
>characteristics and the needs of rural/local
>communities.
>
>* Promoting the development potential of ICTs
>and integrating access infrastructure
>initiatives with other basic needs -- calls for
>a multi-sectoral approach to infrastructure
>development and regulation; specifically the
>integration of ICT regulation and policy with
>local development strategies, as well as the
>exploitation of complementarities between
>different types of development infrastructure

>
>This paper proposes that the convergence in
>opinions about how to address the challenges of
>access may be a result of a maturity in
>understanding of the issues relating to access
>that has built up over time and is discussed in
>other related bodies and fora. However, thinking
>and understanding of tools and implementation
>procedures/processes of solutions for
>resolving/addressing these well understood
>issues and challenges cannot be described as
>having attained a similar level of maturity --
>in fact, particularly in the case of rural/local
>access they can be described as infantile.

>
>There is therefore continued need and relevance
>for addressing Access at future IGF meetings,
>however the way in which this will need to be
>done will have to be different from the largely
>discursive identification of issues and
>challenges. The Internet governance community
>and indeed the portion of the world's population
>waiting to gain access to the Internet would
>benefit from a more implementation-orientation
>to future discussions on Access.

>
>One idea proposed by APC[1] is that the IGF uses
>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 convene working groups to address
>complex issues that emerge during a forum. These
>groups can be made up of individuals with the
>necessary expertise and drawn from different
>stakeholder groups. These groups can then engage
>specific issues in greater depth, and, if they
>feel it is required, develop recommendations
>that can be communicated to the internet
>community at large, or addressed to specific
>institutions.

>
>These recommendations need not be presented as
>formally agreed recommendations from the IGF,
>but as recommendations or suggestions for action
>from the individuals in the working group.

>
>These working groups have a different role from
>the self-organised dynamic coalitions which we
>believe should continue. Dynamic coalitions have
>a broader mandate and are informal in nature.
>APC sees IGF working groups as differing from
>dynamic coalitions in that they should address
>particular challenges rather than a general
>issue area. They will also have a degree of
>accountability and an obligation to report that
>dynamic coalitions do not have. One such group
>could be a working group on competitive and
>collaborative models for access.
>
>Further Information:
>Willie Currie
>APC Communication and Information Policy Programme Manager
>wcurrie@apc.org
>
>[1] Statement of the Association for Progressive
>Communications (APC) on the second Internet
>Governance Forum, Rio de Janeiro November 12-15
>2007
><http://www.apc.org/english/news/index.shtml?x=5340227>

(Writer C)

I've received request for info regarding opportunities for remote participation at next week's open consultation. Will people be able to participate remotely and have a means for providing input (such as email address to get a comment on the record)?

Relatedly, will there be remote participation for the Advisory Group discussions next Wed and Thursday? Unfortunately I won't be able to come to Geneva, but would like to participate remotely if possible.

Many thanks for any efforts that can be mustered to facilitate remote participation!
