

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 28 April – 08 May, 2008.

---

---

(Markus Kummer)

Please find below the link to a press release which was issued by the United Nations Department for Public Information in New York on 30 April 2008:

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2008/pi1829.doc.htm>

We can now issue an official call for proposals for new members. In order to give sufficient time to the various stakeholder groups, the Chairman agreed to set 21 May 2008 as a deadline for submitting proposals.

We will post the news on our Web site shortly.

---

(Writer A)

There's a note on the IGF website "Workshop proposals can be edited up to 9 May." Does this mean we are asking for complete proposals by May 9 (all 9 questions answered), or will editing re-open after the consultation?

---

(Writer B)

Dear Markus,

thank you for sending this out. Attention from UN headquarters in New York should be good news for the IGF process as a whole.

I may not be reading clearly part of your email. Is May 21 the deadline for submitting proposals of names of people who would be members of the MAG? Or for proposals for the text, timelines, and processes related to the call for renewal of membership?

Also, a number of organizations have proposed people, and sent the proposals to the Secretariat, during the last several weeks. Do they need to resubmit or is all the received correspondence already part of the file?

---

(Writer C)

Quite relevant questions, Writer B.

---

(Markus Kummer)

Dear Writer A,

As many proponents of workshops had problems with uploading their proposals and as others asked for more time to editing their submissions, we thought it would be most expedient to open the online forms for editing for another week.

We are not changing the rules and we are not asking for all the questions to be answered. However, we thought it would be best to freeze all proposals prior to our meeting so that we get a level playing field.

We thought indeed that we would re-open for editing after the MAG meeting.

---

(Markus Kummer)

Dear Writer B,

What seemed clear to us, obviously is not. We will try and improve the message!

We are calling on all stakeholders to propose names for MAG membership. The discussion on the modalities has been settled, as the Secretary-General endorsed the broad guidelines in the summary report of the MAG's February meeting.

We could not issue an official call as long as we were waiting for a decision/announcement from New York. As you rightly point out, many stakeholder groups did not wait for this and submitted their proposals. Obviously, they will not need to do so once again.

As some groups may have waited for an official call, we need to give them some time to coordinate and propose names. Three weeks should be enough. The consultations and the MAG meeting in May could be helpful for some final coordination among stakeholder groups. (This does not mean that we want to continue the discussions on the MAG in our sessions!)

I hope I have answered your questions.

---

(Writer A)

Thanks for the clarification about workshops -- I know someone's bound to ask (and some will see dark conspiracy!)

I see the Press Release about the MAG extension is now on the website, including asking for proposals for new members. But it does not include the May 21 deadline, an oversight?

---

(Markus Kummer)

Dear Writer A,

Many thanks for spotting the missing deadline - indeed it was an oversight. It is now up on our Web site.

---

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

You may be interested in learning that we have been able to reserve facilities for the September meetings at an unusually early stage. They will take place on:

16 September: Open Consultations

17-18 September: MAG meeting.

I hope this will help you with your planning.

Best regards

Markus

PS: Some colleagues suggested arranging the meetings back-to-back with an A2K Conference, which will take place in Geneva on 8-10 September. Unfortunately, this was not possible.

---

(Writer D)

I am preparing for next week's meetings, and find I am not quite sure what will be the topics for discussion during the open consultation next week. At the last meeting, we thoroughly covered the assessment of the Rio meeting and views of the topics for the Hyderabad meeting, as well as views of the MAG renewal. I suppose it is possible some may want to comment on the conclusions from the Advisory Group meeting

as set out in our minutes, but I wonder what else might be on the agenda? Are any of you aware of any other topics that are likely to be on the table for discussion? I think it would be good practice to issue an agenda in advance of both the Open Consultations and the MAG meeting, as we've promised.

---

(Writer A)

One issue raised recently on a civil society list was the question of chair's special advisers. MAG has had some discussion about this, but no conclusion. And of course they are Nitin's advisers, he should have an important say. But clarification about their role has been suggested. This is a small'ish procedural issue and not one I hope we will need to spend much time on.

Few quick thoughts...

More interesting would be to discuss the workshop proposals, see if they are converging on certain issues that would support the themes we suggested in February. We said some workshops would be held on main themes defined by the MAG, and some on other issues. Hopefully we will have some proposals on these main themes, we may be able to use the proposers to help plan the sessions? I am probably getting ahead of myself, but these are the kinds of issues I'd like to discuss. Add some meat to the rough outline developed in February.

It would be very helpful if the secretariat could provide a single source of all workshop proposals received to date. I don't know how easy it is to extract proposals from the online forms, I hope not hard if someone has the right access. Would save us going through each one by one. I'd really like to see the workshop description, who is proposing it and who they intend to involve.

At the May meeting last year we also tried to discuss the format of the sessions, ideas such as speed dialogue etc. I am not sure I am any more

convinced a speed dialogue is the right way to go, but discussion of the session style would be helpful.

Perhaps we might have time to begin to think about some core speakers?

Could we hear about how funding is progressing and ideas for any fellowships etc. Perhaps discuss how the MAG might go about fund raising (should we try, or is it beyond our mandate?)

Have people also been proposing best practise and "other" sessions?

---

(Writer E)

> [Have people also been proposing best practise and "other" sessions?](#)  
>

I wanted to ask a question along that line : do we have the same deadlines for Best Practice Forums and Open Forums DC workshops? If my memory serves me right, we had a different timing for these activities for the Rio meeting (I'm not suggesting we should do/have done the same, but I'm just asking).

---

(Markus Kummer)

We are running a bit behind schedule - my apologies for not sending out a draft agenda earlier. However, I thought the agenda of the meeting would be fairly straightforward: to discuss the programme, format and the agenda of the Hyderabad meeting, including all proposals for workshops, best practices forums, open forums etc.

The proposals we received (for workshops, best practice forums and open forums) will be made available online by tomorrow at the latest.

Writer E asked about the deadline for the other events: we had set 30 April for all events, but we can revisit an extension of the deadlines in light of next week's discussions.

There may be attempts to revisit the discussion we had last February on the renewal of the Advisory Group and other more institutional issues. Basically, this discussion is over. However, experience shows that you cannot stop people from discussing what they want to discuss and we can give them a briefing on the state of play. There is not much to say beyond what we have on our Web site and as we opted for the "black box approach" we

will have to wait and see what comes out of that box. In any case, I would not put any of these issues on the agenda and rather wait if anyone is going to address them under AOB.

One issue that I expect to come up again is the admission of onlookers or observers without speaking rights. Writer A also mentioned the role of the Chairman's advisors. This is very much the Chairman's prerogative, but I am sure that Mr Desai is happy to listen to your comments. In light of last February's discussion he suggested making a clearer distinction between MAG members and his advisors in the seating order. We will do so and group his advisors separately.

We can also give a briefing on the funding situation, in particular with regard to fellowships. We discussed funding at a donors' meeting last February and identified two categories of donors: those who contribute to the IGF Trust Fund and those who make contributions outside the Trust Fund framework. The latter include Canada (with a pledge of Dollar 200000 to the ITU for IGF Fellowships) ISOC and the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie. We were thinking of holding separate meetings for the two categories of donors. MAG volunteers could be interested in attending meetings of the second group.

Please find attached a draft agenda for the consultations we are planning to upload on our Web site. We suggest using the same agenda also as a basis for the MAG meeting. All the other issues mentioned above can be discussed under AOB.

ATTACHMENT:

## INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM

Open consultations

Geneva, 13 May 2008

Draft Agenda

- 1 Adoption of the Agenda
- 2 Programme and agenda of the Hyderabad meeting

3 Workshops and other events

4 Any Other Business

---

(Writer F)

> Writer E asked about the deadline for the other events: we had set 30 April for all events, but we can revisit an extension of the deadlines in light of next week's discussions.

I had the same confusion than Writer E. Therefore, I am in favor of extending the deadlines for the other categories of workshops.

.....

> One issue that I expect to come up again is the admission of onlookers or observers without speaking rights. Writer A also mentioned the role of the Chairman's advisors. This is very much the Chairman's prerogative, but I am sure that Mr Desai is happy to listen to your comments.

I agree that this is a prerogative of the Chair, and from my perspective they are very welcome while the number is not too large. (3-5 in total).

In my opinion the point is to clarify the role of those advisors. They are advisors of the Chair and so their work is to assist him. They should have speaking rights of course in the AG meetings, but limited to the chair requirements (which don't have limits).

The group of advisors should also have some level of diversity regarding the different criteria that we have talked about many times (gender, regions, etc.)

---

(Markus Kummer)

Dear colleagues,

The list of workshops and best practices forums is now available on our Website.

We also posted a paper on agenda, programme and format of the Hyderabad meeting as an input into the consultations. The paper reflects the comments we have received and incorporate content that was included in three different documents. We hope that it will facilitate our discussions if we can base ourselves on a single document.

We also posted a draft agenda for the open consultations.

Best regards

Markus