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 6 December 2007 and 15 January, 2007. One contribution to this discussion is also posted as a separate submission.

===
Dear colleagues,

Several of you have approached me and enquired about the mandate of the Advisory Group. You may recall that the press release announcing the renewal of its mandate on 20 August included the following:

Quote: As part of its mandate, the Advisory Group has been asked to enhance the transparency of the preparatory process by ensuring a continuous flow of information between its members and the various interested groups. It has also been requested to make proposals on a suitable rotation among its members, based on recommendations from the various interested groups. Any decision on how to prepare subsequent meetings will be taken after the Rio de Janeiro meeting in an open, inclusive and transparent consultative process, taking into account the proposals of the Advisory Group. Unquote

My reading of this para means that the mandate has not yet been fulfilled, as we have not yet come up with "proposals on a suitable rotation among its members". This will be very much part of the agenda of the consultations and the Advisory Group meeting in February, However, these discussions will need to be prepared within the Advisory Group and amongst the stakeholders. I would therefore suggest launching this discussion. We can also launch a request for comments on our Web site, should you wish us to do so.

Best regards
Markus

(Writer A)

"One of the problems is that there is no guideline or common understanding what the right balance of such a group - independent from individual names - is.

You can have a "horizontal balance" based on geography or geo-political criteria and a "vertical balance" based on stakeholder affiliation. It would be much easier first to clear how many seats should be filled by which stakeholder group or region and than you can identify the accepted units to make proposals or to start a nomination process among their constituencies.

To give the advisory group enough legitimacy you have to have an open and transparent discussion process which will lead certainly to a bottom up nomination process at the end. It should not be dictated from the top. But I am afraid that we can not achieve this in one step and in a very short time frame.

Probably a two phase process could be helpful. Phase one would be basically a continuation of the existing Advisory Group, encouraging the main stakeholders to discuss with there representatives - if they have been nominated in a certain way by their groups - about rotation so that we would see some new faces but also guarantee a certain continuity not to loose the experiences from IGF I & II. There is a need that the new Advisory Group can start working immediately after the February consultations. At the same time we can start now also a more general debate which could produce a more formal procedure which could then be adopted for the Post New Delhi phase."

(Writer B)

"I would encourage opening a public discussion area on the IGF website soon to begin collecting views. It seems likely that Advisory Group members will want to discuss among themselves, but in the interests of transparency, some may want to post publicly too. Do colleagues have views about how best to handle this issue"

(Writer C)

"I agree with the suggestion that opening up a public discussion would be useful, and would help to increase transparency, and build the base of exchange on this issue.

A priority should be to have the advisory group confirmed as soon as possible after the February meetings, and a public discussion before February would help in this regard"

(Writer D)

"My thanks as well for starting the discussion thread. As you remind us out, it is part of the mandate of this advisory group as reconfirmed by the UN SG this year to think about a suitable rotation mechanism based on input from various stakeholder groups. Therefore, the work of this Advisory Group is not yet done.

Thanks also to Writers A and B for proposing a public discussion about this to be started before the February meetings. It would fit our group well to assure that the rotation process itself is discussed and agreed upon in an open and transparent manner with wide stakeholder input. However, while seeking input from various stakeholder groups asks for such wide and open participation, in the end the mandate asks the Advisory Group itself "to make proposals on a suitable rotation among its members". Therefore, we should probably have two spaces, a public one to seek input and this list as a way to form a consensus amongst ourselves.

Allow me to kick of the substantive discussion on some of the principles that we could find useful:

a) approx 1/3 of AG members to rotate is a good way to assure continuity and change
b) voluntary rotation to be given preference over mandatory rotation
c) commitment to active participation (incl. time commitment) preferred over status memberships
d) stakeholder groups should nominate final candidates out of their own stakeholder group
e) stakeholder groups can also suggest names from other stakeholder groups as input into d)

There are certainly pros and cons for each of these suggestions and I'm happy to hear what others have to say about them. Before deciding on the substance of these proposals, it might be useful for us to agree first upon the process by which we as Advisory Group come to a decision. I think it would be useful to keep with our tried and tested practice to go for "rough consensus", i.e. no voting mechanism (where a majority could overpower a minority) and no veto powers either (where a small minority could prevent a decision). Let us try in the well-established manner of professional, respectful dialogue to come to a rough consensus that has broad agreement by most, if not all, participants."

Writer (E)

"There has been considerable discussion among the technical community regarding the issue that you have recently raised regarding the composition and evolution of the IGF Advisory Group.

The initial result of this discussion is that several of us would like to put forward the following proposal:

~~~~~~~~

PROPOSAL:

Role of Chair:
- The Chair should be a neutral person designated by the UN Secretary-General

- The Chair should be appointed for the remainder of the mandate of the IGF - we believe that Nitin Desai should continue in this role

Host country representative (at the host country's discretion):

- A senior local host country representative could participate in the AG meetings and be the interface for logistics and protocol matters for the event

Number of AG members:
- 40, comprising, in the spirit of true multi-stakeholderism and equal representation, 10 from each stakeholder group (governments, business, civil society and technical community)

- Rotation in March, service through end February following year

- International organizations with relevance to IG issues are welcome as observers (subject to the approval of the Chair)

Advisers to the Chair:
- Maximum of 5 advisers selected by the Chair

- The Chair may wish to extend an invitation to a host country representative to be one of the five advisers

Rotation:
- Approximately one third of the AG members from each stakeholder group should rotate every year

- Each stakeholder group will be responsible for submitting the names of the outgoing and incoming Advisory Group members to the Chair for approval (the Chair may consult as he sees appropriate with regards to the proposed names). Stakeholder groups may provide more names than there are seats. The Chair's decision is final.

- If an insufficient number of members have retired from the AG, the Chair may ask individuals to retire (in informal and private conversation)

Key guidelines for AG member selection:
- AG members should be chosen on the basis of how large and diverse a community they connect to (which is different than "represent").

- Anyone who did not participate actively and conscientiously should not be renewed. (Note that participation can include postings to the list, private communications with the Chair and the secretariat, attendance at meetings, both in Geneva and at IGF, and actual work in helping to facilitate the IGF, etc.).

- Quality of participation should count more than quantity of participation.

- The AG should be balanced in terms of, inter alia, stakeholders, geographic regions, gender, points of view, while noting that the competence/expertise of the group should not be diluted to achieve this balance.

~~~~~~~~~~

Other members of our community have participated in the discussions leading to this proposal, and are planning to post their specific comments regarding its content to the list.

We trust that this proposal is a positive contribution to the continued functioning and success of the Internet Governance Forum, and we look forward to your comments. In addition, we look forward to continuing to work with you and Chairman Desai to increase the productivity of future IGF interactions and events."

(Writer F)

"Theoretically sounds reasonable, in practice it is dubious -- it is difficult to make sure balance in representation is assured. Members of the so-called (and in my view, ill-defined) "technical community" might be linked to business or government, which might unbalance representation.

I would drop this elusive "technical community" and make sure we have the three basic sectors clearly represented in a careful balance, taking into account as well the geopolitical balance -- after all, most of the crucial problems in Internet governance are in the South, so let its corresponding representation be strong. If we cannot drop it entirely, let us at least ensure that we actually have "academic community" representation with no ties to companies or governments, which is brought to the MAG for their recognized, independent expertise."

(Writer G)

"I'd like to comment on two aspects concerning the composition of the advisory group. Your model suggests 4 stakeholder groups. My guess is that with each new formally acknowledged stakeholder group we will have a hard time denying other groups the same status. For example, how would we explain to academia that they are less relevant than the technical community? What is more, your model would reduce governments to a fourth of all seats. Considering how much pressure the current model has to withstand, I am not sure it would be smart to propose such a model right now.

My second comment concerns the "non-representation" of regions, skills, gender etc. As you may know, civil society groups are very keen on choosing themselves their representatives for the advisory group. In case we really delegate the selection of new members to the stakeholder groups, how do we ensure that we don't end up with a group dominated by white men from the north because each group honestly thought that these people offered the best skill set? In other words, how can we enforce diversity if we decentralize the selection of members?"

(Writer H)

> *(From Writer E)*
>
> *"- 40, comprising, in the spirit of true multi-stakeholderism and equal representation, 10 from each stakeholder group (governments, business, civil society and technical community)"*

"I agree with 40 as the maximum size of the AG, but IMHO, the Chair, supported by the secretariat should be the responsible of advising the UN SG to get an AG balanced in terms of

gender, geography, stakeholders and probably some other criterion. We should avoid to specify that there would be a fix number of representatives from each group, because it would be based in the concept that each group is an hermetic or watertight group and separated from each other and this is not true. Probably appointing one person more than one group could be satisfied and this is the kind of tools that the chair and the secretariat should have on their hands for getting a balanced group.

So we should include here together the number of members

- the group will be composed by 40 members appointed by the UN SG with the advice of the AG Chair and the Secretariat.

with the comment related to balance.

- The AG should be balanced in terms of, inter alia, stakeholders, geographic regions, gender, points of view"

> *"Advisers to the Chair:*
> - *Maximum of 5 advisers selected by the Chair*
> - *The Chair may wish to extend an invitation to a host country representative to be one of the five advisers"*

"This is not a major point, but I think that 5 is a high number for advisers. 3 is more than enough. We have also to specify that the advisers will advice the Chair and so, they are observers in the AG and they will speak only if they are required by the Chair to address a specific point. There should be a distinction between the Chair's advisors and the AG members."

> *"Rotation:*
> - *Approximately one third of the AG members from each stakeholder group should rotate every year*
>
> - *Each stakeholder group will be responsible for submitting the names of the outgoing and incoming Advisory Group members to the Chair for approval (the Chair may consult as he sees appropriate with regards to the proposed names). Stakeholder groups may provide more names than there are seats. The Chair's decision is final."*

"Disagree with the idea of each group appointing or selecting representatives. It would bring us to the discussion about the definition and composition of each stakeholder group, what is a discussion that I am in favor of avoiding. There should be a process open to everybody to nominate people, but not necessarily representing a given stakeholder group. It is consistent with my comments related to composition of the AG."

> *"- If an insufficient number of members have retired from the AG, the Chair may ask individuals to retire (in informal and private conversation)*
>
> *Key guidelines for AG member selection:*
> - *AG members should be chosen on the basis of how large and diverse a community they connect to (which is different than 'represent').*
> - *Anyone who did not participate actively and conscientiously should not be renewed. (Note that participation can include postings to the list, private communications with the Chair and the secretariat, attendance at meetings, both in Geneva and at IGF, and actual work in helping to facilitate the IGF, etc.).*
>
> - *Quality of participation should count more than quantity of participation.*

- *The AG should be balanced in terms of, inter alia, stakeholders, geographic regions, gender, points of view, while noting that the competence/expertise of the group should not be diluted to achieve this balance."*

"I don't support 100 % the last part of the sentence. While the competence of the group is certainly a value to defend, it could not affect the balance of its composition. I am sure that there are enough good candidates to achieve both competence and balance at the same time."

(Writer B)

"Thanks for the original posting, and for this additional work. I would like to recommend that this thread be taken off the IGF-members list and made public on the intgovforum web site, unless there are strong objections. I think it is in the global interest to see this diversity of views, and in our interest in terms of encouraging both visible debate before the open consultations and internal preparations by stakeholder groups. It can't help but make the February sessions more productive, in my opinion. Views?

I would not want to see efforts to achieve some kind of ideal of transparency make it impossible to get a balanced and effective Advisory Group once we move toward rotation. I think the choice of AG members *must* remain in that black box known as "the UN Sec Gen, or we risk the process being manipulated or captured. That said, the various stakeholder groups (themselves a relic of the WSIS) should be encouraged to nominate people they think would be good (keeping in mind balance), but should also be encouraged to nominate more than whatever number is notionally allocated to their constituency.

I also strongly believe that the division of membership into some number of stakeholder groups in a very formal manner could be a problem. That said, I don't have a problem with the characterization of "technical community." To be clear, I think academics could probably be persuaded to self declare as being primarily technical or primarily social (i.e., civil society) in terms of their interests. They would only rarely be primarily aligned with business or government interests, though it is not impossible. I can also think of business people who might self describe as being civil society, because of their focus. There may even be government people who would prefer to fit in that box (although they might be tossed out)."

Writer F)

"Just to make sure the MAG is in accordance with the Tunis Agenda, para 29 reads: "We reaffirm the principles enunciated in the Geneva phase of the WSIS, in December 2003, that the Internet has evolved into a global facility available to the public and its governance should constitute a core issue of the Information Society agenda. The international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations [...]"

The stakeholder groups are defined in para 35: governments; private sector; civil society; intergovernmental organizations; international organizations.

Para 36 reads: "We recognize the valuable contribution by the academic and technical communities within those stakeholder groups mentioned in paragraph 35 to the evolution, functioning and development of the Internet."

So, the communities mentioned in para 36 are not considered by the Tunis Agenda as stakeholder groups; instead, they are considered part of one or more of the stakeholder groups listed in para 35. No news here..."

(Writer I)

"Markus, I would like to pick up the discussion you have opened on this subject. I appreciate the views that have been shared recently on the selection and make-up of the Advisory Group and would like to add a couple of thoughts to the discussion.

It seems to me that the simplest part of the puzzle may be the nomination of government members. There are established ways of nominating representatives from UN regional groups and I assume these can continue to be used with appropriate rotation.

With regard to nomination of private sector, civil society, academic and technical experts, I think that some judgment and flexibility will continue to be needed. For example, when the first AG was appointed, would representation of Web 2.0 or child protection viewpoints have been a consideration? I think they would need to be considered now. This leads me to think that the nomination process should definitely try to take advantage of different sources of expertise and experience, be they broadly or narrowly based, while on the other hand avoiding the problems that could arise from cementing particular 'constituencies' in arrangements going forward. (Of course it is equally important that key stakeholders and contributors should not be excluded!).

Sorry I don't have a particular formula to suggest. At this point I am only cautioning that the flexibility, diversity and openness that will be needed in the future may not be assured by rules that entrench particular interests or procedures. One answer to the puzzle may be some sort of mixed approach of bottom up and top down nominations - but at this point I don't have a prescription that I could offer with great confidence. I think that achieving an appropriate balance without blowing out the size of the Advisory Group will continue to require some judgment."

(Writer A)

"While we have to ensure that the reformed AG is basically multistakeholder, that means that all stakeholder groups from the north and the south are represented in a balanced way, it has to be also "multidisciplinary", so that we have also the substantial competences in the group. We have - so far - six main "disciplines" in the IGF: Access, Diversity, Openness, Security, CIR, Emerging Issues. We should make sure that we have at least two experts on each of the main "IGF-disciplines" in the group. Probably a special recruiting process (via a NomCom) could be launched to have the "best knowledge" in the group."

(Writer F)

"It is a good idea to have independent experts as advisors for each "discipline" -- as impartial (not linked to companies, governments etc) advisors, not as stakeholder reps. How could this be funded? How could these advisors be found, with such rare characteristics?"

(Writer J)

"Striking the right balance between all stakeholders seems to be a recurrent challenge. When discussing composition and representation, we should not lose sight of how the Tunis Agenda envisaged the stakeholders and their role as to Internet Governance.

So, let me recall paragraphs 29, 35 and 35 of the Tunis Agenda, which must be interpreted together:

"29. We reaffirm the principles enunciated in the Geneva phase of the WSIS, in December 2003, that the Internet has evolved into a global facility available to the public and its

governance should constitute a core issue of the Information Society agenda. The international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations.

35. We reaffirm that the management of the Internet encompasses both technical and public policy issues and should involve all stakeholders and relevant intergovernmental and international organizations. In this respect it is recognized that (...)

36. We recognize the valuable contribution by the academic and technical communities within those stakeholder groups mentioned in paragraph 35 to the evolution, functioning and development of the Internet."

Therefore, one possible reading of the "within" on paragraph 36 would be that all stakeholders (Governments, the private sector, civil society and IOs) have their own technical communities, which are part of or are "within" the constituencies mentioned in paragraph 29.

I agree that the communities mentioned in para 36 should not considered as new constituencies; they must be regarded as part of the stakeholders listed in para 35."

(Writer K)

"I support the statement made by several people that ask for the selection of representatives be made "in the black box" of the UN Sec Gen.

More specifically, to have an advisory group (or board or similar group) multi stakeholder imply for me that skills and views from all stakeholders have to exist in the group. This is something that can be guaranteed only by someone that have an overall view over what skills are represented. Not by having each stakeholder group selecting representatives. Further, individuals that end up being members of the group after selection must have as responsibility to ensure the success of the process they are working with, and no longer the success of the organisation they originally represent or come from.

This implies to me that the requirements of multi stakeholder representation does not imply each stakeholder group is to select a certain number of representatives, but instead that views of all stakeholders should exists in the advisory group. And that someone (UN   Sec Gen) take responsibility to ensure that is what the result will be.

And it is the overall composition of the advisory group that has to be balanced. That the members of the future advisory group understand the views of all stake holders."

(Writer G)
"I agree with the suggestion to refrain from fixed numbers for each stakeholder group. The first reason would be that we should keep this spirit of "experimental design" for the IGF as long as possible. Sooner or later practices become codified and that it is much, much harder to change them again. The second reason would be that a generally shared "sense of fair proportion" leaves more latitude for the secretariat to get the balance right between north and south, women and men, etc.

Personally I also don't care about the number of advisers as they also give chair and secretariat some flexibility to add skills or strengthen a point of view.

However, we discuss such principles in light of a chair and a secretariat we all fully trust and appreciate, not least because they believe in the idea of multi-stakeholder processes. But what if the chair changes at some point and the IGF gets a chair who is not as committed to the principle of equal footing for the preparatory process? Under such circumstances, quantitative

proportions might matter more than they do right now. My feeling is that we should define some minimum standards to ensure that a strong version of the multi-stakeholder principles will be reflected in future compositions of the advisory group. Given that we restrict the group's size to 40 members plus some advisers, a certain minimum number of members should represent each stakeholder group.

While each stakeholder group or individual should be invited to suggest members the final selection of the members should be coordinated by the secretariat. Actually, exactly the way the member of WGIG members and our group were selected. I know there was some mumbling here and there about the intransparency of the process but all things considered it probably provides the best results.

I support the proposal to rotate a third of the membership each year. But how do we this? IIRC, it was suggested that we should first look for volunteers who would like to leave the advisory group. This sounds good but we need to insure that each stakeholder group bears its share..."

(Writer H)

> *(From Writer B)*
>
> *Thanks for the original posting. I would like to recommend that this thread be taken off the IGF-members list and made public on the intgovforum web site, unless there are strong objections. I think it is in the global interest to see this diversity of views, and in our interest in terms of encouraging both visible debate before the open consultations and internal preparations by stakeholder groups. It can't help but make the February sessions more productive, in my opinion. Views?*

"Agreed."

> *By the way, in the interest of transparency, I should say that I too participated in the discussions leading to George's original post, and that in general I support it. I have some of the same concerns as writer H. In particular, I would not want to see efforts to achieve some kind of ideal of transparency make it impossible to get a balanced and effective Advisory Group once we move toward rotation. Jeanette's concerns are very realistic in this respect. I think the choice of AG members *must* remain in that black box known as "the UN Sec Gen, or we risk the process being manipulated or captured. That said, the various stakeholder groups (themselves a relic of the WSIS) should be encouraged to nominate people they think would be good (keeping in mind balance), but should also be encouraged to nominate more than whatever number is notionally allocated to their constituency.*

"Agreed, except with the expression "allocated to their constituency" since I think that we (or UN Sec General or whomever) should not allocate a given number of seats to a given constituency. IMHO that is one of the advantages of keeping the selection, as you said, in the black box of the UN Sec General."

> *I also strongly believe that the division of membership into some number of stakeholder groups in a very formal manner could be a problem.*

"Exactly."

(Writer H)

"If you remember there were 2 reasons to not modify the para 35.

a) to keep what diplomats refer as "agreed language" and means that it was already included in previous agreed documents.

b) because some people said that there could (not necessarily but it could) be some overlaps with the categories included in the para 35.

The para 36 says that those groups mentioned here exist and they are important stakeholders, but they could be aligned also in different situations and cases, with the other stakeholders group.

In fact, for example some Internet organizations registered in the Summit as thy were already recognized in UN environment as Civil Society and other Internet organizations registered as business sector, probably because they feel themselves closer from that sector in this given classification.

So, my view is that the disagreement is not important or even it doesn't exist.

The important thing is that this diversity that is shown in paras 35 and 36 should be expressed and represented in every process related with Internet Governance, and therefore in the AG. There should be a significant representations of academic and internet technical communities independently if at the end of the day you count them as independent groups, as part of civil society, business sector or even, although less probable, governmental group, or if you count some of them as belonging to one group and others as belonging to other."

(Writer E)

"I find some interesting responses to my post of 36 hours ago. I'd like to make some points, and I do this in part in response to Writer G's thoughtful reflections.

1. My post was really a rough consensus post of a substantial discussion by the technical community. I did contribute to those discussions, but so did many others, as has been apparent from the recent posts to this list. So when you thank me for the post, you are implicitly also thanking others who contributed equally to the discussions preceding it.

2. My post was a rough consensus post, and I am pleased that others in our group who agree generally but have specific objections have voiced them. Theses differing points of view need to be taken as seriously as the details of the proposal in the original post.

3. Now, concerning Writer G's second comment, I agree that the representational issue and balance across multiple dimensions will not be easy. In my view, this is something that we need to leave to the secretariat. So we have suggested nominations from various stakeholder groups to the Chair, and then leave to the Chair the activity of balancing the Advisory Group across those dimensions. so we do not delegate to the groups themselves the decision regarding who will be on the committee, but the Chair should take seriously the nominations that come from the various groups. Obviously, the Chair is free to accept nominations from other sources also, including the Chair's own choices.

4. With respect to the same point, I do hope that Writer H's statement (in a subsequent post) that it should be possible to achieve such balance without loss of competence, at least geographically, is correct. In our proposal, it will be the Chair's responsibility to try to achieve that goal.

5. With respect to stakeholder groups, I think that a later post did respond to Writer G's very

legitimate concern regarding how people would classify themselves.   In my view of the world, academicians who are interested in Internet governance generally tend to divide into those who are technically oriented and those who are civil society oriented; I did not mean to exclude either of them.

5. Writer F's post, and Writer J's echo, though bothers me a lot. By reverting to the static UN document written in Tunis, I sense that they deny the possibility of a 4th stakeholder group which I characterize (roughly, I admit) as the "technical community."   Writer F, I do not know if I understand your position accurately, but my current understanding prompts a reaction so strong that I will put it in capital letters (without the customary "yelling" implication):

ANY ATTEMPT TO DENY THAT THE TECHNICAL INTERNET COMUNITY IS NOT AT LEAST AN EQUAL STAKEHOLDER IN THE FUTURE OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE DISCUSSION MAKES A MOCKERY OF THE ENTIRE PROCESS.

I think that we as a group have differing opinions regarding this issue, and it is one of the things that I think is implicitly at the heart of a not insubstantial set of our disagreements. My opinion is stated above, in caps, without any reservations whatsoever. I would be interested in the opinions of others."

(Writer A)

(From Writer L)

"*ANY ATTEMPT TO DENY THAT THE TECHNICAL INTERNET COMUNITY IS NOT AT LEAST AN EQUAL STAKEHOLDER IN THE FUTURE OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE DISCUSSION MAKES A MOCKERY OF THE ENTIRE PROCESS.*

"It is worth to remember the pre-ICANN discussion phase when various communities tried to identify the main stakeholder groups and they came out with the following approach (which finally constituted the composition of the Board of ICANN 1.0)
1. Business community & Private Sector (Represented in the DNSO with 3 directors + ICANN´s CEO)
2. Technical Community (Represented in the PSO and ASO with six directors + the Root Server System Advisory Committee)
3. User Community / Civil Society (Represented as "At Large" with originally planned nine directors)
4. Governments (Represented on the Governmental Advisory Committee)

In the WGIG the question "Who is a stakeholder in Internet Governance" was discussed extensively and produced the Chapter 4 which identified main areas of activities, roles and responsibilities for governments, civil society and private sector and added a para 40 for the technical and academic community" as follows:

'33.   Furthermore, the WGIG recognized that the contribution to the Internet of the academic community is very valuable and constitutes one of its main sources of inspiration, innovation and creativity. Similarly, the technical community and its organizations are deeply involved in Internet operation, Internet standard-setting and Internet services development. Both of these groups make a permanent and valuable contribution to the stability, security, functioning and evolution of the Internet. They interact extensively with and within all stakeholder groups.' "

(Writer L)

"I like to add two points for your considerations:

- Chair's advisors: In my opinion no need to have an addition to the "40" members since we are all advisors, I do understand that the Chair will need more active and knowledgeable people to dedicate more time so maybe the solution that he chooses one from each sector, so the result is 3 or 4 advisors from within the 40.

- Making sure to have all sectors, genders, regions... represented and in order not to find ourselves in need to make the advisors more than 40, the solution in the rotation to take this in account so we make sure even if a territory not represented this year it will be next year and so on."

(Writer H)

(From Writer L)

"I like to add two point for your considerations:
- Chair's advisors: In my opinion no need to have an addition to the
"40" members since we are all advisors, I do understand that the
Chair will need more active and knowledgeable people to dedicate more
time so maybe the solution that he chooses one from each sector, so
the result is 3 or 4 advisors from within the 40."

"I agree with you 100 %. However perhaps a compromise solution could be to accept a limited number of advisors. 3 is a reasonable number in my opinion. What I think is very important is the definition of what this kind of advisors is. Those advisors should be just advisors of the Chair, they can be subscribed to the list and participate in every face to face meeting of the AG, but they can speak (or write in the list) only if they are required to do so by the Chair.

Different situation should be IMHO the situation of the observers appointed by International organizations (inter-governmental or not) to act as observers. I think that those persons could be invited to participate in the face to face meetings as observers, and they could speak only by request of the Chair for clarifying some specific issues under the scope of their organizations, but they should not be subscribed to the AG list. The list should be limited to the members of the AG, the secretariat, the Chair and the advisors of the Chair."

(Writer M)

"While the debate is interesting, I think we are making more of this stakeholder issue than is necessary. Now that we have been reminded of Paragraph 33 of the WGIG report, there should no longer be any argument that the internet technical community must be represented in the AG. Indeed the current AG benefits from the technical expertise of several members.

I share the conclusion that "At this point I am only cautioning that the flexibility, diversity and openness that will be needed in the future may not be assured by rules that entrench particular interests or procedures. .... I think that achieving an appropriate balance without blowing out the size of the Advisory Group will continue to require some judgment." I do not recall all of the discussion around the identification of the original AG but it seems that the judgment of the Secretariat and the "UNSG black box" worked very well.

In terms of the proposed rotation, which I support, I wonder if the same judgment could not be relied upon after all current AG members accept that we are no longer members, indicate to the secretariat whether we each individually is prepared to accept a recall, nominate one or two alternative names of persons who we know would be interested in serving and leave it to the secretariat

Finally, I must have missed something but what is the origin of the idea of 3 or 4 person

advisors to the chair? I always thought that the whole AG were advisors to the chair!"

(Writer N)

"I have been following with great interest the discussion on possible evolution of the AG.

It is natural and has been proven by management theory and practice that each bureaucratic structure has a tendency of self-reproduction and self-expansion. Many proposals during discussion went in that direction and only few – in the direction of maintaining AG sufficiently representative, but small and efficient.

I would support those who were speaking in favor of keeping AG as it was created – informal, multi-stakeholder, advisory, non-binding and light. Increase in number or introduction of a hierarchic structure will not lead AG to better efficiency. Difference in opinion will remain because of different perception of the IGF process. Increasing AG in size will further complicate preparatory process and may damage the IGF idea as such.

At the same time I agree that the rotation within AG would be useful and allow influx of fresh ideas on how better manage the IGF meetings."

(Markus Kummer)

"Like others, I enjoyed reading the discussion on the future of the Advisory Group and very much appreciated your thoughtful comments. On the whole, I note a general feeling that there is no need for a radical overhaul, but for some piece-meal improvement applied with flexibility.

I have a few remarks with regard to some of your comments or suggestions.

Role of IGOs

There were several comments on the role of IGOs. In the past, we applied an opting in policy, thus allowing each interested IGO to participate as an equal. This worked well and I would advocate continuing the same practice. As the subject matter is extremely broad it is difficult to determine in advance which organization (also regional organizations) has a relevant contribution to make. Self-selection seems a viable alternative.

The academic and technical communities

Several comments recalled the history and Writer H reminded us of the last phase of the negotiations ahead of the Tunis Summit. I would like to echo these comments. In WSIS-I, they were not identified as stakeholder. The academic and technical communities (i.e. the institutions that developed and run the Internet) affirmed themselves in between the two phases of the Summit, in particular during the WGIG open consultations. They made the point that many of them are not-for-profit institutions, with the objective of working for the public good, and that therefore they are distinct from the private sector. The Tunis Agenda recognized their role. As it happens and as several colleagues pointed out, the various categories often overlap and many stakeholders have multiple affiliations."

(Writer B)

"The Internet technical and academic communities should certainly not be left out of any future AG, and I would hope that there is broad agreement on this point. That said, I agree that modifying the framework that we work with coming from the Tunis text by creating a new category of "stakeholder" should be avoided, in the same way that any other attempt to expand or bend the Tunis Agenda should be resisted. I think the technical and academic communities

played a strong and positive role in the first 2 iterations of the AG, though the individuals may have been selected as reps of other groups. Let's assume that this precedent will continue.”

(Writer H)

(from Writer B)

"The Internet technical and academic communities should certainly not be left out of any future AG, and I would hope that there is broad agreement on this point. That said, I agree that modifying the framework that we work with coming from the Tunis text by creating a new category of "stakeholder" should be avoided, in the same way that any other attempt to expand or bend the Tunis Agenda should be resisted. I think the technical and academic communities played a strong and positive role in the first 2 iterations of the AG, though the individuals may have been selected as reps of other groups. Let's assume that this precedent will continue.”

“Wise words.”