

ICC BASIS interventions on “Taking stock of the Vilnius Meeting” Delivered at Open Consultations 22 November 2010, Geneva

The following ICC BASIS interventions are extracted from the real-time captioning taken during the 22 November 2010 open consultations of the IGF. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors.

MORNING SESSION

Intervention 1 Reflections on IGF 2010 Delivered by Ayesha Hassan, ICC/BASIS

Ayesha Hassan, on behalf of the International Chamber of Commerce and its BASIS, Business Action to Support the Information Society. On behalf of the members of ICC and its BASIS initiative, we join others in the congratulating Lithuania, the host country for the IGF 2010, on a most successful event. The warm welcome and efforts of the organizing team were greatly appreciated. We would also like to express our special thanks and recognition to Mr. Nitin Desai, the chair of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group, for his leadership and guidance, and to you, Mr. Kummer, chair, and your talented team for their tireless efforts and support. We look forward to working with all stakeholders to prepare another successful IGF in Nairobi, Kenya in September 2011.

IGF 2010, “Developing the Future Together”, successfully built upon the productive experiences of Sharm El Sheikh, Hyderabad, Rio and Athens. There was a strong business presence, which demonstrates the importance of the IGF for business. It successfully brought together an extensive range of leaders and experts from the many communities interested in Internet governance. It provided a unique

opportunity to have open discussions on a wide variety of issues and brought together many stakeholders who otherwise do not have opportunities to engage with each other, both formally in sessions as well as informally.

A major value add for all is the constructive exchange of best practices and considerations of the best policy approaches and options that in turn resonate in policy discussions and decisions around the world and at national and regional levels. We also think it is important to recognize, as others have, the emergence of many new national IGF initiatives and the strengthening of regional events catalyzed by the global IGF, which was evident at this year's IGF.

A striking accomplishment this year was the tremendous effort to include participants from around the world through the extensive remote hubs, as you have kindly given us the statistics regarding developing country participants and the remote participants. It is really quite striking.

This expanded remote participation, Webcast, real-time transcription for not only main sessions but also for the workshops and open forums, we believe was a clear improvement this year.

Clearly, multistakeholder participation in the development of the agenda throughout the preparations for this year's IGF was part of its success as well.

I would like to also make a few comments about the sessions themselves.

I would like to support the input that our colleague from ETNO has just provided on the overall schedule and the early call for workshops and how well that worked this year. That was an excellent effort and I believe had a direct impact on participation and allowed people to prepare for this IGF effectively.

We also support the approach regarding the “Internet Governance for Development” session. It was an excellent attempt to try that as a main session this year. We believe that it is a very important set of cross-cutting issues and will be better suited to a workshop in the program next year.

We heard a lot of positive feedback about the depth of discussions and the interactive nature generally of the workshops and the open forums. We also believe that continued vigilance about the number of workshops, efforts to consolidate,

ensuring that workshops do have a range of stakeholder representativity in terms of views and people in the speaker positions as well as participation would be helpful. Finally, we would like to also continue to encourage that if we do consolidate workshops that we also ensure that appropriate space is available for the workshops. Some of those that were very popular had trouble having all the people who wanted to be in the room actually be able to be in the room this year.

With that, chair, I will stop, and I look forward to continuing to participate in this discussion.

Thank you.

Intervention 2

Delivered by Waudo Siganga, Computer Society of Kenya

Thank you, Chairman. My name is Waudo Siganga from the Computer Society of Kenya.

First, I would like, on behalf of the private sector from Africa, to reinforce the appreciation expressed by my colleagues from the ICC/BASIS to the organizers of the meeting in Vilnius and the IGF Secretariat for holding such a successful meeting last September.

There are many things that we feel worked well in Vilnius and should be retained or reinforced at future IGF meetings.

Amongst these things that worked well, for example, we feel the inclusion of a separate IG4D session was an important step in making the IGF meeting more pertinent to participants from the developing countries.

We agree that IG4D is an important cross-cutting theme, but at the same time it is important to reinforce its importance by retaining it as a main session in future meetings.

The second thing we can say worked well was the remote participation hubs.

Certainly the reports we received from the -- regarding the hub in Nairobi, just like

what you have mentioned about Rwanda, indicated that it was well attended and it went a long way in meeting -- helping to meet the WSIS aspirations of inclusivity and participation by all.

There are a couple of areas where we noted perhaps there could be a little bit of improvement, a little bit of improvement could be useful.

On the substantive part of the meeting, we felt that there could have been more merging of workshops, better merging of workshops to make them more compact and reduce duplication, and we have some examples of those, perhaps, that we could discuss later.

The second thing is that many of the regional meetings were held at the same time, which we felt denied a chance for people to attend the meetings of other regions and learning from them.

So there is some chance or a possibility, perhaps, there could be a way to find (inaudible) -- to have regional meetings at separate times for the different regions.

On the administrative part of the meeting, we found that visas provided a major challenge for potential participants, but particularly those from developing countries, and this issue needs to get -- should get greater attention in future; particularly, when the IGF meetings are held in countries who have limited diplomatic presence around the world.

Finally, as we anticipate the next IGF meeting in Nairobi, I would like to add my weight to the welcome extended by my government colleague here Michael, and I look forward to seeing all of you in Nairobi next year.

Intervention 3

Delivered by Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T

Thank you. I would like to add my thanks to the organizers for a very successful IGF meeting, and I would also like to thank Nitin Desai and Markus Kummer for their strong leadership in develop a process and a working development that has been consistently successful in making the IGF a valuable experience for participants.

In addition to taking stock of this year's IGF's meeting in comparison to prior meetings, it is helpful to take stock more broadly and consider the accomplishments of the IGF as the product of its unique multistakeholder format.

First, the impressive statistics on direct participation, remote participation, and developing country participation are a reflection of a sustained commitment to broad participation on the part of the IGF Secretariat and the community.

This level of sustained growth that has been achieved does not happen by accident but through hard work and consistent efforts on the part of many volunteers.

Second, as a community we sometimes take for granted the fact that the IGF meeting format and agenda will continue to change and improve each year, and we also have confidence that our input will have an impact on the process and planning for the next IGF meeting.

Again, this does not happen by accident. It is the product of a constructive bottom-up process that gives IGF participants a real voice in shaping the IGF meeting and make it their own.

Third, the substance and policy discussions at the IGF continue to progress and evolve. As others have noted, there was a high level of engagement and constructive dialogue on Internet policy issues which can easily become divisive. And once again, the discussions this year continue to show progress on existing issues and expand to cover emerging issues.

So ultimately, I would like to congratulate all of those who worked hard to make the IGF meeting a success, including many people in the room today. Ultimately, it is our collective cooperation and efforts that have shown the importance of the IGF as a unique multistakeholder process, not just a series of meetings. And I look forward to seeing everyone next year.

Thank you.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Intervention 4 regarding multistakeholder advisory group (MAG)

Delivered by Jeff Brueggeman, for ICC BASIS

Thank you. On behalf of ICC/BASIS, a few comments to supplement the written submission that ICC/BASIS made on the MAG.

As a preliminary matter, it is helpful to note that the MAG itself is an important part of the multistakeholder process and it helps to ensure that the IGF will continue to evolve on an ongoing basis as a multistakeholder forum.

So it -- I think it is worth noting the important role that the MAG itself plays.

As far as the activities of the MAG, we do believe that it has fulfilled the mandate set out in the Tunis Agenda over the past five years, and we think that it has been an important part of the overall IGF preparatory process and has been successful in helping to obtain input from the community from a diverse collection of stakeholders, and implement those changes and enhancements on an ongoing basis into the actual IGF meeting process.

So it is part of the process, but it plays an important role.

We also share the view of the Internet Society and other commenters that the MAG has done an admirable job of finding ways to work with the community and be inclusive and responsive to the suggestions and contributions that have been made, and that its work has continued to evolve as you just noted. Therefore, it has been responsive to input about ways to change its format and to change its modes of operation and I think this overall continuing process of evaluation and consideration of those types of improvements is a helpful part of the MAG process, as indeed it is in the IGF process overall. Thank you.

Intervention 5

Delivered by Jeff Brueggeman, for ICC BASIS

Thank you. Once again, reiterating some of the points made in the written submission, we do think that a nomination model can be a helpful way to evolve the MAG process. However, we also agree with the comments about transparency. And to some extent we think this should be built on the existing stakeholder groups. And as part of that we support including the technical community as a distinct stakeholder group that should be represented. But the idea is that, for example, the business community is in the best position to assess and determine how to evaluate nominations within that community. So there should be some self-determination aspect to the process. However, having a group much trusted representatives be part of the nominating process, we do think could add value.

Also, I think at the end of the process it is important to have a linkage to the IGF Executive Coordinator and ultimately have the U.N. Secretary-General sign off on the MAG members as happens today so that you have the recognition from that level within the U.N. ultimately in the process. But we do think that the nomination could be a way to help effectuate the selection process.

Thank you.

Intervention 6 Nomination of MAG Chair

Delivered by Ayesha Hassan, ICC/BASIS

Thank you, Chair. Ayesha Hassan speaking for ICC/BASIS.

First of all, we have expressed our support for Mr. Desai and his continuation in this role as MAG chair. He has had a tremendous ability to handle challenging situations and a diverse set of interests that have really been essential to the IGF's success.

However, should there be a new MAG chair, we believe that a transition period for that person with Mr. Desai would not only be important but critical to ensure a smooth transition.

With regard to the selection of a future MAG chair, we believe to ensure qualifications for the unique role, qualified candidates should be selected by a mechanism led by the IGF Secretariat and the outgoing chair, but in consultation with the community and named by the U.N. Secretary-General.

The idea of terms of reference and criteria put forward by APC in their written contribution should be considered. It would ensure there is clear criteria for candidates for this important position. We also found the idea of co-chairs to ensure a smooth transition as mentioned by APC and the Internet Society to be a useful way to shape a transition. We are concerned that an election process from the MAG members themselves would not provide candidates with the next experience or that meet the criteria that we believe are essential for a chair.

Thanks.

* _ * _ *