

Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Programme, Agenda and Format of the Hyderabad Meeting

Open Consultations

Geneva, 13 May 2008

I. Introduction

This paper aims to provide an input into the open round of consultations on 13 May 2008 to discuss programme, agenda and format of the third IGF meeting, which is to take place in Hyderabad on 3 – 6 December 2008. It gives a first draft programme outline and incorporates content that was included in three different documents:

- 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.

Stakeholders were invited to submit their further comments and views on the Hyderabad meeting to the IGF Secretariat and to make suggestions with regard to the preparation of the 2008 meeting after the February 2008 consultations. Those further comments have also been synthesized into this paper. All contributions are posted on the IGF Web site. The readers of this synthesis are encouraged to read those contributions for further details and discussions.

The paper is conceived as a rolling document. Comments submitted to the IGF Web site by 1 May 2008 have been reflected in this revised version which is issued as a conference room paper for the open consultations on 13 May 2008.

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 Themes, Programme and Agenda of the Hyderabad meeting.

II. Substantive issues related to the themes

The planning for 2008 should take into account the Chairman's Summary of the Rio meeting and look at the lessons learned and issues raised in the previous meetings. The process of doing this commenced with the open consultations and MAG meetings of February 2008.

Building on the comments made before and during the February 2008 open consultations, discussions by the MAG on specific topics for the Hyderabad meeting included the following topics:

- a.) Universalization of the Internet / Expanding the Internet

Possible focused topics for “Low cost sustainable access” could include the role of entrepreneurship in providing low cost sustainable access with a special focus on entrepreneurship and India's success.

Comment Box 1: Universalization of the Internet / Expanding the Internet

1. *One comment mentioned that the term “Universalization of the Internet” was unknown and possibly confusing. This contribution recommended an alternate title: Expanding the Internet - how to reach the next billion.” This recommended term has been reflected in other comments received.*
2. *Several contributions commented on the continuing importance of the development theme, especially the focus on capacity building as well as extending access to the next billion users. Some commentators were in favour of strengthening these cross-cutting priorities.*
3. *One comment included the recommendation that this theme focus on access and diversity.*
4. *One paper proposed that the linkages between Internet governance and sustainable development should be a theme for the 2008 IGF and the subject of a main session. This proposal built on the Chairman's summary from the 2007 IGF that “one issue that seems to be really an emerging issue ... is the inter-linkages with sustainable development.” The paper pointed out the notable increase in interest, discussion and debate on this issue that has taken place among different stakeholder groups and in various forums in recent months. Creating a space for exploring linkages between issues related to Internet governance and issues related to the environmental, economic, social and governance dimensions of sustainable development was also raised; the paper suggested that this new theme would help broaden participation in the IGF and support achievement of many elements of the IGF mandate.*
5. *Several contributions called for the inclusion of sustainable development as a key theme. The theme of sustainable development was described as cutting across concerns that were central to Internet governance and as a theme that can be defined in a focused manner that is within the mandate of the IGF for Internet governance.*
6. *Another contribution called for the inclusion of sustainable development with a focus on climate change as another cross-cutting issue and the identification of a few key questions that could be discussed in each of the workshops. The same contributor supported a proposal to work on a development agenda for Internet governance.*
7. *One contribution suggested that the environmental topic of e-waste, the disposal of outdated devices should also be considered.*
8. *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*
9. *One paper recommended that discussions in all the main sessions should emphasize development agenda issues, and the human and institutional capacity building measures that are necessary to strengthen involvement of all stakeholders in Internet governance issues and institutions.*

10. *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.*

b.) Managing/Using the Internet

The scope of “Managing/Using the Internet” topic could focus on international, national or local management of the Internet or the relationship among the three levels.

Possible focused topics for “Critical Internet resources” include:

- Enabling growth and innovation
- Capacity building
- The role of public private partnership in managing/using the Internet
- Transition from IPv4 to IPv6
- Governance issues in promoting the adoption of IPv6
- Topics beyond IP addressing

Comment Box 2: Managing/Using the Internet

11. *One comment indicated that that the term “Managing the Internet” was misleading and recommended changing the theme to “Using the Internet” in order avoid giving a false impression that these session would question the legitimacy of the current Internet management arrangements. This recommendation was also reflected in several other recommendations.*

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

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

14. *One contribution indicated that the IGF India meeting should prioritise 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.*

c.) Possible Debate topics:

- Intellectual Property Right and innovation for development
- Privacy and protection of children
- Relationship between security and privacy

Comment Box 3: Debate topics

15. *It was commented that the Debate category was not clear and questioned why the topics listed under this category should not be discussed under Taking Stock or Emerging Issues instead.*

16. *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.”*

17. *One comment recommended that the Debate category be dropped and that the topics be covered in main sessions and workshops.*

d.) Taking Stock and the Way forward

The “Taking Stock and the Way Forward” session could include an evaluation of the IGF in regard to its mandate.

Comment Box 4: Taking Stock and the Way Forward

18. *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.*

e.) Other Issues

Other comments made during the MAG discussions included:

- Whether Freedom of Expression should have a dedicated session, though there was a question whether the IGF was the appropriate forum to discuss this issue.
- Should the topic on innovations be discussed under Emerging Issues

III. Programme and Agenda

This section aims to provide an input into the open round of consultations on 13 May 2008 to discuss programme and agenda for the third meeting of the IGF in Hyderabad. It gives a 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.

1. Basic structure for the Hyderabad meeting

The proposed meeting structure builds on the successes of the Athens and Rio de Janeiro meetings and takes into account the comments made in the stocktaking process, both on-line and at the meetings in Geneva on 26-28 February. 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 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 basic format of the previous meetings, with main sessions and workshops, should be maintained. The five broad themes – access, openness, security, diversity, and critical Internet resources – will be retained but not necessarily as themes for the main sessions. The point was made that the general issues had been effectively covered during the previous two IGF meetings and that the sessions in Hyderabad should be more focused.

Based on the “lessons learned” from the Rio meeting as discussed by the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG), the following changes could be introduced:

- Two days with general themes and main sessions focused on specific issues and not general overviews.
- Some workshops could be held on themes defined by the MAG (main workshops), but organized by others in response to a call for proposals.
- Main workshops, which are linked to the main sessions and workshops on the five substantive themes, are not to be held in parallel to main sessions.
- Other workshops may be held in parallel to the main sessions, depending on the quantity and quality of the proposals.
- All organizers of 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 for the following year.
- Preference will be given in 2008 to those who did submit a report for 2007. (Submission of reports is still possible and encouraged.)
- No official meetings should start after 1800 hours.
- No official meetings during the lunch-break between 1300-1400 hours.
- Further efforts will be made to enable remote participation
- Efforts will be made to publish the proceedings of the meeting also in other formats.

The objective is still 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 5: General meeting structure and planning

19. *It was suggested by several contributions that the selection and announcement of speakers be completed by June 2008.*
20. *One contribution suggested that the main sessions should be finalized by mid July 2008.*
21. *Several Comments indicated the importance of having the detailed schedule finalized and published by September 2008.*
22. *One contributor argued 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.*
23. *It was recommended that the workshops be used to build the thematic threads that would be discussed in the main sessions.*
24. *Some comments recommended that the number of parallel events be limited especially during main sessions.*
25. *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.*
26. *While several comments praised the inclusion of a networking period each day after lunch, one comment argued that this slot could be better filled with other events.*
27. *One contribution expressed a concern that that there were still too many main sessions and workshops being planned to allow any of the sessions, sufficient amount of time for full interactive participation. This contribution pleaded “for reducing the number of main sessions (thus main workshops as well) to two per day.”*
28. *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.*

2. Meeting types

a) Main sessions

The main focus of the meeting will be on the main sessions. These sessions will take place in the main meeting hall and they will be organized around focal themes. In addition, there will be an opening and a closing ceremony in the same meeting hall. Interpretation will be provided into all six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) for all meetings taking place in the main hall. The discussions will be Web cast and will be rendered in real-time transcription. One session could be devoted to ‘emerging issues’ and another session to ‘taking stock and the way forward’. Duration of the main sessions will remain two hours.

Comment Box 6: Main Sessions

29. *While many commentators felt that the main sessions in the past had in general worked well, they also felt there was room for improvement on the format.*
30. *Several comments indicated that the main sessions could be improved by focusing on specific issues and best-practices instead of focusing on high-level issues.*
31. *One suggestion was that the descriptions of the main sessions should be kept simple and that care should be taken to ensure that the speakers stayed within the topic defined in that description.*
32. *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 a way as to make the connection with the original themes very clear.*
33. *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.*
34. *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.*
35. *Several writers commented that the number of speakers had to be kept small. It was also noted that the practice of assigning several people to the category of designated respondents had not been successful in cutting down the number of speakers.*
36. *One comment mentioned that the main sessions should be geared toward topics that would be of interest to most attendees.*
37. *Several comments emphasised the need to enable wider participation by the attendees in the main sessions.*
38. *Several comments indicated that the success of a session rested on the talents of the moderator.*
39. *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.*
40. *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.*
41. *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.*

42. *One contribution praised the emerging issues session in Rio as a good model that should be used again in 2008. They wrote that it was very interactive, and a valuable opportunity to raise issues that were not discussed during the other main sessions.*

43. *It was also recommended by several comments that discussion of best practices and lessons learned be integrated into the Main Sessions as opposed to being designated as separate sessions.*

b) Workshops

These sessions will be designed to explore detailed issues of the main themes. As such all interested stakeholders are being invited to submit proposals for workshops in a similar way as was done for the previous meetings of the IGF. In addition, some proposals may be initiated by the IGF Secretariat or the MAG. The main workshops will be scheduled before the main plenary session on the same theme, thereby allowing detailed debate to be fed into that session. These workshops will be supported/facilitated by the IGF Secretariat, but organized by the proponent of the individual session. Each session will conform to the WSIS principles of multistakeholder participation in both the proposal to the IGF Secretariat and in its implementation. As important as the multistakeholder approach is the need to present different perspectives on the issue under discussion.

The IGF meeting in Hyderabad should also allow for a number of open workshops where multistakeholder groups can host a meeting. 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 IGF workshop will be required to produce a report on the workshop.
- Duration of the main workshops will be extended to 2 hours.
- Other workshops: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 7: Workshops

44. *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.*

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

46. *There was a suggestion that some workshops should be designed to feed into the main sessions and these workshops should be given a longer time slot.*

47. *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. “*

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

49. *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.*

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

51. *There was support for the practice of encouraging similar workshops to merge.*

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

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

c) 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.

- Duration of these meetings: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 8: Open Forums

54. *It was expressed in some comments that forums should provide opportunity for alternative viewpoints to be expressed.*

55. *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.*

56. *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 websites indicating that the materials had not be approved by the IGF or the UN.*

d) 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.

- Duration of Best Practice Forum meetings: 90 minutes.

Comment Box 9: Best Practice Forums

57. *Several writers suggested 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. Others held the view that Best Practice Forums had fulfilled expectations in the past and had allowed for the sharing of best practices. One contribution 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.*

58. *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 themes' discussion.*

e) **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 10: Dynamic Coalitions

59. *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.*

60. *One contribution wrote that Dynamic Coalitions are a means toward stimulating debate in the IGF and that they should be given room to evolve. As part of this evolution, the contribution explained that Dynamic Coalitions should not be institutionalized and must continue to meet IGF criteria for dynamic Coalitions.*

61. *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.*
62. *It was suggested in one comment that Dynamic Coalitions should be prevented from using the IGF logo or other IGF branding.*
63. *It was recommended that Dynamic Coalitions should not require that participants all adopt a similar viewpoint.*
64. *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.*
65. *Some suggested developing more concrete rules under which these coalitions could work, including their rights and obligations to the “core” IGF.*

f) Other Meetings

Meeting rooms will be given to interested stakeholder groups on a first-come-first-served basis, as available. A number of rooms will be reserved for this purpose for the meeting itself, to accommodate ad-hoc requests.

Comment Box 11: Other meetings

66. *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.*
67. *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 being given.*
68. *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.*
69. *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.*
70. *Another contributor regretted that no use was made of the speed dialogue format in past meetings.*
71. *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.*
72. *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.

73. 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.

3. Format of the Schedule

During the May 2008 meeting, two different basic alternatives were offered for the schedule. These are outlined, without respective timings, in the following table. There are two major differences in the outlines: in Alternative B, there is just one main session per day, and workshops are not held during that main session.

	Alternative A		Alternative B
Day 1- 3 December, 2008			
Morning	Tutorials	Work Shops	Workshops, including preparation for "Expanding of the Internet"
	Lunch		Lunch/Networking
Afternoon	Opening Ceremony		Opening Ceremony
	Main Session: Universalization of the Internet / Expanding the Internet – How to reach the next billion	Work shops	Main Session: Expanding the Internet – How to reach the next billion
Day 2 – 4 December, 2008			
Morning	Theme overview: Expanding the Internet	Work shops	Workshops, including preparation for "Managing/Using the internet"
	Main Session: Low-cost sustainable access	Work shops	Main Session: Managing/Using the Internet
	Lunch		Lunch/Networking
Afternoon	Main Session: Multilingualization	Work shops	Follow-up workshops: Managing/Using the Internet
	Main Session: Implications for Development Policy	Work shops	

Day 3 - 5 December, 2008			
Morning	Theme overview: Managing/Using the Internet	Work shops	Workshops, including preparation for "Privacy and Openness"
	Main Session: Critical Internet Resources	Work shops	Debate: Relationship between Security, Privacy and Openness
	Lunch		Lunch/Networking
Afternoon	Main Session: Arrangement for Internet Governance	Work shops	Follow-up workshops: Privacy and Openness
	Main Session: Global cooperation for Internet Security and Stability	Work shops	
Day 4 - 6 December, 2008			
Morning	Main Session: Taking Stock and the Way Forward	Work shops	Workshops, including preparation for "Emerging Issues"
	Main Session: Debate	Work shops	Debate on Emerging Issues
	Lunch		Lunch/Networking
Afternoon	Main Session: Emerging Issues	Closing Ceremony	
	Closing Ceremony		

4. Location

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 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).
- 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 and have meetings and poster sessions.
- 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.

An “IGF village” will be set up next to the main meeting hall to allow interested entities to present themselves for free. 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.

Comment Box 12: Facilities

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

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

IV. Other issues discussed in contributor's comments

Comment Box 13: Other comments

76. *Several comments suggested a discussion of the continued important of the multistakeholder nature of the IGF and wrote in favor of the evolutionary approach taken to develop an agenda based on stakeholders’ comments.*

77. *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.*

78. *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.*

79. *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.*

80. *One commentator held the view 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". He 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.

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.

82. One suggestion was to create 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.

83. One comment mentioned that pre-meetings should be encouraged by 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."

84. It was suggested that the process of drafting an agenda for the meeting be open to all stakeholders and it was proposed that a working group could be formed for this purpose.

85. The point was made that the written contributions to the IGF should receive greater recognition and acknowledgement.

86. One contributor 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.

87. Several contributions commented favourably on the importance of the real time transcription and on the webcasting of sessions.

88. 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.

89. One writer suggested that there should be active sharing of lessons learned by previous hosts with the next host country of the IGF. They went on to suggest that this process should include representatives of all stakeholder groups.

90. One contribution wrote that whatever proceedings were produced after the Hyderabad meeting, the principle of no official outcomes should be preserved.

91. One comment pointed to the gender imbalance in previous panels and encouraged that the panels for the Hyderabad meeting include more women.