

Government of Japan
Response to Questionnaire
on Convening the Internet Governance Forum

Questionnaire on the Convening the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

1 The Tunis Agenda sets out various functions for the forum. Paragraph 72 (g) indicates that a possible outcome of its meetings could be recommendations (“where appropriate”). Paragraph 72 (l) asks the IGF to produce a report (“to publish its proceedings”) as its output.

- (a) *What outcome would you expect from an IGF meeting?*
- (b) *Should there be any other output apart from the report?*

The IGF is a forum “*for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue*”, as indicated in paragraph 67 of the Tunis Agenda, and it is desirable for the IGF to be a space to “*discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet*” [paragraph 72(a), Tunis agenda] and to “*facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities*” [paragraph 72(d), Tunis agenda].

In addition, Japan would like to emphasize the mandate of the IGF to “*identify emerging issue*” [paragraph 72(g), Tunis agenda].

Japan, therefore, believes that, at its outset, the outcome of the IGF does not have to be a set of recommendations. Rather, the Forum should be well satisfied to just produce a report as its output and as a first step in the process of discussion.

2 The Tunis Agenda describes the IGF as “multilateral, multi-stakeholder, democratic and transparent” (para 73) and sets out many functions it should assume (see paras 72 and 77). However, it leaves open questions of participation as well as periodicity, duration and type of IGF meetings, including on-line aspects and virtual collaboration and participation. Several delegations endorsed the proposal contained in the WGIG Report, i.e. to create a Forum that should be modelled on the WGIG open consultations, where all stakeholders participated on an equal footing.

- (a) *Could the WGIG open consultations constitute a possible model for the IGF?*
- (b) *How often should the Forum meet?*
- (c) *How long should its meetings be?*
- (d) *Should meetings be considered subject to UN rules, such as accreditation, rules of procedure or languages?*
- (e) *How could the IGF make best possible use of ICTs and promote virtual interaction?*

Japan believes that the IGF must be a space for open dialogue by multi-stakeholders, and as such closed meetings are not expected to be held. In paragraph 72 of Tunis agenda, IGF is required to be convened by UN Secretary-General, however,

paragraph 74 of Tunis agenda also mentions “*to examine a range of options for the convening of the Forum, taking into consideration the proven competencies of all stakeholders in Internet Governance and the need to ensure their full involvement.*” In respect of the latter paragraph, existing forums held by private sectors should be fully utilized from the view of the human and financial resources.

- 3 The Tunis Agenda has a strong development focus. It raises questions related to access to the Internet (para 72(e)) as well as to developing country participation in Internet Governance mechanisms (para 72 (f)). It also emphasizes that the IGF needs “to contribute to capacity-building for Internet Governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise” (para 72 (h)).
 - (a) *How should the IGF approach access issues (“availability and affordability of the Internet”)?*
 - (b) *Para 72 (f) indicates that special measures ought to be taken to facilitate developing country participation in the IGF itself. What should be done?*
 - (c) *What should be the focus of capacity-building initiatives?*

As mentioned in paragraph 73(c) of Tunis agenda - *Meet periodically, as required. IGF meetings, in principle, may be held in parallel with major relevant UN conferences, inter alia, to use logistical support.*-, it is essential to examine ways of maximizing the participation of developing countries, such as by fully utilizing of existing organizations’ activities and effective Fellowship to the best possible extent.

- 4 Para 78 (b) calls on the Secretary-General to “establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau to support the IGF, ensuring multi-stakeholder participation”.
 - (a) *Does this para refer to a bureau as it is normally used in an intergovernmental context, such as the WSIS bureau?*
 - (b) *Would it be a bureau to deal with organizational issues and prepare agenda and programme of the IGF meetings?*
 - (c) *If so, how should it be composed?*
 - (d) *Alternatively, could it be a high-level senior advisory body to provide overall direction and shape to the IGF meetings?*
 - (e) *If so, how should it be composed?*

As stated in paragraph 78 (b) (*establish an effective and cost-efficient bureau to support the IGF, ensuring multi-stakeholder participation.*), Bureau requires multi-stakeholder participation. At this point, “bureau” should not be what it is called in the UN context, rather it should be as a “program committee” or “advisory group.” Japan believes that the objective of the discussion at the IGF should be broad and inclusive, as stated in paragraph 58 of Tunis agenda-*We recognize that Internet Governance includes more than Internet naming and addressing. It also includes other significant public policy issues such as, inter alia, critical Internet resources, the security and safety of the Internet, and developmental aspects and issues pertaining to the use of the Internet.*-. In addition, to “*identify emerging issues*” [paragraph 72(g), Tunis agenda] is important for the IGF. Therefore, when the agenda is being prepared, it is significant to examine effective mechanisms, such as the use of the online consultation, in which the comments of multi-stakeholders can be fully taken into consideration.

5 Para 78 (b) can also be interpreted as referring to a secretariat function.

- (a) *Could this function be assumed by existing institutions, which could take turns in providing the secretariat for the IGF?*
- (b) *Alternatively, is there need for an independent secretariat?*
- (c) *If a secretariat is established,*
 - (i) *Where should it be based?*
 - (ii) *What should be its linkage to the United Nations Secretary-General?*

Regarding a secretariat function to support the IGF which should ensure multi-stakeholder participation, Japan recognizes the WGIG secretariat as a well-functioned mechanism. Respecting its past experience, Japan supports the establishment of a small-scale and cost effective secretariat modeled on the WGIG secretariat.

6 Para 73 addresses aspects related to the structure of the IGF, which should be “lightweight and decentralised” and build on “existing structures of Internet governance, with special emphasis on the complementarity between all stakeholders involved in this process”.

What does this mean in practice?

- (a) *Does the decentralized structure refer to a support structure (secretariat) or the Forum itself, or both?*
- (b) *Does it point to additional expert meetings and / or programme committees, which could report back to the IGF and help prepare its meetings? Should possible sub-structures be supported by organizations with the relevant expertise?*

The forum should be a decentralized structure. It should adopt an effective structure, including the involvement of existing forums held by private sectors as places to discuss a broad range of issues surrounding the Internet.

7 The Tunis Agenda does not elaborate on aspects related to the funding of the IGF.

How do you think the IGF should be financed?

It is desirable that the IGF be funded via voluntary multi-stakeholder contribution with effective use of private sponsorship and cost-saving effort in mind. Further, the balance should be transparent to multi-stakeholders.

8 Para 74 mentions the “proven competencies of all stakeholders in Internet governance and the need to ensure their full involvement”.

What steps should be taken to identify and engage all stakeholders and what needs to be done to make best possible use of their competencies?

Refer to the answer 9.

9 Para 74 also encourages the Secretary-General “to examine a range of options for the convening of the Forum”.

Are there any other options not addressed in the questions above? What are these options as you understand them?

In addition to a forum that the UN secretary general convenes, it would be effective to regard any forums held by private sectors, which satisfy the criteria indicated in paragraph 72 and 77 of the Tunis agenda, as additional IGF meetings. For a space to discuss a wide-range of Internet issues, the utilization of these forums should be taken into consideration to incorporate a broad range of professional opinions.

10 Paragraph 72 (a) of the Tunis Agenda gives the IGF the mandate to “discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet”.

- (a) What are these issues?*
- (b) Are they all the issues mentioned in the Chapter on Internet Governance in the Tunis Agenda?*
- (c) Which issues should be treated as priorities?*
- (d) Could these issues constitute a work programme for the coming years?*

Regarding these issues, the IGF can refer to the public policy issues indicated in the WGIG final report. Also, it is important to invite broad range of opinions in order to identify emerging issues.

11 The first meeting of the Internet Governance Forum should take place “no later than 2006”

- (a) When would be the best time for the meeting?*
- (b) What should be on its agenda?*
- (c) Should it focus on one or at the most two issues that would be dealt with in depth, or should it discuss a wide range of issues?*
- (d) How should its programme be designed (time-management plan, organizational aspects)?*

Regarding the first meeting of the IGF, Japan respects the proposals of the Greek Government, and it is expected to reflect opinions from multi-stakeholders in preparing agendas for the meeting. As for the following IGF meetings, it is required to take opinions from multi-stakeholders into consideration. At the same time, Japan would like to propose to invite opinions widely from all stakeholders on the possibility to utilize the existing forums held by private sectors.

12 Any other comments, suggestions or questions that should be addressed?

Please let us know your views on any other issues that ought to be addressed.