Breakout group 2: Stakeholder groups and their configurations

Part 1: Are the stakeholder groups we currently recognize in global Internet governance adequate?

Context

Macdonald (2008) suggests that a "fundamental pre-requisite for the existence of a democratic stakeholder community [is] the existence of certain basic shared political values across the population in question". However, it is difficult to find basic shared political values even within each of the traditional stakeholder groupings of government, civil society and business, because each includes such wide variation within it (for example, see challenges faced in ICANN's GAC and civil society's Internet Governance Caucus).

Questions:

1. Are the current main Internet governance stakeholder groupings, as defined in the WSIS Tunis Agenda, of government, private sector and civil society still relevant given that they now comprise such diverse memberships and have few shared values within each of them?

Discussion:

[INSERT YOUR VIEWS AND IDEAS HERE]

2. How hard would it be to find new and more effective ways of helping stakeholders group themselves and represent their common interests?

Discussion:

[INSERT YOUR VIEWS AND IDEAS HERE]

3. Could Internet governance benefit from looking at the other ways stakeholders are grouped in non-Internet governance settings? Examples:

- **UN Major Groups (Women, Youth, Persons with Disabilities, Indigenous Communities, etc.)**
- **ICANN Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations**

Discussion:

Careful about following ICANN model as its interest-specific. Creates silos. And leads to creation of new silos or perhaps blurring.

Issue based areas - crime, access, privacy. Move away from stakeholders to issue based.

Wsis forum as issue-based example. No distinguishing between stakeholder. Discussion as issue based.

What can be done at the national level to address issues? In Chile, discussions happen at the same level with a few requirements (must be an NGO). This can bring things to the international level via the government's representation of the stakeholders issues.

Legitimacy of goals as a highly relevant issue to consider. A goal may have more gravitas and importance than another goal. One size doesn't fit all.

Groups themselves don't need legitimacy per se, but the organization calling for comments can decide which comments to listen to.

One size doesn't fit all. But we're still running on a MSH format from 2003-2005. But today is a very different world. National issues are now huge.

ILO is a good example of multistakeholder decision-making.

Comes down to hierarchy.

- How do you dovetail the needs of the governments with needs of other stakeholders? If don't find a sol
- Institutional legitimacy vs individual stakeholder legitimacy

---

- WSIS Grouping : gov, civil society, IOs, private sector, plus academia and technical - pushed separately later on; in ICANN: business spread across multiple constituencies - Should these groupings be updated?

- Caution in following ICANN model - building silos / instead of issue areas, we get stuck in some bucket --> Issue based areas - collective interest to solve a problem , moving away from stakeholders and being issue-based (after IANA transition there is a move back towards the constituencies)

- WSIS Forum in Geneva : understanding that open dialogues make sense -- outcomes will be reliant on implementation either at gov level or private sector level; implementations

- A lot can be done at the national level; the example of Chile where there is an equal-level playing field (direct discussions with the trade negotiators, low requirements to enter the discussions)
- Brazilian depart of Info Society: legitimacy of goals in the process (has changes a lot in IG debates). When it started, limited scope, limited conflict of goals (like protecting national governments, fighting terrorism, cybercrime, etc.). The contribution that IG has to offer - no one-size fits all

- German parliament: a competence to decide or a a decision-making capacity vs. consultation / listening to everyone ; once a decision is taken, there is a need for legitimacy

- MS format coming about 2003/2005 - we are MS on things that are different than what we started with; the point of national issues is huge. RIRs writing their own policies, but a separate process altogether

- MS is most suitable for IG process - thus legitimate; ILO model model could be followed

- WSIS is about discussion, not decision-making - why does the tension arise? Just a question of traditional sense of hierarchy?
-

Part 2: Is there a better way of enabling stakeholders to participate in multiple stakeholder groups and still be considered legitimate members of multiple groups?

Context

While in our everyday lives, many stakeholders in Internet governance have multiple sets of interests that can mean they can be seen as members of more than one stakeholder group. However, in many circumstances, multistakeholder processes require stakeholders to identify as only one stakeholder group. For example, when:

- Registering for meetings that request stakeholder group affiliation
- Stakeholder groups are asked to nominate representatives for limited membership processes such as working groups

The risk, however, is that when a participant is identified by only one stakeholder group but they have multiple allegiances, other stakeholders may view the participant as not being a legitimate voice of the single stakeholder group they have had to identify as.

In addition, where a participant may feel comfortable in being identified as part of a particular stakeholder group in one process (for example, as academia within a CSTD process), they may feel that their voice is lost if they need to identify as broader civil society in another process that does not recognize academia as a distinct group.

Questions:

1. Should there be looser restrictions on how people participate in processes that require stakeholders to identify with particular stakeholder groups? Should people be able to "tick multiple boxes"?

Discussion:

[INSERT YOUR VIEWS AND IDEAS HERE]

2. If people or entities can "tick multiple boxes", how can such "multiple stake holders" participate in multistakeholder processes in ways that aren't viewed as undermining the purity of particular stakeholder perspectives? Can the presence of such "multiple stake holders" instead be seen as a strength, providing cross-over perspectives that can further legitimate the multistakeholder process?

Discussion:

[INSERT YOUR VIEWS AND IDEAS HERE]

3. Who identifies who is a member of a stakeholder group? The person/group wishing to be identified as a member of a defined stakeholder group, or the members already in the stakeholder group?

Discussion:

[INSERT YOUR VIEWS AND IDEAS HERE]

4. Should there be a negotiation process between both parties (participant and larger stakeholder group they wish or need to be identified with)? If so, would this allow a stronger sense of legitimacy to be conferred on the members of the stakeholder group?

Discussion:

[INSERT YOUR VIEWS AND IDEAS HERE]