

**Comments on the Formal consultation with Forum participants In accordance with
Paragraph 76 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society**

Affiliation: Spanish Internet Governance Forum

Name: Jorge Perez and Ana Olmos

Responses:

1. To what extent has the IGF addressed the mandate set out for it in the Tunis Agenda?

The Internet Governance Forum provides a unique space for debate and encourages joint work from different multistakeholders. It definitely has an impact on policy making and Internet evolution.

The multistakeholder spirit has been transferred to multiple regions and it has encouraged the engagement and participation of different actors of value.

2. To what extent has the IGF embodied the WSIS principles?

All stakeholders are able to debate on an equal footing and are also able to exchanging ideas of how to make Internet move towards the principles of the Tunis Agenda of the Information Society

3. What has the impact of the IGF been in direct or indirect terms? Has it impacted you or your stakeholder group/institution/government? Has it acted as a catalyst for change?

The Spanish IGF was born precisely because a varied group of people representing the different stakeholders felt there was work to do at the regional level. Following closely the international process, learning from it, identifying local issues and ways to work towards solutions and improvements, the Spanish IGF has introduced a new way of uniting people and working together towards common goals.

4. How effective are IGF processes in addressing the tasks set out for it, including the functioning of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG), Secretariat and open consultations?

We think the present structure is adequate in order to address the mandate and is being very successful at engaging all multistakeholders. Open consultations, in order to provide wide participation and enhance transparency, are a key feature of the IGF.

5. Is it desirable to continue the IGF past its initial five-year mandate, and why/why not?

We support the continuation of the IGF, and we strongly believe that no big changes should be made regarding the structure or the spirit. The IGF process has inspired many other national and regional processes which are making progress and fully appreciate the process. As it has been said in the Opening Session, some of the regional initiatives will certainly continue to exist and maintain the multistakeholder spirit.

6. If the continuation of the Forum is recommended, what improvements would you suggest in terms of its working methods, functioning and processes?

Although some improvements may be made, no major changes should be introduced,

especially if they were to alter in any way the wide participation and multistakeholder spirit.

The participation of all stakeholders in the IGF debates is very important as they are able to take these issues to their companies, their organizations and their environment, including them in their respective agendas, and working together towards effective results. We believe this is a successful scheme that should continue to exist.