

IGF 2020 MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy

Online Meeting VI

10 september2020 at 14:00 p.m. UTC

Summary Report

The sixth online meeting of the IGF 2020 MAG's Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 10 September 2020 at 14:00 p.m. UTC. The meeting was hosted and moderated by the Group's co-chairs, Concettina Cassa and Anriette Esterhuysen. The meeting's agenda is annexed to this report, as well as the list of participants. The recording of the meeting is available only to the meeting participants upon request.

The co-chairs opened the meeting by introducing the agenda and reminding that the WG is dealing with drafting proposals on the following matters:

1. Possible implementation models for the Roadmap's High-level body
2. Response to the Options Paper document
3. Improvements to the IGF
4. Strengthening of IGF outcomes
5. Series of online discussions on IGF strategy and strengthening in 2020

The facilitator for each of the above-named activity shared updates summarizing key inputs for the group's attention and invited the group to agree on next steps. Below is the summary of shared updates and agreed next steps on each work stream.

A. Possible implementation models for the Roadmap's High-level body

Output document:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Rr5hlalahhW4lgWDy7Jjgqx33hn13j6C/view?usp=sharing>

1. **Summary of key points:** the output document includes three possible options (A, B, C) for the Roadmap's proposed new multistakeholder high-level body (MHL body, Par. 93 a)).
2. *Option A: MHLB as a separate and complementary body to the MAG; Option B: MHLB as an internal body of the MAG (executive Committee) and Option C: IGF Leadership Group that includes both the MHLB and the MAG*
3. The MAG Chair explained that option C draws on elements of options A and B. Option C as the other two options stands alone, is not a merger of the two proposals. Option C presents the new body not as separate body that gives a separate direction to the IGF. The Leadership Group has two tears or subgroups that work together as a single leadership group with overall responsibility for the ongoing strategic development of the IGF. The MHLB will be empowered to provide strategic leadership and more senior representation for the IGF+ while the MAG will continue to focus on the annual IGF process and intersessional activities.

4. Several members suggested to find consensus on option C as it represents a good compromise between options A and B. While other members suggested not to force consensus and to leave all the three options in the document as they are reflecting the different views of the WG's members.
5. **Next steps: WG's members will give additional comments to the proposal by 16/9/2020**

B. Response to the Options Paper document

Output document: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eVwoVFoch6id-SzT9EXd7etofFsjAeU1/view?usp=sharing>

1. **Summary of key points:** the document is intended to be a consensus document to be sent to the co-champions of Recommendations 5/A/B of HLPDC report. The co-chairs explained that the document has been updated to include the comments received. The updated version was commented to collect more inputs from the WG's members. It was noted that the Options Paper document delivered on September 3 by the co-champions has changed a significant aspect related to the soft law and policy recommendations. Consequently, the response document should be updated to reflect the new changes.
2. Some participants observed that introducing participant fees associated to the IGF event could change the nature of the meeting and it was suggested to find other ways to reduce the costs and to increase voluntary contribution. Some others WG's members were in favour of introducing participant fees. One participant suggested to understand why participant fee is needed. The head of Secretariat, Chengetai Masango, pointed out how difficult is for the UN to accept fees. In order for the UN to accept fees there should be some sort of agreement as it should be checked that fees are not coming from trouble sources. He also added that is not aware about UN events where there are participation fees.
3. The par. 6 of the response document related to the MHLB implementation received several comments. Several participants asked to find a consensus between the three options to operationalize the MHLB so that only one option could be included in the response. Several WG's members express support to option C drafted by the MAG Chair. It has been said that it represents a good compromise among options A and B. Many other members said that is not needed to force a consensus. They asked to reflect the different point of view as diversity is also important and to leave the three options. It was shared that is important for the champions to get the message that this is a very complex decision and that establishing this kind of Body is not a trivial exercise that needs to be done with great care because it can either enhance or undermine the legitimacy of the entire exercise. There was also a request to delete some text included in this section that seems to be in favour of option A. It has been agreed that par. 6 would give a general summary of the three options A, B and C and that the response document will include the proposal on how to operationalise the MHLB as annex. One participant pointed out that introducing more focus in the programme will not dilute participation. Someone observed the importance that the Options Paper final document delivered by the co-champions refers to the MHLB as part of the IGF and not as a decision making body. It was pointed out that around two third of the working group were in favour of option C.

Next Steps: By September 18, the WG group members will finalize the response to the Options Paper to be sent the co-champions of Recommendation 5A/B of HLPDC report. The deadline to include your comments to the response document is **16/09/2020**.

C. Improvements to the IGF

Output documents:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1b3XPWUAF8N_CHJRKFrUiArG7BvdKpuZv/view

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UEBjVU45gsTL1tuNIH8m6Mk7plcz3Ms/view?usp=sharing>

- **Summary of key points:** The facilitator, Flavio Wagner, has gathered all 58 proposals (different from recommendations) from the options paper and a selection of the previous recommendations collected by the IGF Improvements Working Group (see the above-shared spreadsheets). He invited the WG's members to give more comments on the two documents. He also said that considering the ongoing discussion on MHLB, the ongoing work that has been done by Samantha on strengthening the process of outputs creation and also taking into account the discussion on BPF as having a different ToR to be a first version of policy incubator and accelerator, the 10 recommendations to focus on could be already defined. Flavio observed that most of recommendations coming from previous documents (IGF retreat and so on) are almost all included in the Options Paper with different words. The MAG Chair, Anriette, also noted that in some way the ongoing discussion on the Options Paper has in some way already identified some priorities and that one element that is not really addressed is the institutional relationships and how to strengthen and consolidate the relationship of the IGF with other institutions. Raúl Echeberría expressed interest on this subject.
- **Next Steps:** In the next days, the group should provide feedback on both documents; and prioritize up to 10 proposals out of the listed 58. The facilitator will then integrate these in the output document to the extent possible by the next WG's meeting (24 September).

D. Strengthening the IGF outcomes

- **Output documents:**

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_Dlq4a6D3lvv89QGbcPbd36kos4KyD6iGc_w4w_RAO4/edit#heading=h.juck72nlha3c

Summary of key points: Participants were invited to continue providing inputs as only few comments were received. The Former MAG Chair, Lynn Saint Amour, pointed out the importance to include in the document some paragraphs on the definition of recommendations, to explain the process the recommendations follows, who is engaged, as there are different ways to frame the recommendations. She also highlighted the need to present a range of options around types of outcomes. The suggestion was welcomed. It was observed that the description to be included in the document should make clear that recommendations aren't linked to the IGF as becoming a negotiating forum. It was decided to include new sections to the document to address this issue and to include also the results of the "Series of online discussions on IGF strategy and strengthening in 2020" convened by the Mag Chair.

Next Steps: participants to provide feedback on the document and advise on how to achieve a narrower focus; drafting new sections on policy recommendations.

E. Series of online discussions on IGF strategy and strengthening in 2020

The MAG Chair will send a message to the WG to give an update on this subject.

1. **Next meeting:** The next meeting of the WG is planned for 24 September at 14:00 UTC.

Annex 1:

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Possible implementations of MHLB
3. Response to the Options Paper document
4. Improvements to the IGF
5. Strengthening of IGF outcomes
6. Series of online discussions on IGF strategy and strengthening in 2020
7. AOB

Annex 2:

List of participants

1. Anja Gengo, IGF Secretariat
2. Anriette Esterhuysen, IGF 2020 MAG Chair, Group's Co-Chair
3. Ben Wallis, Microsoft, MAG member
4. Bill Drake, University of Zurich
5. Chengetai Masango, IGF Secretariat
6. Concettina Cassa, Group's Co-Chair, Government of Italy
7. Flavio Wagner, CGI.br and University of Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil
8. Fiona Alexander, Independent expert
9. Giacomo Mazzone, Independent expert
10. Jason Munyan, HLPDC Secretariat
11. Jorge Cancio, Government of Switzerland
12. Jim Prendergast, Independent expert
13. Luis Bobo, IGF Secretariat
14. Lynn St. Amour, Internet Matters
15. Markus Kummer, IGFSA
16. Paul Blaker, Government of UK
17. Paul Charlton, Government of Canada
18. Raúl Echeberría, Independent Expert
19. Raquel Gatto , Fiona Alexander
20. Roberto Zambrana, ISOC Bolivia
21. Valentina Scialpi, European Commission
22. Timea Suto, ICC Basis
23. Valeria Betancourt, APC
24. Veni Markovski, ICANN

25. Wim Degezelle, IGF Secretariat