IGF 2020 MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy

Online Meeting V
27 August 2020 at 14:00 p.m. UTC

Summary Report

1. The fifth online meeting of the IGF 2020 MAG's Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was hosted on 27 August 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.

2. The co-chairs opened the meeting by introducing the agenda and reminding that this WG's members are working in groups on documenting the suggestions for next steps on the following matters:
   A. Possible implementation models for the Roadmap's High-level body
   B. Strengthening IGF outcomes
   C. Improvements to the IGF

3. The facilitator for each of the above-named work groups, shared written 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

4. **Output document:**
   https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zk8D2ub1D9yY4y5mznDbGuqZPDdZi6NjlV38Jsv4FkI/edit?usp=sharing

5. **Summary of key points:** Forming of the Roadmap's proposed new multistakeholder high-level body (HL body) could be done in two possible ways, described under options A) and B) in the above shared output document. The approach A) proposes establishing a multistakeholder HL body, separate from the MAG but with clear linkages between the two groups. The HL body would focus on providing leadership and bringing in a higher visibility and relevance for the IGF. The HL body would liaise with other organizations and would communicate its outputs to decision makers. The MAG Chair and Tech Envoy, if appointed, would be the ex-officio members of the HL body. The document's option A proposes further that the HL body is composed of up to 25 members through a bottom up nomination process across communities with rotation principle in place.

6. Unlike option A, option B proposed that the HL body be integrated into a reformed and strengthened MAG (''MAG Plus''). The MAG Plus would include a 'Leadership Team' tasked to drive the implementation of the IGF Plus as set in the Roadmap. This Leadership Team body would be composed of senior-level persons appointed by IGF stakeholders to the MAG through a nomination processes. It would be led by the MAG Plus Chair. The MAG Plus would be composed of around 40 to 50 high-level leaders' from all stakeholder groups.

7. Participants engaged in commenting on the two presented options. While some were of an opinion that the group should reach the consensus on one of the two options, namely A) or B) others expressed that having two models reflects the diversity of views and that as such, both should be submitted to the Recommendation V co-champions. In the course of the discussion a possible third option that draws on elements of both option A and option B, option C) was proposed. In other words a total of three options would be sent in response to the Options Paper: *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 .* One participant explained that the option B) may not be feasible as the MAG already has many tasks and works at an operational level that may not be suitable for the high profiles members intended for the MHLB. Others expressed concern about the MHLB being too top-down. Several participants underlined that, if the Tech Envoy is appointed, they should be an ex-officio member of the HL body.

8. Some also advised that the wording in all output documents is carefully reviewed and standardized where possible. For example, referring to high-level leadership in the context of academic communities is not self-explanatory and the wording could be adjusted in this regard.

9. **Next Steps:** By the next WG's meeting (10 September), WG group members to provide feedback directly to the document for further consideration for integration.

B. Improvements to the IGF

10. **Output documents:** https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lutZTnFaGLhMm-QK3hSb2ZNv4i3f658LTLWguT-OT8Y/edit and https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UEBjVU45gsTL1tuNIH8m6Mk7pIczz3Ms/view

11. **Summary of key points:** The facilitator has gathered all 58 proposals (different from recommendations) from the options paper in the above-shared spreadsheet.

12. **Next Steps:** In the next 10 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 (10 September).

C. Strengthening the IGF outcomes

13. **Output documents:** https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_DIq4a6D3lvv89QGbCpbd36kos4KyD6iGc_w4w_RAO4/edit#heading=h.juck72nlha3c

14. **Summary of key points:** Received feedback is integrated in the shared output document. Participants were invited to continue providing inputs and specifically suggest how to focus the agenda at the beginning of each IGF process and to narrow down the focus.

15. **Next Steps:** By 7 September, participants to provide feedback on the document and advise specifically how to achieve a narrower focus, for final consultations at the next WG's meeting.

Forming a response to the Options Paper document

16. The WG discussed the next steps regarding providing a consolidated response to the Recommendation V co-champions on their options paper. The WG's co-chair informed that all so far received comments are integrate in the output document: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eVwoVFoch6id-SzT9EXd7etofFsjAeU1/view?usp=sharing

17. Participant were invited to coment within the next seven days (by 4 September), on the output document. Particularly, the co-chair asked for feedback on the following items which need more clarity:
    - *Modalities for having the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Forums as part of the Cooperation Accelerator or Policy Incubator. Could the WG propose one possible solution to this?*
    - *How to create better linkages between the IGF Plus and other decision-making bodies?*

18. The facilitator will prepare up to two pages of the final response by the next WG's meeting on 10 September.

19. The MAG Chair reminded that the series of MAG-Chair-led online discussions on the IGF has been communicated and participants were invited to provide feedback and inform her if they would like to participate.

20. In closing, the Secretariat for Digital Cooperation informed participants that the final options paper is expected to be communicated by the end of the week. It is unlikely that the paper will include any major differences compared to the currently circulated draft. It was also reminded that a high-level event on digital cooperation is planned to be hosted withing the UN 75th anniversary framework

21. **Next meeting**: The next meeting of this WG is planned for 10 September at 14:00 UTC.

Annex 1:
Meeting Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Update from the working groups: 1) Possible implementations of MHLB, 2) Improvements to the IGF, 3) Strengthening of IGF outcomes)
3. Response to the Options Paper document
4. Series of online discussions on IGF strategy and strengthening in 2020
5. 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
8. Giacomo Mazzone, EBU
9. Jason Munyan, HLPDC Secretariat
10. Jim Prendergast,
11. Livia Walpen, Government of Switzerland
12. Lucien Castex, ISOC France, University of Sorbonne
13. Luis Bobo, IGF Secretariat
14. Lynn St. Amour, Internet Matters
15. Markus Kummer, IGFSA
16. Matthew Shears, ICANN Board of Directors
17. Paul Blaker, Government of UK
18. Paul Charlton, Government of Canada
19. Raúl Echeberría, Independent Expert
20. Roberto Zambrana, ISOC Bolivia
21. Timea Suto, ICC Basis
22. Valeria Betancourt, APC
23. Veni Markovski, ICANN
24. Wai Min Kwok, UN DESA
25. Wim Degezelle, IGF Secretariat
26. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus