



## IGF 2020 First Open Consultations and MAG Meeting Contributions Taking Stock of IGF 2019 and Looking Forward to IGF 2020

### Synthesis Paper

*(First Draft as of 13 January. Given that a few valuable inputs were received after the deadline, the final version will be updated)*

#### Introduction

1. This paper summarizes inputs received from the community in response to an invitation<sup>1</sup> from the IGF Secretariat for stakeholders to submit written contributions taking stock of the IGF 2019 meeting (14th IGF) and looking forward to the IGF 2020 meeting (15th IGF).
2. The synthesis paper is intended to form an input for the first Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting (14 - 16 January 2020) in the preparatory process for IGF 2020. This paper is a summary of the various contributions received by the IGF Secretariat. Some specific suggestions are included verbatim. A complete list of contributions received can be found here: <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/2019-2020-stocktaking-contributions> and in the Annex of this document.

#### **I. Taking Stock of the 2019 programming, outputs, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the event itself: What worked well? What worked not so well?**

1. Stakeholders expressed deep appreciation to the Government of Germany for hosting a successful IGF. The MAG, under the stewardship of its Chair, Ms. Lynn St. Amour, and the IGF Secretariat and UNDESA were also thanked for their work in preparing the 14th IGF.
2. Positive feedback toward an effective preparatory process timeline was given. This includes the timely renewal of the MAG 2020 and its Chair, the announcement of the next Host Country, as well as the call for session proposals.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/taking-stock-of-igf-2019-and-call-for-inputs-for-igf-2020>

3. Regarding the programme structure, many noted as important a successful return of a Day Zero pre-event, as it allowed for a stronger stakeholder interaction. Efforts of the Host Country to engage high level stakeholders into meaningful discussions with concrete output documents were praised.
4. Many saw the bottom-up selection of themes and subthemes for the IGF 2019 as a good step toward enabling multi-disciplinary discussions and a more focused programme structure. In addition, many welcomed the innovative legislator's track with a concrete follow-up output.
5. Stakeholders noted important steps made toward IGF evolving into a tangible outcome-oriented process, visible through IGF Berlin Messages, Chair's Summary, number of Host Country outputs, as well as transcripts and session reports.
6. A few submissions noted that the process of the selection of workshops lacked transparency. They added that the workshop evaluation process lacked expertise, resulting in some topics not being integrated into the programme, for example the environmental impacts of ICTs. Some participants noted challenges in updating the workshop speakers lists. Regarding the overall workshop organisation, some said that large panels prevented the development of meaningful, interactive discussions. Some felt that some sessions lacked diversity, adding that some did not respect scheduled time.
7. Efforts on advancing the reporting mechanism from sessions were recognised by many, while a few inputs called for more clarity on the overall reporting process.
8. Many noted the rise of the IGF's political visibility and it making a stronger global impact, due to the presence of the German Chancellor and the United Nations Secretary-General, as well as of other high level stakeholders, including heads of states and governments, leaders of large private companies and non-profit organizations. Of particular importance to many was the legislators track and engagement of a fair number of parliamentarians from around the world.
9. A positive growth of the overall participation at the IGF 2019 was underlined as important. Many recognized the contribution of the German Host in this regard as well, through funding participation from developing countries. Some said that a delayed selection process was problematic as it affected the visa processing. Stakeholders called for better support regarding visa processing for some developing countries, as many were denied visas, despite having secured funding and guarantees from respected larger organizations of these participant's

engagement.

10. The valuable work of the Best Practice Forums (BPFs), Dynamic Coalitions (DCs) and National, Regional and Youth IGFs (NRI) has been broadly appreciated; as well as an enhanced youth engagement into the overall programme. However, some noted that the content of the BPF and DC sessions was duplicative in comparison to other sessions.
11. The IGF Village was seen as well-equipped and organized. A few inputs noted that splitting the Village area into two sections negatively impacted the accessibility of some booths. These also added that the signage to the Village area could have been more clearly displayed.
12. The overall logistics of the meeting received very positive sentiments. Stakeholders appreciated the availability of bilateral rooms; as well as free of charge coffee and snack breaks; and a friendly service of the staff.

## **II. Suggestions and Recommendations Looking Forward to the 15th IGF**

### **Overall summary of suggestions for way forward**

1. IGF 2020 should continue the bottom-up, inclusive thematic approach to the overall programme structure. Many inputs noted that the 2019 thematic approach could be extended to the 2020 process. A number of other inputs suggested that the 2019 thematic setup of the programme prevented from some topics to be on the agenda. The following topics were suggested by a number of stakeholders to be reflected by the 2020 process setup: *Digital Transformation; Digital Skills; Digital Economy; Trust and Security Emerging; New and Emerging Technologies; Digitalization and Climate Change; Environmental Impact of the ICTs; Trust and Security.*
2. Some inputs noted the importance of keeping the interactive format of the opening sessions, as well as a need for continuation of improving the formats of other sessions to be interactive, engaging and dynamic as much as possible. A number of inputs called for reduction of a number of panellists in individual sessions that often prevent from meaningful engagement of all participants present onsite and online.
3. Efforts should be continuously invested to increase the participation of individual stakeholder groups going through process of digitalisation and in general impacted by the digital technologies. In particular, governments and the private sector, start-ups and SMEs should be engaged in a more meaningful manner. Overall, IGF should

strengthen cooperation with other mechanisms related to digital policy. One of the ways this could be done is through fostering discussions on issues of current interest to people in their daily lives; to business; but also, global politics. For example, IGF could focus on climate change and digitalisation, which is at the centre of global political discourse.

4. An outcome oriented IGF meeting should be a practice, with adopting some of the innovative ways the IGF 2019 host country introduced (e.g. the Jimmy Schulz Call; SMEs Charter). The IGF should continue to improve its outcomes and they should be put at disposal to the wider community. One possible way is utilisation of these outcomes or outputs by the MAG and IGF Secretariat, as well as a revisit at the forthcoming IGFs and NRIs meetings.
5. Linkages should continue to be improved with the NRIs, DCs and BPFs networks, as well as with the youth global community. This should be done across sessions, but also in regard to the development of outcomes.
6. There was a suggestion that the IGF Secretariat could maintain a dedicated site linking to partners that provide observatory and helpdesk functions, which provide updated information on relevant issues, processes and actors; provide capacity-building for interested stakeholders on relevant issues in the field of digital policy; and/or collect and share best practices. Such partners could especially offer support to BPFs, DCs and NRIs.
7. Annual IGF processes could be better interlinked by creating closer cooperation between the previous, current and future host countries.
8. High level participation, including from the Head of the host country Government and the UN Secretary-General, should be a permanent practice. Some suggested that the IGF frames this participation as the 'State of the Internet' or 'State of Digital Cooperation' Speech. This is seen as critical to strengthen the overall profile and visibility of the IGF.
9. Given the extended mandate and government's interest for hosting the IGF, a multi-year strategy could be developed to interlink the annual IGF processes. Stable funding, however, remains a challenge to this and it should be addressed by all supporting organizations and current network of donors to the IGF.
10. Some advised that the IGF focuses on hosting the meeting outside of Europe to achieve regional inclusion and diversity.

11. There was an input for the IGF to update its privacy policy, which will be carefully reviewed by the IGF Secretariat.
12. A number of stakeholders referenced to the Report of the UN Secretary-General's High - Level Panel on Digital Cooperation and stressed that the IGF should evolve into a stronger mechanism for digital cooperation, as the Panel proposed. One input referenced the potential appointment of the Tech Envoy by the EOSG that could raise the visibility of the IGF.

### **III. Concert and implementable suggestions for improvements for the 15<sup>th</sup> IGF and beyond**

#### **Preparatory Process**

- 1) More clarity on the session **reporting process**.
- 2) Timely publish **meeting outputs** (e.g. messages on the last day of the meeting). IGF Secretariat to develop plan for **dissemination of outputs** (identify outputs, audience and timeline of communication and marketing strategy).
- 3) Communicate overall **programme timeline** on the programme beforehand (opening and closing session tracks; newcomers track; feedback process on workshop).
- 4) Develop detailed requirements for **workshop** proponents and simplify overall process. Introduce more transparency in the workshop evaluation process. Policy questions for thematic narratives to be more specific. There could be two types of workshops: 1) workshops exploring new areas and looking to the future on emerging issues and 2) others that are expected to feed concretely the discussion of the main sessions on the selected priority topics.
- 5) **Main session** discussions should be based on pre-prepared and published documents, developed by the IGF Secretariat and the MAG on the basis of community's input.

#### **Community Intersessional Activities and NRIs**

- 1) Align all intersessional work sessions (BPF, DCs; and NRIs) into thematic tracks.
- 2) Increase role of the NRIs to collect local inputs and convey to global IGF programme.
- 3) Develop linkages between high level meetings and intersessional work.
- 4) Enhance dissemination of intersessional work outputs.

#### **Structure and Flow**

- 1) Maintain the practice of **thematic tracks**.
- 2) **Legislators/parliamentarian track** to be continued with outcome concluding document (Jimmy Schultz Call).
- 3) **All sessions to be outcome oriented**.
- 4) **Outcomes** (e.g. messages) to be **linked** to the outcomes/results of the intersessional work and NRIs.
- 5) **High level meetings** from Day 0 could be organized during regular meeting days (suggested to be the last day, as it would allow for participants to discuss session outcomes).
- 6) Reduce **number of sessions** and improve selection methods.
- 7) Leave enough **time in between session** for participants to meet bilaterally and do not miss many of the programme components.
- 8) There could be one **main session** per day.
- 9) Avoid for workshops to compete with main sessions. Day 1 could be dedicated to workshops and day 2 and 3 to a more general discussion.
- 10) **Workshops** should feed into the discussion of the **main sessions**.
- 11) **Session conclusions** could be prepared similarly as at EuroDIG (form of messages prepared by trained rapporteurs where present participants are asked to express support of objections).
- 12) In the **workshop proposal form** or other forms, stakeholders could be given an option to identify as 'individuals' instead of to identify with traditional stakeholder groups.
- 13) Promote dynamic, interactive **session formats** with limited number of panellists/speakers to allow for broader interaction.

## Themes, Tracks and Content

- 1) Providing synergies between **BPFs and main sessions** (" for example the main session on Applying human rights and ethics in responsible data governance and AI, also gave an opportunity to raise the visibility and impact of their work. The work and outputs of different BPFs was also well presented in workshops, thereby forfeiting the need to have allocated main session slot for these intersessional activities."
- 2) Maintain the current three themes. The following additional themes were put forward for consideration:
  - a. *Digital Transformation*
  - b. *Digital Skills*
  - c. *Digital Economy*
  - d. *Trust and Security*
  - e. *Human Rights and Ethics*
  - f. *New and Emerging Technologies*
  - g. *Digitalization and Climate Change*
  - h. *Environmental Impact of the ICTs*

## Participation

- 1) Increase participation of **private sector, governments, start-ups and SMEs**.
- 2) Reach out to **permanent missions to the UN in Geneva** to have them informed and engaged in the IGF preparatory process as soon as possible.
- 3) Participation of a **head of host country/government and UN Secretary-General** to become permanent practice framed as 'State of the Internet' or 'State of Digital Cooperation'.
- 4) Gathering and participation of **high-level leaders** through high level session formats should be continued.
- 5) Further raise efforts to engage participants from **developing countries/global south**, like the IGF 2019 did.
- 6) **Youth** to be embedded into overall IGF work.

## Other

- 1) **Partnerships with other projects/organisations:** The information sources at the disposal of the participants during the IGF (such as digital policy summaries, instant "session reporting", "daily reports", etc.) should be further developed and improved, e.g. by strengthening partnerships with, inter alia, GIP, GIPO, IG Schools, etc.
- 2) The IGF Secretariat could maintain a **dedicated site linking to partners** that provide observatory and helpdesk functions, which provide updated information on relevant issues, processes and actors; provide capacity-building for interested stakeholders on relevant issues in the field of digital policy; and/or collect and share best practices. Such partners could especially offer support to BPFs, DCs and NRIs.
- 3) Further strengthen **linkages of the IGF to the UN Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development**.
- 4) IGF to evolve toward becoming a platform that provides practical solution through dedicated projects such as **hackathons and prizes**, involving industry, innovators and tech-developers.
- 5) Develop **strategic multi-annual planning** and interlink previous, current and future host countries and MAG programming. The intersessional work could be spanned over 2-3 years.

## Annex:

### *Taking Stock of the [IGF 2019](#) and Call for Inputs for the [IGF 2020](#): List of Received Inputs*

1. [June Parris \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
2. [Kennedy Rubben \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
3. [Rabie Bouyahiaoui \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
4. [Federica Tortorella \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
5. [Judith Hellerstein \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
6. [Pajaro Velasquez Juan \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
7. [Avis Momeni \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
8. [Nguyễn Minh quo Quoc \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
9. [Sufian Khalfalla \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
10. [Nadira Alaraj \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
11. [Shin Yamasaki \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
12. [Muriel Alapini \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
13. [Amali De Silva - Mitchell \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
14. [Dan Caprion \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
15. [Abdoul Aziz Issaka Hassane \(in personal capacity\)](#)
16. [Carlos Afonso \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
17. [Anna Kotarska \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
18. [Raul Echeberria \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
19. [Mary Uduma \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
20. [Dr. Evelyne Tauchnitz \(in a personal capacity\)<sup>2</sup>](#)
21. [Concettina Cassa \(in a personal capacity\)](#)
22. [RayZnews \(submitted by: Rayamajhi Shreedeeep\)](#)
23. [FGI Cote D'ivoire \(submitted by: Salyou Fanny\)](#)
24. [IGF Guinea Conakry for the Parliament of young leaders of Guinean civil society \(submitted by: Thierno Abdoul Bah\)](#)
25. [African Internet Governance Forum \(Submitted by: Makane Faye\)](#)
26. [Vanuatu IGF \(Submitted by: Jackson Miake\)](#)
27. [TIM Technology Services Ltd \(submitted by: Timothy K. Asiedu\)](#)
28. [Usuarios Digitales \(submitted by: Velazco Alfredo\)](#)
29. [Social Media Matters \(submitted by: Amitabh Kumar\)](#)
30. [European Commission \(submitted by: Valentina Scialpi\)](#)
31. [APC \(submitted by: Deborah Brown\)](#)
32. [ISOC \(submitted by: Requel Gatto\)](#)
33. [Government of United States of America \(submitted by: Susan Chalmers\)](#)
34. [Governance Primer \(submitted by: Mark Datysgeld\)](#)
35. [Swiss Federal Office of Communications \(OFCOM\) \(submitted by: Livia Walpen\)](#)
36. [ICC BASIS \(submitted by: Timea Suto\)](#)
37. [Cybersecurity Association of China \(submitted by: Yang Xiaobo\)](#)
38. [Coding Rights \(submitted by: Bruna Martins dos Santos\)](#)
39. [Albania IGF \(submitted by: Fotjon Kosta\)](#)
40. [iNGO European Media Platfor \(submitted by: Oksana Prykhodko\)](#)
41. [HEDERA Sustainable Solutions \(submitted by: Diaz Durana\)](#)

---

<sup>2</sup> Feedback reflected in the final report of the [BPF on IoT, Big Data and AI](#)