

MAG WORKING GROUP ON IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
- IGF 2018 Status Report
January 2019

The **MAG Working Group on Improvements to the IGF** started working in 2017. Its current charter can be found here:

https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/4919/642

The Working Group collected recommendations for the improvement of the IGF that have been proposed in various fora. These recommendations have been grouped into a single spreadsheet, together with the identification of the various sources. The spreadsheet is available here:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1TdxEe0Qit3qAMCaGeyOLOI4PvUIuY3Nv5hmBsq0OfE/edit#gid=198699308>

The spreadsheet contains proposals of improvements from five different sources:

1. The Commission on Science and Technology for Development - CSTD WG on IGF Improvements Report (2012)
2. Implementing WSIS Outcomes: A Ten-Year Review (2015)
3. Recommendations made by United Nations general Assembly - UNGA on renewal of the IGF mandate (December 2015)
4. Draft report from the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs - DESA Retreat (July 2016)
5. The NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement (April 2014)

These reference documents may be found here:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B4C745NEsGNqZWHLdIh3c1R0VGc>

The spreadsheet that has been prepared by the WG-IMP in 2017, containing a listing of the improvements proposed in the above set of inputs and a first classification of these improvements into a set of categories and tags.

Goal of the WG is to prepare an assessment of all these recommendations, so that the community can see how far the IGF has progressed. It is up to the MAG to propose future steps deriving from this assessment, possibly involving the wider IGF community. These steps can include:

- Possible proposal for an IGF 2019 session.
- Engagement with National and Regional IGFs as appropriate with the IGF/MAG remit.
- Establishing thematic sessions on the various issues at future IGFs.
- Propose ways to implement specific recommendations where needed

In that regard, and to facilitate this exercise, recommendations have been classified into 11 different categories (see “category” tab in the spreadsheet), according to their themes:

No.	Category	Status
1	Stakeholder (Engagement, Understanding)	Completed
2	Funding (Diversity and Funding) - Acknowledge in-kind support - Account & Transparency	Almost Completed. Account & Transparency need to be assessed, UNDESA can provide information for the assessment.
3	Intersessional work (Capacity Building, Multiyear Planning, Outcomes, Stakeholder engagement)	Almost Completed. Three proposals for improvement pending to assess.
4	Outcomes (Link to other entities) - Tangible Outputs	Almost Completed. One proposal for improvement pending to assess.
5	Participation & Capacity Building	Almost Completed. Two proposals for improvement pending to assess.
6	Link to IG entities and others	Most of the proposals are pending to assess.
7	MAG Structure & Methods - Multiyear Planning	Pending to elaborate the assessments.
8	Broader Participation - Diversity - Relevance & inclusiveness of IGF mtg- Program and Outreach.	Almost Completed. Four proposals for improvement pending to assess.
9	Multiyear Planning (Funding, Link with other entities) - Evolution and Impact	Completed.
10	Process - Secretariat	Pending to elaborate the assessments.
11	Enhanced communication - Improve Visibility - Mandate - Modalities - Working Modalities - Workshop selection	Pending to elaborate the assessments.

The assessment shall assign a status to each recommendation, corresponding to one of these three situations: recommendation **completed**; recommendation **in progress**; recommendation **to be implemented**. In case there is uncertainty about the status of the IGF with regard to a particular recommendation, a fourth situation can be chosen: **assessment pending**.

It must be clear that these are still draft versions of the documents. They still need final revision by WG members and, afterwards, analysis and approval by the MAG. It may also receive contributions from the IGF community, in modalities to be defined by the MAG, so that they

correspond to a consensual view on the progress that has been achieved towards the implementation of the recommendations.

All documents have the same format:

In the heading each document contains title, source of the proposals for improvement, and the volunteers that assessed the proposals:

2-. Proposed Improvements in Funding (Diversity and Funding) - Acknowledge in-kind support - Account & Transparency

Source: CSTD WG IGF, IGF RETREAT July 2016, Netmundial Multistakeholder Statement April 2014, final report UN WSIS +10

Volunteer reviewers: Raquel Gatto MAG member, Flávio Rech Wagner former MAG member..

Then we find the assessments for each proposal including the status **Completed, in progress, has to be implemented or Assessment Pending**. In most of the files the proposals for improvement are clustered into categories. Then the paragraph starts with a number that refers to the ID assigned in the **Evaluation Table** Tab of the spreadsheet where it is possible to track the original document where the recommendation comes from. Then the assessment is presented in italics, as in the example below:

Outcomes:

65. It was noted that many of the IGF documents tended to be descriptive rather than substantive. It has been also remarked that – in addition to the detailed reports – there should be shorter and more concise synthesis documents, in particular if they are to be made usable for policy makers.

To be implemented. *Outcome documents continue to be rather descriptive than substantive and, in general, do not map converging and diverging opinions on given policy questions. Guidelines should be defined for all processes that produce outcomes (BPFs, DCs, main session, workshops, ...), so that their final reports necessarily reflect converging and diverging opinions.*

68. In order to improve the IGF's outputs, it should be determined first what the purpose or purposes and "target audiences" of these documents are and what types of documents would be most useful to the different user groups and their specific needs.

To be implemented. *The IGF does not produce different outcomes that are targeted at*

different audiences. Guidelines should be defined for all processes that produce outcomes (BPFs, DCs, main session, workshops, ...), so that their final reports include messages that are targeted at different audiences, depending on each case (governments, civil society, technical community, international organisations, various industry sectors, etc.).

66. All outputs and documents are on the IGF website but not always easy to find. There would be a need for better organization of these, to “librarianize” these documents. A search optimization, e.g. using indexed texts or tagged keywords, would also be useful.

69. Data mining, search tools, multimedia (photos, videos), multilingualism and taxonomy (tagging) are all elements that should be incorporated into the IGF website to enhance the accessibility, readability and attractiveness of the IGF’s documents.

In progress: *The IGF website has been improving over the last years, both in contents and in organisation. However, tools like the search engine of the site are not efficient and need to be improved. i.e. searching the terms "Accessibility and disability discussions" provides no results, but doing the same search at Google "Accessibility and disability discussions site:intgovforum.org" provides multiple results. Tagging will help to organize the information, i.e. like The friends of the IGF website does at <http://friendsoftheigf.org>. Further, IGF 2018 has introduced the “call for issues” public consultation in order to collect input from the community on the main themes and subthemes to be considered as reference for the workshops proposal. This could be used to integrate the archive of IGF events, For the next IGF 2018 archive content there could be a new section that states the main key messages coming from the workshops grouped by themes/subthemes*

Recommendations.

- The assessment on various proposals for improvement to the IGF can bring inputs for the incoming MAG and for the continuation of the work carried out by the Multi-year Strategic Work Programme WG-MWP and WG-IMP, perhaps considering a possible merge between them for 2019.
- Results should be presented to other WGs for a further analysis, especially the results from the **Funding (Diversity and Funding) - Acknowledge in-kind support - Account & Transparency** category to the Working Group on Fundraising WG-FUN; **Multiyear Planning (Funding, Link with other entities) - Evolution and Impact** category to the Working Group on Multi-year Strategic Work Programme WG-MWP; and **Enhanced communication - Improve Visibility - Mandate - Modalities - Working Modalities - Workshop selection** category to the Working Group on Outreach and Engagement (WG-OE) WG-OUTREACH.
- Extend the table with recommendations coming from published submissions to consultations on IGF improvements, i.e. IGF Taking Stock activities.

We believe as WG-IMP that this is an initial assessment on quite a number of recommendations for improvement to the IGF and now it is time to open the exercise to the community and not only to the MAG, noting that this is a partial view from the WG-IMP volunteers and a broader review is important.