

MAG WG ON IGF STRENGTHENING AND STRATEGY

PROPOSALS FROM THE OPTIONS PAPER SELECTED AS PRIORITIES BY THE WG FOR FURTHER ACTION

The WG, in a previous step, identified 12 proposals from the Options Paper as possible priorities. They are listed in the Annex to this document.

During a previous meeting, on October 15, the WG suggested to focus on only two to three proposals. Based on the discussion during the meeting, and following its minutes, the three proposals listed below have been selected for further action by the WG.

For each of them:

- The corresponding section in the Options Paper is identified;
- The corresponding paragraph in the Roadmap for Digital Cooperation is identified;
- Relevant nodes from the previous WG meeting are indicated;
- A possible path forward on how to address the proposal is suggested.

PROPOSAL 1

V.4. On communication between different fora: Introduce reporting between the IGF and decision-making bodies in both directions and invite decision-making bodies systematically to present their work at the IGF.

Options Paper: Section V - Forging Links between Discussion and Decision-Making Bodies

Roadmap: Paragraphs 93(a) and 93(c)

Note from previous WG meeting: It was noted that the communication between the IGF and other fora and decision-making bodies is a central point in the three approaches on MHLB that have been developed by the WG.

Suggested path forward:

- 1) As noted in the WG response to the Options Paper, “the MHLB’s main function would be to build bridges at a high level between what is discussed and prepared by the IGF and the fora and institutions where decisions are taken, by contributing to improved awareness among high-level decision-makers of the discussions and proposals emerging from the IGF”. As such, the implementation of this proposal is closely related to one of the main functions of the MHLB and, therefore, shall immediately follow from the MHLB operation.
- 2) The MAG should create a special track in the IGF programme, for which relevant decision-making bodies will be invited to present their work and engage in discussions with the IGF community.
- 3) Liaisons in relevant decision-making bodies should be identified. The IGF communication strategy, to be discussed and approved among relevant bodies (MAG, IGF Secretariat, MHLB) should implement

a permanent communication with those liaisons. These liaisons should be invited to F2F MAG meetings, as observers, and to selected MAG virtual meetings, as appropriate. They would be also the contact points to which feedback on the IGF overall outcome document would be asked.

- 4) Specific messages targeted to specific decision-making bodies should be produced to from the IGF overall outcome document.
- 5) As a concrete step for 2020, the decision-making bodies that are participating of the IGF 2020 should be listed and the main messages/results of this year's edition should be sent to them. After that, a virtual meeting could be scheduled with them to collect inputs and reflections on the main messages and share the next steps and related initiatives.

PROPOSAL 2

V.1. On establishing a policy incubator: Rather than establish a new structure, further develop the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora which already organize intersessional work and produce recommendations and best practice proposals. They should be given a clear mandate, working procedures and principles and receive more resources and administrative support by the IGF Secretariat. The work of the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora has to be complemented by other initiatives to link discussion and decision-making bodies.

Options Paper: Section V - Forging Links between Discussion and Decision-Making Bodies

Roadmap: Paragraph 93(e) addresses IGF intersessional work, although it does not directly mentions a policy incubator.

Note from previous WG meeting: It was observed that some work on this direction has already been initiated by the BPF on BPFs and could be used to implement the priority.

Suggested path forward:

- 1) The Terms of Reference of Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora should be adapted, so that they produce recommendations in a more systematic way. These recommendations shall be integrated into the overall outcomes document of the IGF, which will be available for public feedback from different stakeholders.
 - 2) As noted in the WG response to the Options Paper, "the WG suggests that BPFs and DCs should as a rule include experts from external organizations and, especially, representatives from decision-making bodies. They would discuss recommendations that could inform the adoption of norms and policies by decision-making bodies and organizations from various stakeholder groups". Therefore, the Terms of Reference of BPFs and DCs should be adapted to include the above experts and to build stronger communication paths to decision-making bodies and other organizations.
 - 3) As a concrete step for 2020, after this year's edition the BPFs and DCs should issue two pages of takeaways and recommendations to be sent to decision-making bodies.
-

PROPOSAL 3

VIII.1. Create an observatory to provide a central entry point for information requests. Create a “database of databases” which could take the form of a virtual platform linked to the IGF+ Website and would collect information on accredited initiatives, databases and observatories.

Options Paper: Section VIII - Providing Transparency and Guidance in a Complex System

Roadmap: Although mentioned in paragraphs 36 and 84 of the Roadmap (sections on “Digital Capacity Building”), this proposal of the Options Paper is not directly reflected in paragraphs 93 and 94 of the Roadmap, which indicates the path forward for the IGF Plus.

Notes from previous WG meeting: It has been noted that during the last MAG face to face meeting there was a strong support that IGF Secretariat would include in the IGF website the list of observatories and help desks currently playing the role of informing on digital policy issues (among them GIP and GIPO). The idea discussed on January included the possibility to have the IGF Secretariat acting as a kind of a router of requests of assistance to the right observatories and help desks. It has been also noted that UNDP and ITU think that setting up another Help Desk isn't necessary and that the best way to reach out to people that need support for more advice is to strengthen existing institutions that are already playing the role of help desk. The WG should work in line with other parts of the HLPDC process.

Suggested path forward:

- 1) In its response to the Options Paper, the WG “strongly suggests that in case of having a new digital capacity-building entity created by ITU and UNDP, the IGF + should be a key member of it and ways should be found for the IGF to feed into this, e.g. through access to an updated and organised archive of past IGF meetings and outcomes, and by steering requests received via the IGF to this new ITU-UNDP ‘joint facility for capacity development’”. For this, the MAG shall build a close contact with ITU and UNDP and closely collaborate on the implementation of this new digital capacity-building structure. In its response to the Options Paper, the WG also noted that “this could be an opportunity to share the best practices linked to the IGF (e.g. DC on IG schools), would prevent duplication, reduce the amount of functions and create a clear linkage between the UN agencies for digital capacity-building and the IGF”.
- 2) As proposed in the previous WG meeting, the IGF website should include the list of observatories and help desks currently playing the role of informing on digital policy issues (among them GIP and GIPO).
- 3) In order to have visibility of the current observatories and help desks available worldwide, a public call to get information should be launched by the IGF Secretariat.

ANNEX. Proposals from Options Paper - Results from indications of priorities by WG members

7 WG members indicated their priorities:

- 1 proposal received 6 indications
- 3 proposals received 5 indications
- 4 proposals received 4 indications
- 4 proposals received 3 indications

PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVED 6 INDICATIONS

(From Section V. Forging Links between Discussion and Decision-Making Bodies)

V.4. On communication between different fora: Introduce reporting between the IGF and decision-making bodies in both directions and invite decision making bodies systematically to present their work at the IGF.

PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVED 5 INDICATIONS

(From Section IV. More Actionable and Concrete Outcomes)

IV.2. On the format of outputs: Introduce reports, drafted e.g. by an independent organization as during previous IGFs, which formulate outcomes of the IGF and its thematic tracks describing consensus and areas of difference, as well as best practices emerging from the forum. Relevant reports could position the IGF as a reference point on Internet Governance issues for a global audience.

(From Section VII. Placing Digital Cooperation Issues at the Top of the Political Agenda)

VII.1. Continue a high-level leaders segment at the IGF with strong links to other parts of its program; this segment should be linked to the enhanced MAG structure referred to under point VI.

(From Section X. Adequate Funding and Fair Distribution of Resources)

X.1. Establish a dedicated and professional fundraising structure within the IGF Secretariat.

PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVED 4 INDICATIONS

(From Section IV. More Actionable and Concrete Outcomes)

IV.6. On content: Introduce multi-year IGF planning to strengthen long term focus and consistency of IGF.

(From Section V. Forging Links between Discussion and Decision-Making Bodies)

V.1. On establishing a policy incubator: Rather than establish a new structure, further develop the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora which already organize intersessional work and produce recommendations and best practice proposals. They should be given a clear mandate, working

procedures and principles and receive more resources and administrative support by the IGF Secretariat. The work of the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora has to be complemented by other initiatives to link discussion and decision-making bodies.

(From Section V. Forging Links between Discussion and Decision-Making Bodies)

V.3. On communication between different fora: Have dedicated sessions at the IGF on the work of decision-making bodies and invite members of decision-making bodies to participate.

(From Section VIII. Providing Transparency and Guidance in a Complex System)

VIII.1. Create an observatory which would provide a central entry point for information requests and create a “database of databases”. This “database of databases” could take the form of a virtual platform linked to the IGF+ Website which would collect information on accredited initiatives, databases and observatories.

PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVED 3 INDICATIONS

(From Section II. Inclusivity)

II.1. To facilitate participation: Increase dedicated funds to participants from the Global South to enable their participation in IGF meetings and other relevant fora.

(From Section IV. More Actionable and Concrete Outcomes)

IV.4. On the process of output creation: Create a sandbox at the IGF for developing and testing innovative approaches, for example for the development of concrete recommendations. If tested successfully, concepts could become permanent features.

(From Section VII. Placing Digital Cooperation Issues at the Top of the Political Agenda)

VII.4. Send out personalized IGF invitation letters from the UNSG’s office to high-ranking government officials.

(From Section IX. Greater Visibility of a Global Digital Cooperation Architecture)

IX.1. Build a high-quality, clear and easily-accessible website under the supervision of the MAG.