

IGF 2020 MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy

Online Meeting XI

10 December 2020 at 1 p.m. UTC

Summary Report

The eleventh virtual meeting of the IGF 2020 MAG's Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on December 10 2020 at 1 p.m. UTC. The meeting was hosted and moderated by the Group's co- chairs, Concettina Cassa and Anriette Esterhuysen. The list of participants is annexed to this report. The recording of the meeting is available only to the meeting participants upon request.

The co-chairs opened the meeting by introducing the agenda:

Agenda

- A. Draft proposal to MAG on IGF2021 design and process;
- B. IGF improvements and priorities;
- C. Parliamentary track;
- D. Response document to the Options Paper;
- E. AoB.

A. Draft proposal to MAG on IGF2021 design and process

Document:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vfX-on8W4kKoUrDYzEbT2tVVeoAz-2E5_aYW5z2Gqhc/edit

Key points summary:

Olivier Bringer observed that the document suggests a process-oriented document on how to prepare the next IGF agenda 2021 but at the same time proposes a number of longer-term improvements for IGF in general. He remarked the importance to implement some of the elements included in the Recommendations 5A/B of HLPDC report and in the UN Secretary General's Roadmap in the preparation of IGF 2021 and in the IGF intersessional works. He mentioned the three objectives that should be achieved on the preparation of IGF 2021:

1. To build, not just a more strategic agenda, but a more strategic IGF;
2. To have a good articulation between the preparation of the yearly meeting agenda and the output of the intersessional works;
3. Inclusion of Governments, Youth and discussion about how to attract a broader participation from the Internet Community.

He recalled the need to share the IGF results and the output of intersessional works in the relevant fora. He also suggested re-organizing the document putting the logistics and the preparation of the event at the end.

Jorge Cancio expressed support for the idea of starting with IGF+ implementation consistently

with the Roadmap. He said that the proposal of IGF 2021 design and process goes in this direction.

The WG's participants shared the list of the documents under discussion:

- 1) [Response document to the Options Paper](#),
- 2) [Priorities on IGF improvements](#)
- 3) [Proposal to the MAG on IGF2021 design and process](#)
- 4) [Non-Paper document: Building a Parliamentary track for the IGF +](#)

Several participants observed that there is an overlapping between documents 2) and 3).

Anriette informed the WG's participants that the "*Call to Take Stock of IGF 2020*" will remain open until the 20th of January, therefore there is more time to finalize the proposal on IGF 2021 design and process (document 3).

Jorge Cancio suggested not updating the "Response Document to the Options Paper" as it has already been published and delivered to the co-champions.

Some participants suggested merging of documents 2) and 3) as they overlap in several parts. Some others said that it would be better to keep them separate as they have different purposes.

Paula Martins suggested integrating the document 3) so that the scope and the context is clearer. She also suggested revising the structure to include the strategic approach at the beginning of the document.

Some participants said that a communication letter with the last updates and the new documents drafted by the WG should be sent to the co-champions.

Paul Blaker from the UK Government observed that the document 2) on priorities was supposed to be used internally by the Working group while the other documents were supposed to be shared with the co-champions. He highlighted the need to have a more focused agenda and to define clear actions for the next IGF as there are only 4 IGF left before the end of the mandate.

Ben Wallis recalled the directions Jason Munyan gave to the WG during the last virtual meeting suggesting that the WG should focus on the parts of the priorities document not related to fundraising communication strategies and to MHLB. He added to have no preference on merging nor leaving the documents separate underlying the importance to select the priorities to be implemented.

Some participants said the proposal on the Parliamentary track should be kept separate.

Raquel Gatto expressed support on the updating of the "Response Document to the Options Paper" and on re-sending it to the co-champions. She also said that the parliamentary track should not be considered only by the MAG in shaping the next year program and next year agenda, but also for the HLPDC and the Roadmap for Digital Cooperation.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter asked to get an update on the active Roundtables (Roundtable on AI and on Cybersecurity /Rec. 4).

Next steps:

WG's participants agreed that:

- 1) The document "Response to the"Options Paper" will not be updated and will stay as it is.
- 2) The proposal for design and format for IGF2021 will be expanded and reorganised so to provide general strategic input for moving towards IGF+ in 2021. The proposal will extend beyond suggestions on the design of the event. It will become a more holistic strategic response to IGF improvements and will include elements from other documents that the WG has produced.

B. IGF improvements and priorities**Document:**

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1L6cf00crInn_ae3_peObjkIMxWE3cSIL/edit#heading=h.gjdgxs

Summary of key points:

The co-chair Anriette shared an update about the document drafted by Flavio saying that there is a consensus only on the first two priorities. She observed that the third priority, where there is no consensus, is including at least three elements:

- 1) Capacity building;
- 2) Development of modalities;
- 3) IGF capacity to communicate (IGF website, outreaches, etc.).

She suggested rewording the third priority in "Strengthening the IGF institutional capacity and IGF Secretariat for further capacity building". She explained that keeping it fairly on the general meaning would give the possibility to include different areas such as the new website, capacity building and so on.

Jorge Cancio expressed some doubts on the proposal raised by Anriette. He suggested that priority 3 should reflect the broad agreement reached at the beginning of the year to have synergies between the IGF Secretariat and the existing help desks and observatories like GIP.

Paul Blaker observed that databases and observatories are not an immediate priority and that priority 3 seems to duplicate some of the work happening in the Roundtable 2 led by ITU/UNDP. He suggested the IGF Strengthening and Strategy WG should have a regular update by Chengetai and other WG's participants involved in the Roundtable 2 discussions. He said that this would allow the IGF Strengthening and Strategy Working Group to be fully aligned with the activities the Roundtable 2 Working Group on Capacity Building is doing.

Anriette added that there are several regional platforms on Internet governance that have been activated (from Latin America, Africa, etc.,) and that it would be an excellent idea for the IGF to collaborate with all of those even if this would need further staff capacity.

Some participants highlighted that the capacity building development initiative led by ITU/UNDP is not entirely focused on Internet governance capacity and that it is very different from what the IGF itself has been doing on capacity building.

Chengetai confirmed that the IGF Secretariat and UNDESA are part of the Working Group on Capacity Building activated by the Roundtable 2 and that some MAG members are participating.

Next steps: WG's participants will suggest how to rephrase priority 3. Chengetai and other WG's participants will give an update on the activities of Roundtable 2.

c. Parliamentarian track

Documents:

https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/10447/2384

https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/10447/2385

https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/10447/2386

Summary of key points:

Wolfgang Kleinwächter said that the Parliamentarian draft document has been updated to include the discussion held during vIGF2020. He shared few elements that are under discussion:

- 1) The structure of the IPIG (Informal Parliamentarian IGF Group). He said that the idea is to have a small group made by few champions that will push the process forward.
- 2) Parliamentarian track. It should be decided if it should be left as an annual IGF event or if some intersessional work is needed. He suggested having parliamentarian roundtables in national and regional initiatives (NRIs).
- 3) Recommendations for the digitalization of parliamentarians work in the 193 Parliament's around the globe. He said that this request has been discussed with IPU (International Parliamentary Union).
- 4) Proposal to have a roundtable on Internet governance issues in the IPU General Assembly in order to have a better link between the Parliamentarian work and what IGF is doing.

He added that the German Parliament is engaged on the Parliamentarian Track and will schedule a meeting at the beginning of January to discuss how to organize the IPIG. The German Parliament has also allocated financial support for the first phase.

Next steps: Wolfgang will keep the WG updated on the follow up activities.

Next meeting: the next meeting of the WG is planned for **January 14 – 2 PM UTC**.

Annex 1:

List of participants

1. Anja Gengo, IGF Secretariat
2. Anriette Esterhuysen, IGF 2020 MAG Chair, Group's Co-Chair
3. Ben Wallis, Microsoft, Independent Expert
4. Chengetai Masango, IGF Secretariat
5. Concettina Cassa, Group's Co-Chair, Government of Italy
6. Eileen Cejas, Youth IGF Argentina, Independent expert
7. Esteve Sanz, European Commission
8. Flavio Wagner, CGI.br/ University of Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil
9. Fiona Alexander, Independent expert
10. Jason Munyan, HLPDC Secretariat
11. Joice Chan, Independent Expert
12. Jim Prendergast, Independent Expert
13. Jorge Cancio, Government of Switzerland
14. Juan Pajaro, Independent Expert

15. Luis Bobo, IGF Secretariat
16. Markus Kummer, IGFSa
17. Olivier Bringer, European Commission
18. Paula Martins, APC, Independent expert
19. Paul Blaker, Government of UK
20. Paul Charlton, Government of Canada
21. Peace Oliver, Independent Expert
22. Raquel Gatto, ISOC, independent expert
23. Roberto Zambrana, ISOC Bolivia, MAG Member
24. Sophie Peresson, ICC, MAG Member
25. Susan Chalmers, NTIA, MAG Member
26. Wim Degezelle, Independent Expert / consultant IGF Secretariat
27. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus