

I share a few notes below on how to improve IGF in the evolutionary context of the IGF + model.

The organization of vIGF2020 was excellent and highlighted, as never before, the interest and the increasingly incisive participation of the multi-stakeholder community. The online event offered economically disadvantaged groups the opportunity to participate remotely and is an element that must also be considered and exploited in the future to improve inclusion and participation. This must not diminish the importance of physical presence participation which in many cases accelerates and simplifies the activation of collaborations and transversal activities.

Global IGF is experiencing a historical moment of particular importance in which multiple indications go in the direction of integrating and leveraging its strengths (MAG, NRIS, BPF, DCs, etc.) to implement the IGF + model outlined in recommendation 5A and B of the HLPDC report.

In my personal vision, global IGF should evolve towards a year-round online platform that constantly collects input from the multi-stakeholder community regarding the IG needs and priorities to be addressed. Organizing just one annual event is not enough to address these needs. It would be advisable to plan at least three or four moments of debate and study throughout the year that culminate in the organization of a main event.

NRIs, BPFs, DCs already have experience with working between sessions, and it should be build on their experience to make the IGF more than the annual event

An important element in the IGF context concerns the centrality of the debate, the dissemination and communication of the results and the connection between IGF and the other initiatives and subjects dealing with IG issues.

The question to ask is how can we make the IGF platform the central point of collection of the Internet Governance perspectives of the global multistakeholder community, leaving the decentralized model, the multistakeholder model unchanged, and strengthening the IGF guiding functions for the development of the open, inclusive Internet centered on human needs?

To pursue this result, the IGF should, in my opinion take on the role of an Observatory, not limit itself to sharing the results of the debate of the annual IGF event and of the previous editions but should also collect, share and link information about the initiatives underway by other international entities that operate in various capacities in the Internet Governance constellation (ICANN, ITU, OECD, UNESCO, IEEE, CSTD, Council of Europe, etc.).

The observatory must give visibility to the planning of the events organized and the results obtained, the treaties and agreements in progress, etc. The observatory contains the map of the next scheduled appointments worldwide: G70, G20, etc., must give visibility and awareness of what is currently being discussed on these issues in the world, and at the same time "remember" the results obtained in the past to avoid unnecessary duplication in future initiatives.

As the title of the HLPDC report "*The age of digital interdependence*" recalls, digital interdependence also concerns the various fora where the public regulatory policies of the Internet are discussed, that should be interconnected to make the results common.

The observatory is also a tool powered by National and International Initiatives to which a space must be reserved to constantly share the results of its debate and best practices.

In other words, the IGF Observatory is the map, the reference compass in the IG panorama that helps to improve the visibility of the ongoing debate and make it more central. It is the support tool for the debate that takes place in the IGF.

Some examples of observatories have been already implemented and it may be useful to start from these.

A useful element for the implementation of the Internet Governance Observatory is the connection between the global IGF and other international organizations, fora, governmental and non-governmental institutions, corporate contacts and international initiatives. It is important to activate a function that takes care of and supports this network of relationships and the mutual exchange of information. This function should be placed and, where existing, strengthened in the IGF Secretariat.

The coordination activity carried out by the MAG in the organization of the annual event is essential but should be expanded and diversified by providing subgroups with different functions and tasks. Not all MAG members should be focused in building the IGF program.

Greater involvement of young people in global IGF is more than desirable and should be pursued in a more integrated way. Such involvement cannot ignore the development of greater sensitivity on these issues. Universities at national, regional and global levels can make an important contribution by integrating their curricula with IG subjects. IGF could promote the inclusion of Internet Governance as a subject to be included in national school programs in the various regional fora.

The activity of BPFs and Dynamic Coalitions are fundamental and should be adequately enhanced by exploiting the network of skills as a basis for the development of standards.

Lastly, no less important is the involvement of legislators and high-level ministerial representatives who represent an essential element for following up on the recommendations through legislative initiatives.

Further I suggest:

- 1) to activate a closer path between WSIS process and IGF in view of WSIS + 20;
- 2) to move the IGF secretariat from UNDESA and place it directly under the SG's office;
- 3) to create a structural link with the UNGA to contribute to the work of thematic Open Ended WGs relevant to IGF.

Best Regards,

Concettina Cassa (MAG member 2020 on my personal capacity)