Summary Report

The 50th virtual meeting of the IGF MAG Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 2 February at 16 UTC. The meeting was moderated by Chris Buckridge. The list of participants and the recording of the meeting is available upon request.

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

**Agenda**

1. Presentation of the two journal articles on multistakeholderism at the IGF and youth participation by Nadia Tjahja (United Nations University – CRIS | Digital Governance Cluster | PhD)
2. Proposed Activities of the WG Strategy for 2023
3. Open Consultations and MAG Meeting
4. WSIS +20 action plan
5. UN Global Digital Compact
6. Update from the IGF Secretariat
7. AoB

**Discussion**

1. **Presentation by Nadia Tjahja**
   A presentation was made by Nadia Tjahja from United Nations University – CRIS. She highlighted the varying definitions of youth, their participation in IGF and six recommendations to enhance youth engagement.

   Chris suggested it would be good to take the recommendations to the MAG meeting.

   Adam Peake mentioned that it will be helpful to see more on something that can guide how the definition of age of youth is framed.

2. **Proposed Activities of the WG Strategy for 2023**
Amrita Choudhury requested WG members to look at the Proposed Activities of the WG Strategy for 2023 and in case anyone wants anything added, they suggest it by 7 February.

Titti Cassa added that if there are any additions the same could be shared with the MAG.

3. On the Open Consultations and MAG Meeting

Paul Mitchell pointed out that apart from open consultation and MAG meeting there would be a meeting of the IGF Leadership Panel.

For the open consultation, Paul opined that the MAG needs actionable input that can be implemented. He suggested it would be helpful if the feedback were bundled and the inputs shared ahead of the meeting for MAG consumption. Bundling up similar ideas and thoughts in order to synchronise common themes and actionable items would be helpful rather than having to redefine them.

Jim Prendergast questioned why the meeting of LP and MAG was a closed session. Paul responded that perhaps it was a closed meeting since the new LP is an intergovernmental process and MAG a multistakeholder process. He also guessed that it may have been planned to be a closed meeting to create an opportunity for frank discussion between MAG and LP. He opined it may be a compromise for this year.

Adam responded that the LP-MAG meeting should at least be broadcast. For the open consultation as MAG member, he would aspire for simplifying application form, dwelling on how to define hybrid since full online meetings do not work.

Jorge Cancio suggested that the MAG look at the Global Digital Compact while creating the IGF2023 program and have some discussion on the WSIS+20.

He shared that the LP should start with open meetings, especially when meeting with the MAG. The meetings should be open and broadcast.

Jorge pointed out that the LP is not an intergovernmental process.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter stated that while he understands the need for an informal discussion between LP and MAG in a more private environment at this stage, he
does not understand how a multistakeholder LP is "part of the intergovernmental process" as there are only two governmental members in the LP.

Mark Carvell agreed with Jorge that closed formal meetings are an anachronism. He said it reminded him of the GAC transformation within the ICANN eco-system following the ending of its routine closed meetings.

Anja Gengo shared that the morning of 8 March would be open consultations day and includes open discussion with the present LP members.

3. On the WSIS+20 action plan

Chris asked WG members to look at the draft WSIS+20 action plan and contribute to the document. He requested if the WG members could add more ideas into the document within the next two weeks, the same could be compiled and shared with the MAG and given more shape before the next MAG meeting.

Mark reiterated Chris’s call.

4. On Global Digital Compact

Jorge mentioned sending out the invitation to the WG sent out by co-facilitators to share the invite for the consultation meetings on 3 and 10 February. There is a roadmap for the consultations already planned by the co-facilitators with support of Office fo the Tech Envoy.

He shared there was a consultation on 30 January for member states and there were disagreements on how the process should be. Developed countries proposed multistakeholder a process, while G77 countries proposed intergovernmental process. He noted that references to the IGF were limited.

Jorge further pointed out that it would send a wrong message if the IGF did not show up in the consultations. He hoped that the IGF messages from Addis would be shared as those are multistakeholder-generated messages and IGF is not fully known in New York.

Chris appreciated Swiss reference to multistakeholder model and IGF messages.
Giacomo asked if IGF received any formal invitation to participate in the discussions. Anja replied that she was not aware if any formal invitation had been received.

Responding to Chris’s query whether the co-facilitators would be participating in Vienna, Anja replied that there was expected to be some form of participation.

Mark shared that it is important for member states to understand the IGF community, including Dynamic Coalitions and NRIs, as they can be the primary channels for global communities such as tech, business, civil society and others as they prepare for the GDC discussions beyond June. He suggested it is a point to be reinforced that the IGF community can support even during the implementation process.

Wolfgang stated that there was a discussion on the procedures and questioned what would happen after March when the public comment period ends and September. He asked who would be the pen holder for various baskets? At the Addis it was discussed to establish a multistakeholder drafting team, taking the Net Mundial process as an example. The LP and MAG could propose such a process.

Chris questioned what can be done in tomorrow’s call and on 10 Feb. He suggested connecting with the speakers and suggesting they speak on the IGF and its messages as immediate ad-hoc steps.

Valeria shared that the value and importance of the IGF should be emphasized in the framework of the GDC consultations, particularly in light of the synergies that would be established with the WSIS+20 review and the renewal of the mandate of the IGF. It is important to keep highlighting the central role that the IGF has in the Internet governance and global digital cooperation ecosystems.

4. Update from the Secretariat

Anja updated that the IGF Secretariat will be attending the meetings on 3 and 10 and promote the IGF practices and outcomes.

Regarding IGF2023 preparations she said the secretariat is trying to receive proposals for the intersessional work.
Mark asked if there are any hosts for 2024. Anja responded that there are concrete proposals for 2024.

5. **AOB**
   The next call of the WG is scheduled for 16 February at 14:00 UTC.
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