

# IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group Tasks and Working Modalities

## Survey Responses

10 February 2026

As part of ongoing efforts to reflect on and strengthen the effectiveness of the MAG's work, current and previous MAG members, official representatives of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) to the MAG and former IGF host country representatives were invited to respond to a survey developed by the IGF Secretariat and share their views on the current MAG working modalities and to suggest potential improvements.

This survey sought input on a range of aspects covered by the [MAG Terms of Reference](#), including MAG composition and rotation, MAG meeting formats, internal structures and decision-making processes, programme development, outreach responsibilities and overall coordination.

The aim is to support informed discussions within the MAG on possible adjustments to working modalities, with a view to enhancing effectiveness and collaboration in future IGF cycles.

The input of the fourteen (14) survey respondents is consolidated in this document and summarized in [this presentation](#).

---

### MAG COMPOSITION, NOMINATION & ROTATION

**Purpose:** Assess whether current selection and rotation mechanisms support effectiveness, diversity, and continuity.

1. What aspects of MAG call for nominations, composition or rotation could be improved to strengthen effectiveness? (*Open-ended*)

To strengthen the effectiveness of the IGF MAG, improvements are needed in nominations, composition, and rotation. The call for nominations should be more transparent, with clear selection criteria, predictable timelines, and targeted outreach to underrepresented regions and stakeholder groups. Composition should go beyond formal stakeholder balance to ensure functional diversity, including thematic expertise, practical experience, and stronger representation from developing countries in leadership roles. Rotation rules should be applied consistently, with enforceable term limits, staggered transitions to preserve institutional memory, and performance-based renewals linked to active participation. Clear expectations, accountability mechanisms, and stronger links between MAG members and their stakeholder communities would further enhance credibility, effectiveness, and trust in the MAG process.

Skill based criteria could improve the composition of the MAG, as well as experience within own NRI

It could be beneficial to advertise the MAG to groups and communities that are not yet well represented at the IGF in order to increase their engagement. In general, it may also be valuable to recruit people from youth communities to bring new ideas and perspectives to the IGF.

There should be some documentation, more complete, that describes what is expected from MAG members, so every one interested knows exactly what is expected of him /her. Also, there should be an EoI (Expression of Interest) from the interested persons, with a certain guide as to what to include in this EoI. This is in order to ask for real commitment, in time and dedication, from potential MAG members

DESA is doing it right. The idea of retaining some old hands while introducing new members ensures proper governance transition.

Effectiveness could be strengthened by increasing transparency on selection, renewal and rotation criteria, including clearer expectations regarding time commitment, engagement throughout the year and contribution to intersessional work.

Consideration could also be given to formalized support roles for former MAG members willing to continue contributing, particularly in advisory or coordination capacities.

Formal recognition of such roles would be especially important for representatives of government institutions, who often require a clear mandate to justify continued engagement.

To strengthen the effectiveness of the MAG, improvements could be considered in three interrelated areas: nominations, composition and rotation, with a view to balancing renewal, continuity and capacity.

- First, the call for nominations could benefit from greater clarity and strategic framing. Clearer articulation of the expected role, workload and skill sets sought each year would help attract candidates with the right profile and ensure a better match between individual expertise and MAG needs. This would also support more informed nominations by stakeholder groups and governments.
- Second, composition could be strengthened through a more deliberate balance of experience and institutional memory. While diversity across regions, stakeholder groups and perspectives remains essential, effectiveness also depends on retaining sufficient continuity. Ensuring that each MAG cycle includes a critical mass of experienced members alongside new ones would improve coherence, mentoring and the quality of deliberations.
- Third, rotation rules could be made more flexible to preserve expertise where it is most needed. Strict rotation can sometimes lead to the loss of highly relevant expertise at key moments. Limited flexibility — for example, staggered rotations or justified extensions in specific cases — could help maintain momentum and institutional knowledge without undermining openness or renewal.
- Finally, onboarding should be seen as an integral part of the nomination and rotation process. Effectiveness is not only about who is appointed, but also about how quickly new members can contribute meaningfully. Structured briefings, mentoring and clear documentation from the outset would significantly enhance early engagement and overall MAG performance.

I strongly recommend to keep the three year term for MAG members. But, renewal after the first and second year should be bound to the members commitment to the MAGs work, their participation in the meetings on a regular basis and their fulfilment of the MAGs tasks like assessment of workshop proposals etc. While industry and government representatives most often are able to dedicate part of their paid for working time to MAG obligations, representatives of civil society more often struggle to fulfill their MAG obligations in their spare time on a honorary basis. This imbalance should be taken in consideration and addressed properly. Gender balance must be ensured any time.

1. Call for nominations. In terms of Government candidates, communication should be sent to missions in NYC and Geneva.

2. Ensure representation from SIDS and/or Global South
3. Rotation of 3 years is good

Additional information on expectations of work to be undertaken, expected concentrations of work (e.g. during assessment of workshops etc.) to align with available time to dedicate to responsibilities being on the MAG.

The selection of non-governmental MAG members should be decided in close consultation with the community, through the respective stakeholder groups.

The most significant challenge for MAG rotation is the timeline, which has regularly resulted in new (or continuing) MAG members being unaware until very briefly before (or even after) the IGF annual event. This means that they miss an invaluable opportunity to participate in an IGF with the awareness of their impending responsibilities, providing a chance to reflect on processes and outcomes, to engage with that year's MAG cohort, to build relationships with the Secretariat and other key stakeholders.

Prior experience of an IGF or other similar events should be required.

I think that a lot of experts are on board. The discussion is always very interesting about the preparation of IGF. I think the biggest issue is that IGF is not well known in each country, so maybe to make much more communication and dissemination, especially by social media.

2. What could support the onboarding of new MAG members (e.g. briefings, mentoring, documentation)? (*Open-ended*)

Onboarding of new MAG members can be strengthened through structured support. This includes formal induction briefings on the IGF mandate, MAG roles, processes, and annual priorities, supported by clear onboarding documentation such as a MAG handbook, past reports, and timelines. Just like ICANN Fellowship system, the new MAG, a mentorship or buddy system pairing new members with experienced MAG members can help transfer knowledge. Thematic and procedural briefings on programme development and workshop evaluation, along with recorded sessions and shared knowledge repositories, would further reduce the learning curve and enable new members to contribute effectively from the outset.

Applying the Experience within NRI as criteria could facilitate onboarding of new members. In anyway a nominated MAG member should only be from the IGF community, which means with sufficient knowledge that can be developed via mentoring or briefings from previous experienced members.

The IGF Secretariat could create a dedicated onboarding program tailored to the needs of specific groups — both stakeholder groups and communities with different levels of experience. This could include online webinars, FAQs, or user journeys that guide newcomers through the process and help them engage more effectively with the IGF.

I started to write an onboarding document for incoming MAG members, because I felt its absence when I first joined the MAG. This document can be improved and reviewed periodically.

There could be a course like it is in ICANN Learn for Newcomers. All new MAG members could be required to undergo the eLearning course before formal onboarding.

Onboarding could be improved through:

- a structured briefing package (Terms of Reference, annual cycle, intersessional architecture, key external linkages);
- an initial orientation session with the Chair and Secretariat;
- a light mentoring mechanism, possibly involving former MAG members in recognized support roles, to ensure continuity and knowledge transfer.

The first meeting with new MAG members should allocate sufficient time to ensure a clear understanding of the role, supported by structured briefings, mentoring and comprehensive documentation. For this reason, the initial meeting should ideally take place in person, as face-to-face interaction is essential to align mindsets, build trust, establish a shared understanding of roles and working methods, and foster the collegial dynamics that are difficult to achieve remotely. Early in-person engagement can significantly strengthen cohesion, mutual confidence and the overall effectiveness of the MAG.

I suggest mentoring of new MAG members by those who are in their third year in an overlap period of one year. The circle of a three year MAG membership would be as follows: First year mentee in shared responsibility with a full MAG member, 2nd year full MAG member, third year full MAG member and mentor for a new MAG member.

Briefing would be best especially with an introduction to the working groups, the intersessional work, and NRIs

Perhaps a single onboarding session for MAG members start from the same shared understanding.

Nothing to suggest.

More formalised mentoring arrangements could be very helpful, such as pairing each new MAG member with a continuing (ideally third-year) MAG member. Planning for such an arrangement should include helping the mentor to prepare, providing them with relevant materials to share and speak to, etc.; it should also include a feedback opportunity at the close of the cycle to allow mentors and mentees to reflect on the experience and how it could be improved.

A basic manual and briefings

The people today don't like a lot of documentations. Make the briefings could help.

## MAG MEETINGS (VIRTUAL & IN-PERSON)

**Purpose:** Improve efficiency, inclusiveness, and decision quality.

### 3. What changes would improve **virtual** MAG meetings?

Virtual MAG meetings could be improved by clearer agendas shared in advance, time disciplined facilitation, and concise background documents. Rotating moderators and structured speaking queues would ensure balanced participation across regions and stakeholder groups.

Virtual MAG meetings can at times feel somewhat unstructured. It may therefore be helpful for the Secretariat to take a more active moderating role or, alternatively, to offer more structured guidance and support to the MAG Chair in managing the discussions. Drawing on good practices from online meetings held by other international organisations could further strengthen the process and enhance the overall effectiveness of the meetings.

For example, all attendees could be renamed in the call by the Secretariat following a clear and consistent format such as: Role\_Name — e.g., MAG Member\_Name, Former Host Country\_Name, Observer\_Name. This would help all participants understand who is speaking in which capacity and would assist the Secretariat in managing the speaking order and ensuring that procedures are followed.

Keep the rotation of time around the world, trying not to have anyone at critical hours (1 to 4 am)

The current approach is ok.

Virtual meetings are well managed by the IGF Secretariat. They could be improved by:

- earlier circulation of agendas and background documents;
  - clearer distinction between items for information, discussion and decision;
  - strengthened facilitation to ensure balanced participation and effective use of time.
- First, greater emphasis should be placed on verbal interaction rather than extensive use of chat. Over-reliance on chat discussions tends to fragment attention and reduces active listening, making it harder for participants to fully engage with what is being said. Prioritising spoken interventions encourages focus, clearer exchanges and more meaningful deliberation.
  - Second, clearer facilitation and moderation are needed. Stronger chairing can help manage speaking order, ensure balanced participation across stakeholder groups and regions, and keep discussions focused on decision points rather than parallel conversations.
  - Third, meetings would benefit from more structured agendas and clearer objectives. Each agenda item should clearly indicate whether it is intended for information, discussion or decision. This helps participants prepare adequately and engage more purposefully.
  - Fourth, limiting the length and number of agenda items would improve attention and quality of engagement. Shorter, more focused meetings reduce fatigue and allow for deeper discussion on priority issues, rather than superficial treatment of many topics.
  - Fifth, better preparation and use of written materials in advance is essential. Circulating concise background notes, key questions and proposed options ahead of meetings allows virtual time to be used for discussion and decision-making, rather than information-sharing.
  - Finally, greater use of visual and interactive tools could enhance engagement. Clear visual summaries, decision slides or short synthesis moments during the meeting can help anchor discussions and maintain collective focus.

Schedule all virtual meetings in advance in a reliable two weeks interval and a time frame adapted to the different time zones

Include an agenda item with an update from a partner UN agency or group. This would increase communication and awareness.

Value to retaining the rotation of time zones. Summaries sent out for those unable to attend, with notation of specific decisions or follow-ups.

Brief reporting from the various Working Groups and intersessional workstreams should be avoided as much as possible. Brief reports could be distributed to the MAG members before the meetings. The meeting should concentrate on the discussion of issues for which the MAG needs to take decisions.

A cadence for MAG meetings laid out early in the cycle (i.e. prior to the new year) would help to ensure that MAG members were able to manage their schedules and prioritise active participation in those virtual meetings. This planning should extend beyond the IGF event itself (especially if it falls early in the year) to include some interaction around handover to the new MAG and continuation of larger, multi-year strategic activities.

More focus on content, e.g. intersessional work, outreach and key digital policy issues relevant to the IGF.

More interactive discussion. Not only one way the communication. One way meetings could be for operational agenda. But for creation of IGF, we need collective intelligence, well balanced and open and transparent.

4. What changes would improve **in-person** Open Consultations and MAG meetings (meeting preparation, agenda setting, activities and meeting conduct, stakeholder engagement...)?  
(Open-ended)

In-person Open Consultations and MAG meetings would benefit from earlier circulation of agendas and documents, clearer objectives for each session, and more interactive working formats instead of long statements. Further, discussions must be more of reporting than deliberations because Virtual Meetings play an important role during the early part of the year.

In meetings, ensure a balanced speaking queue across regions and stakeholders, with pre meetings documents circulation for preparation

We would also like to encourage the Secretariat to take a more active moderating role or, alternatively, to provide more structured guidance and support to the MAG Chair in managing the discussions.

Keep promoting the request for the floor in an orderly fashion, and, when necessary, limit each intervention to an agreed amount of minutes.

The current approach is ok.

Effectiveness could be enhanced by:

- clearer objectives and preparation for each agenda item;
  - a better balance between operational planning and strategic discussion;
  - more interactive formats that support structured multistakeholder exchange and synthesis of inputs.
- First, greater emphasis should be placed on verbal interaction rather than extensive use of chat. Over-reliance on chat discussions tends to fragment attention and reduces active listening, making it harder for participants to fully engage with what is being said. Prioritising spoken interventions encourages focus, clearer exchanges and more meaningful deliberation.
  - Second, clearer facilitation and moderation are needed. Stronger chairing can help manage speaking order, ensure balanced participation across stakeholder groups and regions, and keep discussions focused on decision points rather than parallel conversations.
  - Third, meetings would benefit from more structured agendas and clearer objectives. Each agenda item should clearly indicate whether it is intended for information, discussion or decision. This helps participants prepare adequately and engage more purposefully.
  - Fourth, limiting the length and number of agenda items would improve attention and quality of engagement. Shorter, more focused meetings reduce fatigue and allow for deeper discussion on priority issues, rather than superficial treatment of many topics.
  - Fifth, better preparation and use of written materials in advance is essential. Circulating concise background notes, key questions and proposed options ahead of meetings allows virtual time to be used for discussion and decision-making, rather than information-sharing.
  - Finally, greater use of visual and interactive tools could enhance engagement. Clear visual summaries, decision slides or short synthesis moments during the meeting can help anchor discussions and maintain collective focus. Clear objectives, well-defined agenda items and the advance circulation of concise background materials help ensure that in-person time is used effectively for substantive discussion, synthesis and decision-making, rather than for information-sharing or being disproportionately shaped by a small number of more vocal participants.

Setting up a consensual agenda during the last virtual meeting before the next in-person meeting and make it public to all MAG members; adhere to a strict differentiation between MAG meeting days with MAG members speaking only, and Open Consultations with the right to speak for everybody - the ratio of time between OC and MAG meeting should be set depending on the tasks to be performed; on certain issues esp. in regard of emerging issues external experts might be invited to base the debate on equal grounds

- 1. Meet and greet session at first OC for MAG members.

- 2. Breakout session by stakeholder group.

Retaining ability for virtual participation; clear agenda and objectives to be achieved for the in-person meeting. More regular in-person meeting during key periods of the MAGs work.

Better preparation of the meeting by the chair and co-chairs (see response to question 13) would allow more effective decision-making. Small groups of MAG members, led by the chair / a co-chair, should prepare proposals prior to the meeting. For this preparation, these small groups could also interact with the IGF Secretariat and the host country before the meeting, as needed.

A more solid focus on desired and/or necessary outcomes ahead of the meetings, with clear reporting following the meeting would help to focus the discussions and provide clarity on the importance of participation (including in-person participation). Stakeholder engagement elements of the meeting (particularly the Open Consultation) should continue, but should be focused on relevance for that year's IGF event and how best to contribute to the event. The MAG itself should help to develop the call for stakeholder (including UN agency) updates to ensure that respondents know what is being sought and how they can best contribute.

Group or breakout sessions. Deepening engagement with different stakeholder groups e.g. technical community, civil society, government, environmental sustainability groups etc.

This is great, but the organisation the non formal meetings could be very helpful, that some issues or ideas are discussed already in the non formal colloque/s.

## MAG INTERNAL STRUCTURE

**Purpose:** Examine the effectiveness of MAG structures, decision-making processes, resources and coordination.

5. What could improve the process leading to **MAG decision-making?** (Open-ended)

MAG decision making could be improved through clearer criteria for decisions with early sharing of options and background papers, and structured deliberations that distinguish consensus from differing views from different stakeholder members. Transparent documentation of decisions and rationales, along with clear follow-up actions, would strengthen legitimacy, efficiency, and accountability. Using a decision repository (past decisions), it becomes easier to adopt a working style unlike re-inventing the wheel.

Decision making is based on consensus, thus ensure that all voices were heard with stricter time allocation per member

There should be no voting, particularly not in online settings where roles may not always be clear. As in other Internet governance bodies, a rough-consensus approach should guide decision-making. It is the responsibility of the Chair, with support from the Secretariat, to determine when rough consensus has been reached and to move the discussion forward. Decisions that have already been taken should not be reopened.

Making sure everyone receives and has enough time to read and make questions about the relevant documentation for an issue.

The current approach is ok.

The decision-making process could be strengthened by:

- clearer articulation of how rough consensus is determined;
- systematic documentation of decisions, next steps and responsibilities;
- improved follow-up between meetings to ensure continuity.

Improving the process leading to MAG decision-making requires, first, a shared reflection on what MAG decision-making currently encompasses and whether this scope remains adequate in the new context of a permanent IGF.

At present, MAG decision-making is largely centred on a limited set of core tasks, such as selecting the annual IGF theme, proposing and shaping main sessions, and evaluating workshop proposals. While these functions remain essential, the permanence of the IGF calls for a more strategic and forward-looking approach to decision-making, extending beyond annual and largely procedural choices.

With the IGF now established as a permanent forum, MAG decision-making should increasingly reflect continuity, coherence across cycles and long-term strategic intent. This includes greater clarity and coordination regarding the respective roles of the MAG and the host country. Without a more integrated approach, there is a risk of overlapping sessions on similar topics, competition for the same speakers, inefficient use of programme slots and confusion among participants.

Broadening the scope of MAG decision-making to include early and structured engagement with the host country on programme architecture, thematic priorities and expectations would help ensure complementarity rather than duplication, improve sequencing of discussions and enhance the overall participant experience.

In addition, a clearer decision-making framework — distinguishing issues for information, discussion or decision — would strengthen transparency, manage expectations and support more effective deliberation within the MAG.

In sum, now that the IGF is permanent, MAG decision-making should visibly evolve from primarily annual, event-focused choices towards greater strategic oversight, continuity and coordination — or, where appropriate, such greater strategic oversight could be exercised through a clearer and complementary role for the Leadership Panel, while ensuring effective coordination with the MAG.

The concept of 'rough consensus' has proven valuable over the past 20 years, provided that sufficient time is available for debate in advance of the issue at hand and the consequences of the decisions to be made. From my perspective a vote of majority is not appropriate to address the complexity of decisions to be taken by the MAG.

This would depend on the decision to be made. We often have discussions by email prior to, but sometimes conversations are disjointed or missed. If a major decision, use an AI tool to summarize email thread, send out summary, call a meeting specific to subject, have open discussion and resolution

Incorporating key areas on decisions that can contribute to an IGF program and agenda that is substantive and relevant to all stakeholders, forward thinking and timely on issues relevant to Internet governance.

Issues to be discussed and decided by the MAG should be assigned to small ad-hoc groups, composed of MAG members from different stakeholder groups and led by the chair / a co-chair. These small groups would discuss and present already structured and well-thought proposals to the full MAG. No issue should be presented and decided during a MAG meeting without this previous preparation.

MAG decision-making suffers from a lack of clarity about its roles and responsibility. At this point, the MAG's mandate has been reduced to coordinating approximately half of the IGF agenda (i.e. the workshops and Main Sessions), a mandate that does not align with the MAG's Terms of Reference (i.e. "Develop the detailed programme and schedule of the annual IGF meetings, including the identification of themes, sub-themes and issues taking into account inputs of all relevant stakeholders"), the calibre of individuals enlisted to serve, or the time required of them. Lack of clarity around what is expected of the MAG and what the MAG should expect of other IGF institutional actors (including the Secretariat and the Leadership Panel) has led to uncertainty, delayed decisions, and frustration from MAG members, the community, and the Secretariat. An effort to provide greater

clarity, including information on what different institutional actors can commit to and expect of each other, would significantly improve decision-making.

CLARIFYING the MAG TORS. Co-chairs from various stakeholder groups to support the MAG chair; merging the MAG and the LP. Including NRI and PN and BPF reps in the MAG.

Maybe to let us more time, if we want to discuss on several proposals. We were in the stress, not enough time for discussion.

6. How could the **MAG's internal structure and ways of working** be improved? In particular, are there aspects of internal coordination, workload distribution, or support for the Chair, and intersessional work that could be strengthened? *(Currently, the MAG's structure includes the MAG Chair's role, MAG members, MAG working groups and MAG members as facilitators of the intersessional work.)*

The MAG's effectiveness could be improved by strengthening internal coordination and clarifying roles across the Chair, working groups, and facilitators. Workload distribution should be more balanced, with clear mandates, timelines, and deliverables for working groups. Administrative and analytical support for the Chair would improve continuity and follow-up. Intersessional work should be structured, with regular check-ins, shared workspaces, and progress reporting. The current burdensome workshop evaluation process, where members must assess over 120 proposals in limited time, should be streamlined to ensure quality, fairness, and manageable workloads.

Ensure that all MAG working groups are inclusive and regionally diverse

Promote the existence of liaisons between WGs and from Intersessional work to the MAG and viceversa, have 2 or 3 Cofacs in each WG (no more, no less), promote periodic meetings of WG Co facs, if needed

The current approach is ok.

Within the existing institutional framework, the MAG's internal structure and ways of working could be strengthened through a combination of clearer internal coordination mechanisms, better workload distribution, and more structured support to the Chair, while preserving the MAG's multistakeholder and advisory nature.

In particular: Internal coordination and workload distribution

- The MAG could benefit from a more structured internal coordination model, aimed at reducing fragmentation across activities (annual programme, intersessional work, NRIs, outreach).
- Workload distribution could be improved by clustering related tasks and themes and by avoiding over-reliance on a limited number of MAG members during peak phases (e.g. session evaluation, intersessional oversight).

Support to the Chair:

- The Chair's role could be further supported through clearer delegation and coordination arrangements, including designated MAG members supporting specific clusters of activities.
- This would help ensure continuity across IGF cycles and reduce the operational burden concentrated on the Chair.

Voluntary reference layer within the MAG

- On a voluntary basis, the MAG could introduce a clearly identified group of MAG members acting as reference points for specific thematic or cross-cutting areas.
- These reference members would not have additional decision-making or representational roles, which would remain with the IGF Secretariat and the Leadership Panel, but could:

- support internal coordination across MAG Working Groups, intersessional activities, NRIs and Youth initiatives;
- facilitate structured interaction with the Secretariat and the Leadership Panel;
- help ensure coherence between IGF discussions and related UN and non-UN processes addressing similar digital policy issues.

#### Intersessional work and facilitators

- The role of MAG members acting as facilitators of intersessional work could be strengthened through clearer mandates, defined expectations and better internal coordination.
- Stronger feedback loops between intersessional work and MAG-level discussions would help translate year-round activities into strategic inputs for the annual IGF programme and external outreach.

Overall, these adjustments would enhance efficiency, continuity and strategic alignment within the MAG, while fully respecting existing mandates and preserving the IGF's non-negotiating and non-prescriptive nature.

#### Improving the MAG's Internal Structure and Ways of Working

The current MAG structure — comprising the Chair, MAG members, ad hoc MAG working groups and MAG members serving as facilitators of intersessional work — provides flexibility and inclusiveness. However, its effectiveness could be strengthened through clearer internal coordination, more balanced workload distribution and enhanced support mechanisms.

##### 1. Strengthening internal coordination and role clarity

Clearer differentiation of roles and responsibilities within the MAG would improve efficiency. This includes:

- more explicit articulation of the respective roles of the Chair, MAG members, working groups and intersessional facilitators;
- clearer internal coordination mechanisms to ensure alignment across MAG working groups and intersessional tracks.

This would reduce fragmentation and improve coherence in decision-making.

##### 2. Better distribution and management of workload

MAG members often carry uneven workloads, particularly those acting as facilitators or leading working groups. This could be improved by:

- more transparent allocation of responsibilities;
- regular review of workload distribution;
- ensuring that facilitation roles are adequately supported and time-limited.

A more balanced workload would improve sustainability and engagement.

##### 3. Enhanced support structures for the Chair

The Chair's role is central and demanding, particularly in a permanent IGF context. Effectiveness could be strengthened through:

a more structured support mechanism, such as a small coordination or steering group drawn from the MAG;

- clearer delegation of tasks where appropriate;
- stronger Secretariat support focused on enabling the Chair's strategic role.

This would help ensure continuity, coherence and strategic focus.

##### 4. Improving coordination of intersessional work

Intersessional activities would benefit from:

- clearer guidance on objectives, expected outputs and timelines;
- stronger coordination among facilitators to avoid duplication and siloed work;
- more systematic reporting and synthesis of intersessional outputs for MAG consideration.

This would enhance the contribution of intersessional work to MAG decision-making.

#### 5. Strengthening links between MAG deliberations and intersessional outputs

MAG working methods could be improved by:

- more regular and structured briefings from intersessional facilitators to the MAG;
- clearer pathways for intersessional outputs to inform programme design and strategic discussions;
- improved feedback loops between the MAG and facilitators.

This would ensure intersessional work meaningfully supports MAG priorities.

#### 6. Supporting continuity and institutional memory

Given rotation within the MAG, effectiveness could be enhanced by:

- better documentation of decisions, rationales and lessons learned;
- mentoring arrangements between experienced and new members;
- continuity tools to preserve institutional knowledge across cycles.

This is particularly important now that the IGF is permanent.

To support the chair the role of a vice chair could be considered in addition to the host country chair. Two people chairing the meetings would make it easier to schedule the meetings on a regular interval, f. e. in times of holidays or other absences. New MAG members should be appointed early in their first year preferably at the previous annual IGF giving them enough time to prepare for their new role. According to my previous suggestion of the mentee / mentor role distribution throughout the three year MAG term the workload of each member would be easier to be handled and shared.

Not sure

This model seems to work well, one aspect may be via a strengthened and more resourced IGF Secretariat able to designate staff support and engagement to enable additional support to work, and regular updates of work as part of insight into the MAG's work underway leading to an IGF, including integration of, e.g., NRI and other inputs.

Co-chairs from stakeholder groups other than the group to which the chair belongs should be appointed. All administrative decisions taken by chair should be shared with the co-chairs. All communications between the chair and the IGF Secretariat and the host country should be shared and discussed with the co-chairs. The co-chairs could be made responsible for specific issues, such as to reduce the workload of the chair and allow greater attention to those issues.

The role of working group chairs should be explicitly included as an element in the MAG structure, recognising (and reinforcing) the accountability that accompanies the role in relation to the activities and outcomes of their working group. Past years have seen some attempts at coordination between the MAG Chair and working group chairs - more active coordination within such a group could be used to assess progress in MAG activities at more regular intervals than full MAG meetings allow.

Co-chairs from different stakeholder groups and regions. More integration and coherence with the LP. More collaboration with the Secretariat.

Yes, maybe you can add vice-chair/s on several topics, because the dynamism of changes in this area is very quick.

#### 7. How should **MAG Working Groups** be proposed to the MAG and what criteria for establishing, continuing, or closing Working Groups should be used? (*Open-ended*)

MAG Working Groups should be proposed to the MAG through a formal submission detailing objectives, scope, deliverables, and alignment with IGF priorities (thematic areas). Criteria for establishing, continuing, or closing groups should include relevance, clear work plans, progress, resource availability, and stakeholder inclusiveness. Coordination with Dynamic Coalitions (DCs)

should be considered to avoid duplication, leverage expertise, and ensure coherent, impactful outputs across intersessional activities.

There should be a clear proposal with clear objectives and expected outcomes . MAG members can assess the value add of creating a new WG with balanced representation, without duplication with other processes or existing groups . The WG can set its working modalities, nominate facilitators and present regular reporting to the full MAG but continuity should be well justified.

The charter for each WG should be reviewed each year by the volunteers in that group, and approved / modified by the IGF Secretariat. This should include duration of the WG, if appropriate.

A group of serving or past MAG members can propose a new Working Group, which must be approved by the MAG to function. Its focal objective/s should not be covered by any existing group, and the objective can not be handled by any existing group. There should be a justification for a Working Group to continue after 2 or 3 years. If the objective/s of any working group is/are no longer relevant after a mandatory review, then the group should be discontinued.

Working Groups should be proposed on the basis of:

- clear objectives and added value;
- defined outputs and timelines;
- coherence with MAG priorities, IGF themes and IGF mandate.

Clear criteria should also be established for continuation or closure, based on relevance, results achieved and contribution to the overall IGF programme.

MAG Working Groups should be proposed through a clear and lightweight proposal process, submitted either by the Chair, a group of MAG members, or the Secretariat in support of identified MAG needs.

1. Each proposal should briefly specify:

- Purpose and added value: what problem the Working Group is addressing and why it cannot be handled through existing MAG structures;
- Scope and deliverables: clear objectives and expected outputs;
- Timeframe: whether the Working Group is time-bound or ongoing;
- Composition: proposed balance of stakeholder groups and regions;
- Link to MAG decision-making: how outputs will inform MAG deliberations or decisions.
- Proposals should be discussed and endorsed by the MAG to ensure shared ownership and clarity of mandate.

2. Criteria for establishing a MAG Working Group

A MAG Working Group should be established when:

- the issue is clearly relevant to the MAG's mandate and cannot be effectively addressed through plenary discussion alone;
- focused work is needed to develop options, recommendations or structured input for MAG decisions;
- the task requires continuity or sustained attention over a defined period;
- there is clear added value compared to ad hoc coordination.
- Working Groups should be purpose-driven, not permanent by default.

3. Criteria for continuing a MAG Working Group

A MAG Working Group should be continued only if:

- it continues to deliver outputs that are useful and timely for MAG deliberations;
- its mandate remains relevant in light of evolving priorities;

- progress against agreed objectives can be demonstrated;
- coordination with other MAG Working Groups and IGF tracks is effective.
- Periodic light-touch reviews by the MAG can help ensure relevance and avoid inertia.

#### 4. Criteria for closing a MAG Working Group

A MAG Working Group should be closed when:

- its objectives and deliverables have been achieved;
- the issue has been absorbed into regular MAG work or other IGF processes;
- the Working Group is no longer adding distinct value;
- continuation risks duplication, fragmentation or inefficient use of MAG resources.
- Closure should be seen as a positive outcome, signalling task completion rather than failure.

#### 5. Reporting and accountability

To support transparency and effectiveness:

- Working Groups should report regularly to the MAG in a concise and structured manner;
- outputs should be clearly documented and accessible;
- lessons learned should be captured to inform future MAG working methods.

Since the main task of the MAG is set-up the programme and agenda of the annual IGF working groups should be clustered around that task. Further tasks like improvements of the IGF structure and strengthening the visibility of outcomes should be placed intersessionally in the intervals between calls for issues and programme setting, according to a repeatable annual schedule.

There should be a defined means of measuring participation by members ... a working group may be significantly large but with maybe only 10 to 20 percent active persons.

2 to 3 co-chair persons maximum. Chair max of 2 years.

Review of group mandate every 2 years

Indicators:

- Number of meetings held
- Number of participants
- Diversity of members
- Quality and quantity of outputs

Limit the number to a few key ones relevant, with a clear scope of focus and timeline to achieve it. Retain transparency and ability for others to engage.

MAG Working Groups should continue to be proposed and selected by the MAG itself, as part of a multi-year planning and considering permanent needs of the MAG and of the IGF ecosystem. The proposition should be debated by the chair, co-chairs and proposer(s) before being submitted to the full MAG for decision.

It makes sense that the slate of MAG Working Groups be considered at the outset of each IGF cycle - ideally drawing on and incorporating feedback from MAG members involved in the previous cycle and ideas from MAG members in the upcoming cycle. The purpose of a working group should be clearly laid out in its charter; while there should be flexibility to allow a working group to be tasked with a role not anticipated at the beginning of the cycle (at the request of the MAG Chair), the charter should otherwise be regarded as constraining and scoping the work carried out by the group. As part of a more solid MAG timeline, working groups should provide a brief, written report on the past year's activities for consideration of the incoming MAG.

MAG working groups are a mechanism for facilitating bottom-up input and adding resources to the MAG. The MAG should delegate specific tasks and activities to working groups. I think there should be two types of working groups...ones that have a long term mandate like WG Strategy and ones that take on short term tasks.

This is good.

8. What challenges do you observe in **MAG Working Groups** and how could they be improved?  
(Open-ended)

MAG Working Groups face challenges including uneven participation, unclear mandates, high workloads, limited coordination with other groups or Dynamic Coalitions, and insufficient follow-up on outputs. Time zone differences and resource constraints further reduce effectiveness. Improvements could include clearer objectives and work plans, balanced workload distribution, stronger facilitation, regular progress check-ins, better coordination with DCs, and accessible documentation of decisions. Streamlining evaluation tasks and providing administrative support would also enhance efficiency, inclusiveness, and the quality of intersessional outputs.

Members should be able to allocate more time for the WG

MAG Working Groups should support the MAG by preparing issues and developing recommendations, but they should not take decisions themselves.

Continued participation of members, and respecting the decisions that were made in proper meetings, with calls and quorum. That is, avoiding trying to change agreements by members that did not attend certain meetings.

Tendency to have too many meetings. Better for meetings to take place on a need basis.

Key challenges include uneven participation, unclear scope and coordination fatigue.

These could be addressed through clearer mandates, periodic reviews, stronger links to MAG-level discussions and adequate Secretariat support. Key challenges include uneven participation, unclear deliverables, and coordination overload (especially when roles, timelines and expected outputs are not defined from the start).

These could be addressed by:

- defining clear mandates, deliverables and timelines for each WG from the outset;
- assigning a small coordination team (with Secretariat support) and establishing regular check-ins with the full MAG;
- introducing periodic reviews (mid-cycle and end-cycle) to assess progress, relevance and whether the WG should continue or close;
- ensuring stronger links to MAG-level decisions so WG work feeds directly into programme planning, intersessional integration and outputs.

1. Working Group size and effectiveness

One recurring challenge is that MAG Working Groups can become too large, which often makes coordination difficult and slows progress. Large groups can dilute responsibility and reduce accountability for delivering concrete outputs.

Possible improvement: Working Groups should be kept small and focused, with membership limited to MAG members who can realistically commit time and effort. This would strengthen ownership, efficiency and delivery.

2. Availability and commitment of members

Not all members who join Working Groups have the availability to engage consistently, which can affect momentum and place disproportionate burdens on a few active contributors.

Possible improvement: Membership should be based on explicit availability and commitment, rather than broad inclusion. Those unable to engage regularly could still follow and contribute as observers, without being counted as core members.

3. Clear distinction between members and observers

Currently, there is often no clear distinction between those actively responsible for the work and

those who are mainly interested in following discussions.

Possible improvement: Introduce a clearer differentiation between:

- core Working Group members, responsible for advancing work and delivering outputs; and
- observers, who may provide input, feedback or expertise without formal responsibility.

This preserves openness while improving effectiveness.

#### 4. Clarity of mandate and outputs

Some Working Groups struggle with unclear mandates or overly broad scopes, leading to diffuse discussions and limited tangible results.

Possible improvement: Each Working Group should have:

- a clearly defined mandate;
- specific deliverables;
- a realistic timeframe.

This helps maintain focus and enables meaningful evaluation of progress.

#### 5. Coordination and reporting to the MAG

Inconsistent reporting and limited feedback loops can reduce the visibility and usefulness of Working Group outputs for MAG deliberations.

Possible improvement: Working Groups should provide regular, concise updates to the MAG, clearly highlighting progress, challenges and any issues requiring MAG guidance.

time constraints and irregular participation, smaller groups and reliable scheduling of meetings at regular intervals

Only few voices are heard.

Reporting is verbal and access to minutes of meeting. A more defined standard way of reporting. Eg. What was accomplished during last period (between MAG meetings), what is to be accomplished next period. How many persons attended. Level of participation (persons taking the floor, persons engaging in chat, polls, etc)

With workload, additional resource support would help enable working groups to have more aligned levels of ability to achieve objectives. Right now much relies on the MAG members. A more resourced Secretariat to partner with may assist in that.

My recent experience comes mostly from the WG Strategy, which is a very good example of working group. Having a group of co-chairs is very helpful. There is also a group of very committed WG members, both MAG and former MAG members, and this ensures that decisions are not taken by a very small group of people. This model should be adopted by all working groups.

Some working groups are made up of just 2 or 3 people. Others, like WG outreach are essentially doing what the Secretariat is doing and it is not clear what the added value is. I think MAG working groups should be treated as helpful and strategic mechanisms to provide the Secretariat and the MAG with community input and perspectives.

I am a little bit active in WG strategy and it works very well.

9. How to best respond to the community's demand and maintain impartiality with regard to the proposing and selection process of **PNs and BPFs**. Please select all it applies and feel free to add additional ideas:
  - Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria and the MAG can only select
  - MAG should only select from the community made submissions, based on the agreed procedure and criteria
  - MAG members should not propose but be impartial evaluators

- Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG
- Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance
- Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> <li>✓ MAG members should not propose but be impartial evaluators;</li> <li>✓ MAG should only select from the community made submissions, based on the agreed procedure and criteria ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ MAG members should not propose but be impartial evaluators;</li> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ MAG members should not propose but be impartial evaluators;</li> <li>✓ MAG should only select from the community made submissions, based on the agreed procedure and criteria ;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ MAG should only select from the community made submissions, based on the agreed procedure and criteria ;</li> <li>✓ MAG members should not propose but be impartial evaluators;</li> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> <li>✓ Other ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ MAG members should not propose but be impartial evaluators;</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> <li>✓ Other ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> <li>✓ Other ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> <li>✓ Other ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Stakeholders from the community can propose a topic against a set of MAG-developed criteria;</li> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Encourage multi-year thematic coverage with annual review of relevance ;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> <li>✓ Other ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ MAG should only select from the community made submissions, based on the agreed procedure and criteria ;</li> <li>✓ Call for thematic issues results should guide the holistic selection of the proposals by the MAG;</li> <li>✓ Proposals should always include both thematic substance and implementation mechanisms;</li> </ul>

- Please specify

It is crucial to explain the complex processes and activities of the IGF — including those that take place behind the scenes — in a simple and appealing manner to a broader audience, especially on social media.

Amount of active members should be a minimum number, decide by the proponents and the MAG.

- Publish a short selection rationale for accepted and non-accepted proposals (high-level, non-judgmental), to increase transparency and trust.
- Use conflict-of-interest disclosure: MAG members who are closely involved in a proposal (or organization proposing) should recuse themselves from evaluation/discussion of that proposal.
- Ensure alignment with a limited set of MAG-defined core themes (with room for a “wildcard” emerging issue), so selection is coherent and not fragmented.

strengthen the role of impartial evaluators and external experts

no particular observations

PNs and BPFs must be selected by the MAG based on a multi-year planning. Suggestions may come from the community, for instance based on a call for proposals, but this should never override a

careful multi-year planning by the MAG, considering a holistic assessment of relevant themes. PNs and BPFs should be proposed and planned for two-year cycles, with an exceptional extension to a third year, but never more than that.

Intersessional fora should be linked to IGF messages and outcomes and contribute to shaping the programme. Each annual outcome should include suggestions for deep diving that these fora could undertake.

10. How could the **facilitation and coordination of PNs and BPFs** be improved? Please select all it applies and feel free to add other suggestions

- Improve outreach through specific communication strategy
- Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media
- Improve design of BPF/PN webpages
- More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role
- More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators
- Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points)

- More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role ;
- Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);
- More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;
- visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;
- Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;

- More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;
- More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role ;

- Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;
- Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;
- Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;
- More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;
- Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);

- Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;
- Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;
- More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;
- Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);

- Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;
- Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;
- Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;
- More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;
- Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);

- Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;</li> <li>✓ Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;</li> <li>✓ More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);Other;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);</li> <li>✓ More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role ;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;</li> <li>✓ Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;</li> <li>✓ More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;</li> <li>✓ Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;</li> <li>✓ More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Other;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;</li> <li>✓ Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;</li> <li>✓ More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);</li> <li>✓ Other;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;</li> <li>✓ More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;</li> <li>✓ Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;</li> <li>✓ Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;</li> <li>✓ More than two (2) MAG members to be in the facilitation role ;</li> <li>✓ More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);Other;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Improve outreach through specific communication strategy;</li> <li>✓ Enhance visibility of the work by regularly updating the IGF Secretariat on activities to promote via social media ;</li> <li>✓ Improve design of BPF/PN webpages ;</li> <li>✓ More communication and exchange of work practices between the facilitators ;</li> <li>✓ Host multiple discussion sessions throughout the year not just at the annual IGF meeting (e.g. leverage regional IGFs and other bigger meeting points);</li> </ul>

- Please Specify

Regular meetings and briefings the full community

Intersessional work is one of the cornerstones of the IGF. However, the annual meeting should not be overloaded with coordination or alignment meetings. Such preparatory work should be carried out in advance.

Increase the activities to recruit more members and supporters of PNs and BPFs  
provide clearer facilitator guidance, templates and periodic coordination calls.

1. Clearer differentiation of roles and expectations

- There should be greater clarity on the respective purpose, scope and expected outputs of PNs and BPFs. This would help avoid overlap, manage expectations, and ensure that each mechanism adds distinct value within the IGF ecosystem.

2. Stronger and more consistent facilitation

Effective facilitators are critical. Facilitation should focus on:

- guiding discussions towards concrete outputs;
- managing timelines and milestones;
- ensuring balanced participation across stakeholder groups and regions;
- preventing capture by a small number of highly active contributors.

Providing facilitators with clearer mandates, guidance and support would significantly enhance effectiveness.

3. Improved coordination across PNs, BPFs and the broader IGF programme

Regular light-touch coordination among PNs, BPFs and the MAG/Secretariat would help:

- identify thematic overlaps early;
- encourage complementarity rather than duplication;
- align outputs with IGF main sessions and broader annual priorities.

4. Earlier start and clearer timelines

- PNs and BPFs would benefit from earlier activation in the IGF cycle, with clearly defined timelines for consultation, drafting and validation. This allows for more inclusive participation and higher-quality outputs.

5. More structured engagement with NRIs

NRIs could be more systematically engaged as:

- sources of bottom-up input and case studies;
- dissemination channels for PN/BPF work at national and regional level;
- contributors to relevance and contextualisation of outputs.

6. Clearer linkage between outputs and IGF sessions

PN and BPF outputs should be more visibly connected to:

- main sessions;
- high-level discussions;
- synthesis messages emerging from the IGF.

This strengthens visibility, uptake and perceived impact.

7. Better support for translating dialogue into usable outputs

Support from the Secretariat (editorial, synthesis, formatting) can help ensure that outputs are:

- concise and accessible;
- policy-relevant;
- usable by decision-makers beyond the IGF community.

Nothing

no particular observations

Even if each PN/BPF could have its own working modalities, all of them should necessarily follow general terms of reference and guidelines, including communication strategies, coordination/facilitation roles, transparency, interaction with the community, types and periodicity of outcomes, etc. The São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines should be followed in designing their structures and working modalities.

Take on work of producing background materials on relevant themes and be a closer part of building the programme. Also, engage NRIs.

11. What could improve the MAG's interaction, engagement in and support of:

○ **Dynamic Coalitions**

The MAG could improve interaction and support for Dynamic Coalitions by establishing regular communication channels, providing guidance and resources, coordinating to avoid duplication, involving MAG members in DC activities, recognizing DC outputs publicly, and integrating DC insights into IGF planning and intersessional work.

Involving DCs in IGF program setting especially on policy tracks within their focus while preserving the autonomy of DCs

Try to get liaisons from each DC into the MAG

Recommendation for MAG members to participate in the Dynamic Coalition activities.

Interaction could be improved by:

- establishing structured channels for DC inputs into MAG discussions;
- encouraging alignment of DC outputs with IGF priority themes;
- supporting the synthesis of DC outputs into formats suitable for dissemination beyond the IGF community, including towards UN and intergovernmental processes

This would further enable Dynamic Coalitions to contribute to the IGF's role as a source of structured multistakeholder inputs for WSIS+20 follow-up and Global Digital Compact-related processes, while preserving their bottom-up nature.

1. Clearer mutual understanding of roles and expectations:

- A shared understanding is needed of what Dynamic Coalitions are — autonomous, community-driven groups — and what the MAG's role is not (oversight or control), but rather facilitation, recognition and connection. Clarifying expectations on both sides would reduce misunderstandings and foster more constructive interaction.

2. More structured and predictable engagement points

Interaction between the MAG and Dynamic Coalitions would benefit from:

- regular, clearly defined moments of exchange (rather than ad hoc engagement);
- predictable opportunities for DCs to brief the MAG on their work, priorities and challenges.

This would improve mutual awareness and strategic alignment without undermining independence.

3. Better integration into the IGF programme and narrative

Dynamic Coalitions' work is often rich but insufficiently visible. The MAG could support:

- clearer pathways for DC outputs to feed into relevant main sessions, PNs or BPFs;
- improved signalling of how DC work contributes to annual IGF priorities.

This strengthens coherence and avoids parallel or siloed discussions.

4. Stronger coordination to avoid duplication and fragmentation

- Light-touch coordination — facilitated by the Secretariat and supported by the MAG — could help identify thematic overlaps between DCs and other IGF tracks early in the cycle, encouraging collaboration and complementarities rather than duplication.

#### 5. Improved communication and accessibility of DC outputs

MAG support could focus on helping DCs make their outputs more accessible and policy-relevant, including:

- clearer summaries of key messages;
- improved visibility on the IGF website and programme;
- stronger links to decision-maker audiences.

#### 6. Recognition and encouragement of diversity and inclusiveness

The MAG can play a constructive role by encouraging DCs to:

- broaden participation across regions and stakeholder groups;
- renew leadership and engagement over time;
- remain open and inclusive in their working methods.

This should be done through encouragement and good-practice sharing, not prescription.

#### 7. Using the permanence of the IGF as a strategic opportunity

- With the IGF now permanent, MAG engagement with Dynamic Coalitions can evolve from ad hoc support towards a more long-term, strategic relationship, focused on continuity, learning and cumulative impact across IGF cycles.

DCs are already obliged to provide an annual report of their activities which is published on their respective part of the IGF website. This could be supplemented by a set criteria for DCs to be considered as 'active'. Recognition of active DCs' work by granting them sufficient space in the annual IGFs programme. Dedicate time for the Dynamic Coalitions Coordination Group to report to the MAG in each virtual and in-person MAG meeting. Also, it should be ensured that MAG members are aware of the DCs' work and their annual report. Given the huge number of DCs MAG members should decide which DCs suit best their individual expertise and interest and then affiliate themselves with the respective DCs.

Assign 2 MAG liaisons to the Coordinated group.

Encourage MAG Members to join a DC of their interest

Ensure DC representation in BPFs and PNs

DCs have categorized groups that present at IGF, these same groups should have worksops with MAG participation

regular understanding of topics under discussion and shared information flow.

Action plans for all active DCs should be shared annually with the MAG. These plans should follow general terms of reference and guidelines, including types and periodicity of outcomes. MAG rapporteurs should be appointed to assess each of those action plans, interact with the DC leaders, as required, and prepare brief reports to be shared by the MAG. A MAG liaison should attend the DCCG meetings and report periodically to the MAG.

Clearer expectation on the part of the MAG and of the Dynamic Coalition participants themselves is key. In past years there have been numerous occasions where the MAG and Dynamic Coalitions have had misaligned understanding and expectations as to the role that Dynamic Coalitions should have in the IGF program. As an essential and output-focused element in the IGF ecosystem, it is important to showcase DC work in the annual IGF; however, IGF programme real estate is a limited commodity, and with many Dynamic Coalitions now active, it is not possible to provide individual slots to each DC. A clear understanding should be established at the beginning of the cycle (developing towards a default best practice) on the space and expectations for DCs in the annual IGF event, drawing on the year's theme(s), recent or impending work from specific DCs, and opportunities for specific DCs to

contribute to MAG-organised sessions (i.e. Main Sessions). This will rely upon open and effective communication channels between the MAG and the DCs collective - ensuring the vitality of this DC collective, and exploring the best ways to facilitate communication should be a priority for all stakeholders.

Better promoting of DC outputs.

More common meetings - hybrid. Not documents instead of meeting.

○ **NRIs**

The MAG could strengthen engagement NRIs by establishing regular communication channels, providing guidance and resources, coordinating activities to avoid overlap, involving MAG members in NRI planning, sharing best practices, and integrating NRI insights into IGF intersessional work.

Involve NRIs early in Agenda setting including theme selection and policy tracks to ensure that local realities are taken into consideration

The MAG could consider inviting engaged NRIs to dedicated meetings. Or NRIs could get a special invitation to MAG meetings as observer. In addition, active individuals within NRI communities could be mentored and supported as potential future MAG Members.

Prepare periodic presence of MAG chair and some members in NRI meetings

Recommendation for MAG members to participate in the NRIs.

The MAG could strengthen engagement with NRIs by:

- reinforcing two-way communication and feedback loops;
- creating clearer pathways for NRI inputs to inform global IGF discussions and outputs;
- supporting consolidation of NRI messages into thematic syntheses usable at global level.

1. Clearer positioning of NRIs within the IGF ecosystem

- There should be a shared understanding that NRIs are not peripheral activities, but an integral part of the Internet Governance Forum ecosystem, playing a key role in anchoring global discussions in national and regional realities. Clearer articulation of this role would strengthen mutual expectations and cooperation.

2. More direct and regular interaction between NRIs and the MAG

While the IGF Secretariat plays an essential coordination and support role, NRIs would benefit from more direct and structured interaction with the MAG itself, rather than engagement being mediated almost exclusively through the Secretariat. Regular exchanges with the MAG would:

- strengthen mutual understanding of priorities and constraints;
- enhance the relevance of MAG deliberations by integrating bottom-up perspectives;
- reinforce the sense of shared ownership of the IGF process.

3. More structured and predictable engagement points throughout the IGF cycle

- MAG–NRI interaction would benefit from clearly defined and predictable moments of engagement, allowing NRIs to share priorities, emerging issues and key messages at different stages of the IGF cycle, rather than primarily at the annual meeting.

4. Stronger integration of NRI inputs into MAG deliberations and the IGF programme

MAG processes could more systematically:

- draw on NRI outputs when shaping annual themes, main sessions and intersessional work;
- ensure that NRI perspectives inform global discussions in a visible and meaningful way.
- This would reinforce the bottom-up character of the IGF.

5. Better coordination to avoid duplication and fragmentation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earlier coordination between the MAG, NRIs and other IGF tracks (PNs, BPFs, DCs) can help identify overlaps, encourage collaboration and reduce duplication of sessions and competition for speakers.</li> </ul>
6. Enhanced support for translating global debate into local impact — and back <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRIs are uniquely placed to translate global IGF discussions into national and regional contexts and to bring concrete local experiences back to the global level. MAG engagement should actively support and valorise this two-way flow.</li> </ul>
7. Using the permanence of the IGF to deepen the MAG–NRI relationship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the IGF now permanent, interaction between the MAG and NRIs should evolve towards a more strategic, sustained partnership, focused on continuity across cycles, cumulative learning and long-term impact.</li> </ul>
Many DCs are already engaged in NRIs work thus providing a link for intersessional work and the annual IGF. Nonetheless all these activities should mainly be considered on the basis of their thematic area.
If funding allows, a MAG member should attend a Regional IGF if that region does not have MAG member representation.
2 MAG liaisons to attend coordinated NRI meetings
Stronger interaction and proactive identification of NRIs, shared information and reports of NRI events and outcomes, to help bridge NRI work into the MAG work more intentionally, systematically. Enables identification and referencing of key national and regional efforts, and reflection of that at the global IGF.
A MAG liaison to the NRIs network must be kept. Periodic reporting from the network to the full MAG must be kept as well. The MAG must continuously request concrete contributions from the NRIs network in all relevant issues of interest for the NRIs. The NRIs must give a concrete contribution to the IGF main sessions (see response to question on programme development).
A quarterly MAG LP meeting with NRIs. Co-locating MAG meetings with regional IGFs
More common meetings - hybrid. Not documents instead of meeting.

12. How could **intersessional work (PNs, BPFs, DCs) and NRIs** best contribute and support the MAG’s work?

Intersessional work and NRIs can support the MAG by providing timely research, thematic expertise, and community perspectives to inform decision-making. They can pilot initiatives, share lessons learned, coordinate regional insights, produce policy-relevant outputs, and help implement IGF priorities between annual meetings, ensuring continuity and inclusiveness.
Intersessional work and NRIs outputs can be helpful for MAG work and program development.
Suggesting topics for the workshop proposals, but not being part of the proposed workshops
Through making their brief reports available to members. This can be incorporated into the eLearning programme suggested above.
Intersessional work and NRIs could best support the MAG if their contributions were more systematically aggregated and synthesized. This would allow the MAG, together with the Secretariat, to identify cross-cutting messages and support targeted outreach to relevant UN and non-UN processes, including WSIS, GDC and other digital policy fora. This would also support the IGF’s mandate to channel bottom-up, multistakeholder perspectives into

relevant UN and intergovernmental processes, as foreseen in the WSIS+20 Outcome Document and the Global Digital Compact.

1. Providing structured, policy-relevant input (not just activity reports)

PNs, BPFs, DCs and NRIs can best support the MAG by translating their work into:

- concise key messages;
- clearly articulated policy questions or dilemmas;
- short syntheses highlighting areas of convergence, divergence and emerging risks.

This allows the MAG to draw on their work meaningfully when shaping themes, sessions and priorities.

2. Feeding bottom-up intelligence into MAG deliberations

NRIs, in particular, are uniquely positioned to provide:

- early signals of national and regional policy concerns;
- insights into implementation challenges and capacity gaps;
- perspectives from under-represented regions and stakeholder groups.

Regular and direct channels for this input can significantly strengthen the MAG's situational awareness.

3. Helping the MAG anticipate issues rather than react to them

Intersessional work can support the MAG by:

- identifying emerging technologies and governance issues early;
- flagging topics that are not yet mature for negotiation but require attention;
- informing forward-looking agenda setting across IGF cycles.

This reinforces the IGF's role as a pre-decisional, anticipatory space.

4. Reducing duplication and improving programme coherence

Early sharing of work plans and thematic focus by PNs, BPFs, DCs and NRIs can help the MAG:

- identify overlaps across IGF tracks;
- encourage collaboration and complementarities;
- avoid duplication of sessions, speakers and messages.

This contributes to a more coherent and navigable IGF programme.

5. Supporting evidence-based MAG decisions

Outputs from intersessional work and NRIs can serve as:

- evidence bases for main session design;
- background material for high-level discussions;
- references for synthesis and messaging.
- This strengthens the quality and credibility of MAG decisions.

6. Strengthening the link between global discussion and local impact

NRIs can support the MAG by demonstrating:

- how global IGF discussions are translated into national and regional contexts;
- what works in practice, and what does not;
- where global dialogue needs better alignment with local realities.

This reinforces the IGF's bottom-up legitimacy.

7. Engaging more directly with the MAG

Beyond interaction with the Secretariat, more direct engagement between these groups and the MAG — through briefings, focused exchanges or joint sessions — would:

- improve mutual understanding;
- allow MAG members to ask targeted questions;
- strengthen a sense of shared responsibility for IGF outcomes.

See answer above; since Dynamic Coalitions are covering a broad range of issues they are best positioned to contribute not only to the annual IGFs programme but also to the setting of themes and issue to be addressed. We suggest to set-up process - like the trusted flagger concept in the DSA - for DCs' input to be prioritised over input to the general call for issues. This would be justified by the very broad range of expertise gathered by DC members compared to the general public.

Continue with their workshops series.

Involve MAG members in polls

Regular reports of shared information of the work into the MAG and on the IGF website.

PNs, BPFs, DCs and NRIs should actively engage in the preparation of the annual IGF programme. They should be required to bring very concrete, focused and actionable outcomes to the annual IGF, well aligned to the overarching theme and sub-themes. See answers to question on programme development.

NRIs and Dynamic Coalitions, as initiatives not directed by the MAG, should be encouraged to develop their modalities for collective interaction with and communication to the MAG; as the number of NRIs and DCs happily increases, such collective self-direction will be increasingly important. With such interaction/communication practices in place, the MAG can better plan to integrate and reflect NRI/DC work and output in the annual IGF event programme.

More common meetings - hybrid. Not documents instead of meeting.

13. How could the **IGF Secretariat** better support the work of the MAG (e.g. tools, processes...)?  
(Open-ended)

By providing efficient collaboration tools, centralized document repositories, and clear workflows, the Secretariat could better support the MAG's work. Timely communication, accessible reporting templates, technical support for virtual and hybrid meetings, and regular briefings on IGF priorities would enhance coordination, efficiency, and informed decision-making.

nothing

Keep the provision of technical support, as it has been so far

Continue with the level of support being provided...

The Secretariat plays a central role in maintaining external relations and outreach.

This role could be further strengthened through closer and more structured interaction with the MAG, including:

- joint identification of priority external events and processes;
- coordinated preparation of thematic IGF outputs;
- clearer internal workflows for follow-up and reporting on IGF outcomes.

This would enhance the IGF's capacity to report on and promote its outcomes in line with WSIS+20 follow-up arrangements, without introducing any representational or negotiating role.

The WSIS+20 outcome recognises the IGF as a permanent forum and underscores the importance of coherence, coordination, inclusiveness and effective follow-up across WSIS-related processes. Secretariat support to the MAG should evolve accordingly, while fully respecting the IGF's non-negotiating and multistakeholder nature.

Priority 1 — Support the MAG in exercising continuity and coherence in a permanent IGF

With the IGF now permanent, the Secretariat should support the MAG by:

- providing regular strategic overviews of ongoing IGF processes and intersessional work;
- identifying cross-cutting issues, overlaps and gaps across cycles;

- enabling continuity and cumulative learning, rather than a purely annual, event-driven approach.

This aligns with WSIS+20 expectations of improved coherence and follow-up, without altering the IGF's mandate.

**Priority 2 — Strengthen structured coordination between the MAG and the host country**  
WSIS+20 highlights the need for better coordination and effective use of resources. To operationalise this:

- establish early and structured coordination between the Secretariat, the MAG and the host country on programme architecture, thematic priorities and session formats;
- ensure clear complementarity between MAG-led and host country-led sessions;
- proactively prevent overlapping sessions on the same topics, competition for speakers and inefficient use of programme slots.

This is essential to avoid fragmentation and confusion for participants.

**Priority 3 — Improve tools for transparency, coordination and institutional memory**  
In line with WSIS+20's emphasis on effectiveness and accountability:

- provide a shared digital workspace for MAG documents, timelines and decisions;
- maintain clear decision logs with rationale and follow-up;
- support institutional memory across MAG cycles, while allowing for renewal.

**Priority 4 — Enhance preparation and focus of MAG deliberations**  
To support more effective deliberation:

- circulate concise briefing notes ahead of MAG meetings, highlighting key issues, options and trade-offs;
- clearly distinguish agenda items for information, discussion or decision;
- ensure MAG meetings focus on deliberation and coordination rather than information-sharing.

**Priority 5 — Systematically integrate bottom-up and intersessional inputs**

- Consistent with WSIS+20's reaffirmation of inclusive and multistakeholder approaches;
- synthesise inputs from NRIs, PNs, BPFs and DCs into short, policy-relevant briefs for the MAG;
- facilitate more direct interaction between these groups and the MAG, in addition to Secretariat coordination;
- ensure national and regional perspectives meaningfully inform global discussions.

**Priority 6 — Reinforce onboarding, capacity and continuity**  
To support effective participation:

- provide structured onboarding for new MAG members;
- ensure access to clear documentation on roles, processes and past decisions;
- support mentoring and continuity across cycles.

**Priority 7 — Improve visibility of how MAG work contributes to WSIS+20 follow-up**  
Without overstating the IGF's role, the Secretariat can:

- clarify how MAG decisions shape IGF outputs;
- show how IGF discussions contribute to broader WSIS follow-up and, where relevant, to GDC implementation;

- close feedback loops with the wider community.

To my opinion the secretariat's support to the Mag is already excellent. In case my suggestion of a strict schedule of meetings at a regular interval throughout the year is taken up, the secretariat should take care of that schedule and provide detailed agendas and meeting documents in advance.

Not sure. Support is currently very good.

The IGF Secretariat with more resources would be able to support the MAG; enable bridging with the NRIs; support sharing of information and resources, and reporting out of IGFs including into other forums. Additionally a well prepared website will enable the wealth of information of past IGFs and future, to be curated and presented as a resource for all on a wide range of topics.

A better staffed Secretariat could give a more direct support to each of the BPFs, PNs and MAG Working Groups, as well as to the DCCG. It could also better support MAG chair, co-chairs, small groups and liaisons, in different activities I outlined in response to various questions of this survey.

The Secretariat can best support the MAG with clarity on timelines and early notice of meetings (particularly hybrid meetings with the possibility of face-to-face participation).

The Secretariat could also increase support for current and outgoing MAG members to serve as mentors and advisors to incoming MAG members.

Clarity on TORs. More direct calls for support. More honest and open feedback. More collaboration and peer work.

The common meeting should be plan not only for sharing the information, but also for discussion. As I mentioned, not everybody is expert in all topics, so we can choose one or two topics for meeting. The sharing information, as I mention is necessary, but should be very effective and easy to find the instruction for operational things needed.

## PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT

**Purpose:** Improve development, effectiveness and workload distribution in programme shaping.

14. What improvements would you suggest while developing the programme:
- Call for Taking Stocks and follow-up on suggested improvements

Improvements include clearer objectives, structured submission templates, transparent synthesis of inputs, timely feedback to contributors, and public reporting on how suggestions are considered, implemented, or deferred.

none

Perhaps more explicit questions could encourage more responses.

Start with that exercise soon with every new MAG

Enhance the calls so that inputs can be analysed by AI for more precise feedback.

The process could be improved by:

- clarifying objectives and expected outcomes;
- ensuring structured follow-up;
- better integrating results into MAG planning and priority-setting.

The Taking Stock exercise could also be more explicitly linked to the IGF's contribution to WSIS+20 and GDC follow-up, helping identify areas where IGF discussions have informed broader policy processes.

1. Sharpen the purpose and scope of the Call

- The Call for Taking Stock should be more clearly framed as a tool to inform programme shaping and strategic improvements, rather than a broad consultation. Clear guidance on the type of input sought (e.g. lessons learned, gaps, priorities) would improve the relevance and usability of responses.

## 2. Focus on a limited number of targeted questions

Reducing the number of questions and making them more focused would:

- lower the workload for respondents;
- facilitate more structured and comparable inputs;
- make synthesis and follow-up more manageable for the MAG and the Secretariat.

## 3. Better link inputs to concrete programme decisions

The Call should explicitly indicate:

- how inputs will be used;
- which aspects of the programme they are expected to inform;
- which issues may lead to changes in format, themes or processes.

This would strengthen trust in the process and encourage more actionable contributions.

## 4. Improve synthesis and prioritisation of inputs

A more structured synthesis of responses — highlighting common themes, recurring issues and priority recommendations — would help the MAG focus on what matters most and avoid being overwhelmed by volume.

## 5. Strengthen follow-up and feedback loops

Follow-up should be clearer and more visible, including:

- communication on which suggestions were taken up and why;
- explanation when suggestions cannot be implemented;
- indication of how improvements will be tested or phased in.

This reinforces accountability and continuous improvement.

## 6. Use the process to improve workload distribution

Inputs from the Call can be used more deliberately to:

- identify areas of excessive burden or duplication;
- rebalance responsibilities across programme tracks;
- inform decisions on streamlining sessions and formats.

## 7. Align timing with MAG decision-making cycles

- Launching the Call and presenting its synthesis at moments that directly feed into MAG decisions would improve effectiveness and avoid consultation fatigue.

Stock-taking should happen already throughout the annual IGF and as soon as possible afterwards.

The process of stock taking should be as transparent and easy as possible, f.e. standardised feedback forms could be provided to participants at the end of each session.

Not sure

Perhaps reflecting more of also what understanding from NRIs.

A MAG Working Group on IGF Improvements, which already existed some years ago, should be in charge of tracking suggested improvements, assessing their evolution and interacting with the various components of the IGF ecosystem, as needed. This WG should be made permanent. It would deliver an annual report, assessing the improvements made in the last cycle and making proposals to the MAG and to the IGF Secretariat.

Identify priorities, implement and report on implementation

More time to discuss about the choice.

○ Selection of the overarching theme and sub-themes

The process could improve through earlier timelines, clearer selection criteria, and stronger use of community and NRI inputs. Transparent synthesis of proposals, rationale for final choices, and alignment with global policy priorities would enhance legitimacy and relevance.

Ensure that regional priorities are reflected

We would encourage the IGF to be more specific in the selection of themes and to adopt a clearer focus, including with regard to the needs and interests of the region in which the IGF is held. This may also mean that some themes cannot be accommodated each year.

Start with 4 or 5 suggestions from the Host country and MAG chair, and have an open discussion around those seed proposals.

Continue with the current approach of host-led selection process.

A more transparent and staged process could combine:

- structured community input;
- MAG consolidation and prioritization;
- alignment with intersessional work, NRIs and relevant global policy developments.

This would strengthen continuity across IGF cycles and improve alignment with intersessional work, NRIs and ongoing global digital policy processes.

1. Shorter, clearer and more memorable overarching themes

Overarching themes should avoid long or composite formulations that are difficult to recall and rarely become associated with a specific IGF edition. A concise theme improves visibility, communication and long-term recall, helping link each annual IGF to a clear idea.

2. Strongly forward-looking orientation

Themes should consistently focus on emerging and future-oriented challenges, rather than restating broad, well-established concepts. This forward-looking approach would better reflect the IGF's unique role as a space for anticipation and early policy dialogue.

3. Clear differentiation of each IGF cycle

Each theme should clearly distinguish one IGF edition from the next, allowing participants, policymakers and external audiences to immediately understand what that particular IGF was about. This is especially important now that the IGF is permanent and continuity across cycles must coexist with clear annual identity.

4. Better alignment between the overarching theme and sub-themes

Sub-themes should clearly derive from — and reinforce — the overarching theme, rather than operating as parallel or loosely connected tracks. This strengthens programme coherence and helps participants navigate the agenda more effectively.

5. Early MAG agreement and consistency across the programme

Earlier agreement on the theme would allow it to be consistently reflected across main sessions, workshops, intersessional work and host country activities, reducing fragmentation and duplication.

Given the broad range of issues addressed by DCs and their intersessional activities around the globe DCs could act as a radar for emerging issues and thus help shaping the overarching theme and sub-themes.

After call and summary, have an open meeting by stakeholder group to discuss and clarify

Focus on what is current, relevant for a wide range of stakeholders, in particular business, policy makers, that benefit from all stakeholders part of dialogues.

The selection of the theme and sub-themes for a given year should be made in advance, for instance at least 6 months before the end of the previous cycle. This would allow a much better alignment

between the global IGF and PNs, BPFs, DCs and NRIs. These different components of the IGF ecosystem would be much better prepared to bring more concrete, focused and actionable contributions to the global IGF.

Total time wasting at present. And every year is more or less the same. Rethink. Or go back to standing categories. Fine to have a nice slogan for promo versions but to really have impact the MAG should be willing to either commit to one or two themes or not bother with subthemes at all. Be daring. Take on big topics like THE INTERNET AND DEMOCRACY: Friends or foes? Or Corporate accountability in the age of big tech.

The same, we can maybe have more themes and sub-themes and choose the expert for it . OR to make the cascade, so the sub-teams choose the best 5 proposal and after all MAG choose the winners in each theme. As this we are informed on all the possible winners nad we can choose the best of the best. So, also not necessary that all theme will have the same nombre of winners. It depends of actuality of the theme at IGF 20XX. And the dynamisme of the change is very quick, so we should be very flexible.

- Call for session proposals

The call for session proposals could be improved by giving preference to first-time proposers, alongside clearer guidance and evaluation criteria, simplified submission templates, adequate preparation timelines, and transparent feedback on selection decisions to enhance inclusiveness, quality and fairness.

none

Ask everyone to clerly state the subthemes where the proposal falls under, and why do they think it will add something new and beneficial

In the call, recommendations should be made for mergers .

Improvements could include:

- simplified templates and clearer guidance;
- stronger alignment with themes and intersessional priorities;
- clearer expectations regarding outcomes and formats.

1. Provide clearer guidance on expectations and priorities

The call should more clearly articulate:

- the overarching theme and sub-themes, and how proposals are expected to align with them;
- the type of sessions sought (e.g. exploratory, forward-looking, policy-oriented);
- expectations regarding outcomes and takeaways.

This would improve relevance and reduce misaligned submissions.

2. Strengthen requirements for genuine multistakeholder balance

The call should require proposers to:

- demonstrate meaningful participation of different stakeholder groups;
- explain the role of each speaker, beyond formal representation;
- reflect diversity in regions, gender and perspectives.

This would improve quality and credibility.

3. Encourage collaboration and consolidation early

The call could include mechanisms to:

- identify similar or overlapping proposals at an early stage;
- encourage proposers to merge or collaborate;
- reduce competition for speakers and session slots.

This would improve programme coherence and reduce duplication.

#### 4. Simplify and structure the application form

A more structured and concise proposal template would:

- guide proposers towards clearer objectives and outcomes;
- make evaluation more consistent;
- reduce unnecessary burden on both proposers and evaluators.

#### 5. Require clearer articulation of expected outcomes

Proposals should be asked to specify:

- what participants should take away from the session;
- how discussions will contribute to broader IGF objectives;
- whether and how outputs could inform follow-up work.

This strengthens impact.

#### 6. Improve transparency on the selection process

The call should explain:

- how proposals will be evaluated;
- what criteria will be applied;
- how feedback will be provided.

This builds trust and improves future submissions.

#### 7. Align timing with programme development

Launching the call earlier, and with clearer timelines, would:

- allow better planning and collaboration;
- support a more balanced workload for the MAG and the Secretariat.

To my experience there was always a bit of confusion among potential proposers about what is expected from them as input to the proposal form. therefore I suggest to hold webinars on "How to create a successful session proposal" and make it obligatory for proposers to attend at least one of these. This would improve the quality of session proposals and in consequence make it easier for the MAG to identify those best suited for the programme.

Hold mandatory meeting for session proposers. Hold 3 so that persons have choice of which to attend. Deduct points for non compliance

Clarity on expectations; key themes or suggested areas for consideration as examples that could contribute to a substantively vibrant program of an IGF relevant to all stakeholders, including governments and the private sector, or others who may not attend or be aware of the value of the IGF and benefit to awareness of or addressing issues.

Nothing to suggest.

Proposal authors should be able to add subject matter tags to their proposal - these could be chosen from a list or added uniquely - to allow better analysis of common themes or trends in the proposal set.

Just ask for well thought through session proposals. Make it simpler.

To send to much more communities, make a good communication campaign.

- Evaluation and selection process of IGF sessions

A thematic-area-based system could streamline IGF session evaluation by automatically categorizing proposals into approved themes at submission, assigning reviewers based on expertise, and limiting individual workloads. Using standardized scoring matrices per theme, a two-stage review process

(Secretariat screening followed by MAG quality review), and simple dashboards would improve consistency, fairness, and efficiency.

none

Making sure ALL MAG members evaluate the proposals assigne to each one

Consideration should be given to how a host performed in the previous year's session hosted.

The process could benefit from:

- clearer evaluation criteria and weighting;
- greater consistency across evaluators;
- more transparent and constructive feedback to proposers.

1. Provide clearer guidance on expectations and priorities

The call should more clearly articulate:

the overarching theme and sub-themes, and how proposals are expected to align with them;  
the type of sessions sought (e.g. exploratory, forward-looking, policy-oriented);  
expectations regarding outcomes and takeaways.

This would improve relevance and reduce misaligned submissions.

2. Strengthen requirements for genuine multistakeholder balance

The call should require proposers to:

demonstrate meaningful participation of different stakeholder groups;  
explain the role of each speaker, beyond formal representation;  
reflect diversity in regions, gender and perspectives.

This would improve quality and credibility.

3. Encourage collaboration and consolidation early

The call could include mechanisms to:

identify similar or overlapping proposals at an early stage;  
encourage proposers to merge or collaborate;  
reduce competition for speakers and session slots.

This would improve programme coherence and reduce duplication.

4. Simplify and structure the application form

A more structured and concise proposal template would:  
guide proposers towards clearer objectives and outcomes;  
make evaluation more consistent;

reduce unnecessary burden on both proposers and evaluators.

5. Require clearer articulation of expected outcomes

Proposals should be asked to specify:

what participants should take away from the session;  
how discussions will contribute to broader IGF objectives;  
whether and how outputs could inform follow-up work.

This strengthens impact.

6. Improve transparency on the selection process

The call should explain:

how proposals will be evaluated;  
what criteria will be applied;  
how feedback will be provided.

This builds trust and improves future submissions.

7. Align timing with programme development

Launching the call earlier, and with clearer timelines, would:

allow better planning and collaboration;  
support a more balanced workload for the MAG and the Secretariat.

This is not a task that can easily be done by lay men but needs a certain type of experience. Engage persons with professional expertise in the evaluation of project proposals and academic work in the development of the evaluation and selection process. Make it obligatory to adhere to a scoring system set in advance by these experts and rely on the results coming out of that exercise. Proposals must be funnelled through a step-by-step process reducing the huge number incoming proposals to the small number that finally fits into the programme schedule, ensuring this being the selection of the best.

Not sure

Retain criteria for well developed proposals, aligned with theme of the IGF.

Clarity on how many sessions are available for MAG to fill, and insight early on into the strategy behind allocation of sessions and session types. Early and comprehensive coordination between the MAG and the Host would also help to ensure that there can be alignment and efficiency in session development and scheduling.

The MAG should also be provided with the proposals in a more easily searchable and manipulable format (e.g. spreadsheet) to allow MAG members to identify trends and overall characteristics of the data set.

Look at the design of the entire event

The same philosophie as in question 24.

- Development, organization and coordination of main sessions

Improvements to main session development and coordination include earlier planning with clear objectives, stronger thematic coherence aligned to IGF priorities, and closer coordination between MAG, facilitators, and the Secretariat. Standardized session formats, clearer roles, and regular coordination meetings would improve quality, balance, and timely delivery.

ensure regional diversity among speakers

We encourage continued efforts to strengthen high-level participation — including increased engagement from CEOs and senior government officials — while carefully managing any potential trade-offs.

Voluntary MAG members may be involved

The current approach is good.

Main sessions could be strengthened by:

- defining objectives earlier;
- improving coordination among organizers;
- drawing more systematically on intersessional work and NRI inputs.

1. Clearly differentiate the purpose of main sessions and high-level sessions

A central issue is the overlapping of themes between high-level sessions and main sessions. These formats serve different purposes and should not compete with one another. High-level sessions are intended to provide strategic, political or visionary perspectives, while main sessions should enable in-depth, multistakeholder discussion and analysis. Clear thematic and functional differentiation is essential to avoid confusion and competition for participants.

2. Establish a coherent programme architecture from the outset

Main sessions should be developed as part of an overall programme architecture agreed early by the MAG, in coordination with the Secretariat and the host country. This would ensure:

clear sequencing between high-level and main sessions;  
complementarity rather than duplication of themes;  
a logical flow for participants across the programme.

3. Strengthen coordination with the host country

Closer and earlier coordination between the MAG and the host country is essential to avoid thematic overlap. Clear agreement on who leads which discussions, and at what level, would prevent competing sessions on similar topics and ensure efficient use of speakers and slots.

4. Reduce the number of overlapping flagship sessions

Limiting the number of flagship sessions addressing similar topics would improve focus, attendance and impact. Fewer, better-coordinated sessions would strengthen the quality of discussion and the participant experience.

5. Ensure consistency between themes, speakers and formats

Main sessions should:

clearly derive from the overarching theme and sub-themes;

involve genuinely multistakeholder panels;

be designed to build on, rather than replicate, high-level discussions.

This reinforces clarity and coherence.

6. Improve communication and signalling to participants

Clear labelling and communication about the purpose of each session type would help participants understand where to engage, reducing confusion and unintended competition between sessions.

Main sessions are those that attract the most participants, therefore their topics and issues addressed need to mirror the relevance as resulted from the call for issues. Thematic relevance is more important than prominent speakers' names.

Not sure

Focus on themes that would align with current topics, opportunities for awareness of value of IGF to stakeholders usually not aware of attending and benefit.

There shouldn't be a difference between "main sessions" (proposed and prepared by the MAG) and "high-level sessions" (proposed and prepared by the host country). The host country could actively engage with the MAG in the decision about main sessions, so that its priorities and interests are also taken into account.

BPFs, PNs, DCs and NRIs should also be actively involved in the development of main sessions. As the main sessions should carefully reflect the overarching theme and associated sub-themes (to be selected in advance to the current IGF cycle), selected components of the ecosystem could bring concrete contributions to each of the main sessions.

Main sessions should be much better integrated to the overall flow of the programme. As already implemented in some past IGF editions, there would be a certain number of sessions directly related to each of the sub-themes. These sessions would be held before the corresponding main sessions. Their rapporteurs would make very brief reports of the session outcomes at the beginning of the main session, to set the scene.

The distinctions between Main Sessions, High Level Sessions and other plenary room sessions should be revisited and better integrated to ensure there is not duplication, that community expertise is leveraged (e.g. incorporating intersessional work outputs), and that the overall programme coherently aligns with the agreed theme(s).

Look at the design of the entire event

It is often the statements. Really the preparation before should be very relevant and try to make the good discussion.

Also, there are a lot of speakers, so discussion is not possible and it is the reason that there is question,

answer,.... We need definitely 2 moderators, who will be very well prepared and they will be complementary of each other. Definitely, less chairs on the podium.

○ IGF Schedule

The IGF schedule could be improved by restoring stronger thematic clustering and clearer daily focus, which were more evident in pre-2025 IGF. Compared to the last IGF, earlier schedules allowed better spacing of main sessions, fewer overlaps with high-interest workshops, and clearer differentiation between main, intersessional, and NRI sessions. Earlier publication of a near-final schedule, improved coordination across time zones, and better integration of Dynamic Coalitions and NRIs would enhance predictability, participation, and overall coherence.

Reducing parallel sessions under same subtheme

Try to avoid parallel sessions on similar topics.

Do some brain storming on how to group topics, and then let the Secretariat, maybe with the presence of 2 or 3 MAG members, prepare the schedule. This is a very difficult and complex task

The current approach is good.

Improvements could include:

- earlier publication of draft schedules;
- reduced last-minute changes;
- better visibility for intersessional and NRI-related sessions.

While the IGF schedule is already structured around sub-themes, it could be significantly improved by making it clearer and more intuitive for participants. In particular, the schedule should more clearly explain the purpose of each session format and the type of participation or interaction it enables, helping participants identify where they can most effectively engage. Clearer signalling of formats, combined with a simpler and more user-oriented presentation, would enhance clarity, coherence and the overall participant experience.

At the same time, the high number of parallel and overlapping sessions significantly dilutes participation and reduces the impact of discussions. Streamlining the programme by reducing the number of sessions is therefore essential. In particular, main sessions and high-level sessions should be scheduled without parallel sessions, ensuring full attention, broader participation and greater visibility for these flagship discussions.

The programme of the last IGFs featured so called High level Sessions where prominent speakers from government and companies were set on the panel. It seems these sessions did not adhere to the cereal principles of gender, stakeholder and geographical balance. I doubt this approach helps to strengthen the trust in the IGf as a bottom-up multistakeholder forum.

More awareness of High Level sessions

A schedule of less workshops and concentration of key areas of focus to enable more to attend sessions worked well last time. The IGF in Norway - with limited sessions - benefited from a concentrated agenda where participants could manage to attend sessions interested in.

The overarching theme and sub-themes should be decided much in advance (see above). This would allow more time for planning the current IGF edition, when the new MAG starts working.

Look at the design of the entire event.

The last days are very empty of people, so to find each day the stars, that the people are much more involved and it could be more interactive. The questions at the end are good, but it is better to show

the time, that, the person who ask doesn't speak 3 minutes. So, to be strict. After make also 5 lines for questions: government, privat, international organisation,... that we are sure that questions are asked from all kind of organisations. More organise the interactive communication. Often a lot of very good session are in the same time, and after there is a weak sessions in paralel. So, really to control and manage how many points they received during MAG selection to try to make a good "cocteil. We can also use MAG to make the test before IGF, which event they want to see and if the will be a lot of time croosing, we can change. This exercice could help, maybe.

## OUTREACH, PARTICIPATION & INCLUSION

**Purpose:** Align MAG working modalities with inclusivity, multistakeholder engagement, outreach and fundraising goals.

15. How could the MAG promote the work of the IGF amongst all stakeholders (Government, (executive, legislative, judicial), private sector, civil society (incl. academia), technical community and intergovernmental organizations) more widely and foster an inclusive multistakeholder participation (Global South, youth, marginalized groups...) into MAG discussions and planning, at the annual IGF meetings and in its intersessional work? (*Open-ended*)

The MAG could promote IGF work through targeted outreach, partnerships with Regional /Sub Regional forums, NRIs and supporting institutions, clearer messaging, and accessible formats, while actively engaging the Global South, Youth, and Marginalized groups through inclusive planning, capacity building, and year-round participation.

Better support for Global South and youth participation, Regular communications tailored to the different stakeholders and consistently showing how diverse inputs are reflected in IGF Agendas.

Social media is key in this context. The IGF could create clear and engaging explanatory content — for example, short stories or videos on how to organise an IGF or how the MAG works — to make processes more accessible to a broader audience.

Sending a minimum package of outcomes of previous IGF and some non intrusive suggestions about the topics to cover in each NRI, so these events can promote and contribute to the deployment of these outcomes in their local communities.

Every MAG member should demonstrate active participation in his/her stakeholder group. Such a yardstick should be one of the requirements for continuous MAG membership.

The MAG could promote the work of the IGF more widely and foster inclusive multistakeholder participation by adopting a more structured outreach and inclusion approach, in close coordination with the IGF Secretariat (external relations and communications) and complementing the Leadership Panel's high-level engagement.

### 1) Targeted outreach by stakeholder group

- Support the Secretariat in identifying priority communities and entry points for outreach (e.g. executive, parliamentarians, judiciary, regulators; SMEs/startups; academia; technical community; IGOs).
- Encourage tailored engagement formats (e.g. government-focused dialogue formats, parliamentary/judicial exchanges, practitioner-oriented sessions) while preserving the IGF's non-negotiating nature.

### 2) Stronger inclusion mechanisms (Global South, youth, marginalized groups)

- Use NRIs, Youth IGFs and regional IGFs as multipliers to reach underrepresented communities and to channel bottom-up priorities into MAG planning.
  - Promote capacity-building and mentoring for newcomers and underrepresented groups (including training on how to engage in intersessional work and submit session proposals).
  - Strengthen multilingualism and accessibility measures across the IGF cycle (communications, consultations, outputs).
- 3) Integrate inclusion into MAG planning and intersessional work
- Make inclusion goals explicit in programme design, session selection and main session development, focusing on overall programme balance rather than rigid box-ticking per session.
  - Ensure intersessional work (PNs, BPFs, DCs) and NRIs are more systematically integrated into thematic tracks and main sessions, so year-round work visibly shapes the annual programme.
- 4) Promote IGF outcomes beyond the IGF community
- Support the preparation of concise, audience-specific thematic outputs (briefs, summaries, infographics) suitable for dissemination in relevant UN and non-UN fora addressing similar issues (e.g. WSIS/CSTD/UNESCO, as well as G7/G20, EU initiatives, ICANN, FOC, etc.).
  - Encourage coordinated participation of the Secretariat, Leadership Panel and relevant MAG members in key external moments to increase uptake of IGF results.

This would help expand the IGF's reach, strengthen inclusivity and ensure that IGF discussions and outputs have greater visibility and practical influence across the wider digital governance ecosystem.

#### 1. Strengthen the IGF narrative for decision-makers and wider audiences

The MAG should play a stronger role in articulating why the IGF matters, beyond its immediate community, by framing it as a policy-shaping, anticipatory and capacity-building space.

Messaging should be tailored to:

Governments (executive, legislative, judicial): policy intelligence, regulatory foresight, peer learning;

Private sector: risk anticipation, regulatory coherence, responsible innovation;

Civil society and academia: rights, accountability, evidence-based policy;

Technical community: operational expertise informing policy;

Intergovernmental organisations: coordination and coherence across mandates. To strengthen the work with OECD.

Clearer, audience-specific narratives would significantly broaden engagement.

#### 2. Develop a more deliberate media and communications strategy

A stronger focus on media engagement is essential to increase the IGF's visibility and reach.

Identify key messages emerging from IGF discussions and intersessional work that are relevant for wider public debate.

Encourage more systematic engagement with international, regional and national media before, during and after the IGF.

Support MAG members with concise, media-friendly talking points and summaries.

This would help position the IGF as a relevant reference point in global digital policy debates.

#### 3. Use MAG members as ambassadors and multipliers

MAG members are well placed to act as multipliers of the IGF by promoting its work through:

national and regional policy fora;

parliamentary briefings;

sector-specific events and conferences.

Providing MAG members with clear communication materials would strengthen this ambassadorial role.

#### 4. Leverage NRIs as key multipliers, with Secretariat support

NRIs should be more systematically supported — in close coordination with the Secretariat — to serve as multipliers of:

IGF priorities;  
intersessional work (PNs, BPFs, DCs);  
key messages emerging from annual IGF meetings.

This includes:

supporting dissemination at national and regional level;  
encouraging media engagement through NRIs;  
strengthening direct interaction between NRIs and the MAG.

#### 5. Lower barriers to participation in MAG discussions and intersessional work

To foster inclusive engagement, the MAG should ensure:

clearer explanations of processes and entry points;  
simplified documentation and timelines;  
predictable opportunities for input.

This is particularly important for stakeholders with limited resources or institutional backing.

#### 6. Strengthen capacity-building and mentoring pathways

Sustained inclusion requires investment in people.

Expand mentoring and onboarding mechanisms linked to MAG and intersessional work.

Encourage co-facilitation and leadership roles for youth and new voices.

Ensure participation leads to concrete skills, networks and learning outcomes.

#### 7. Improve visibility and usability of IGF outputs

Participation is reinforced when impact is visible.

Present outputs in accessible, policy-relevant formats.

Show clearly how multistakeholder inputs influence discussions and outcomes.

Close feedback loops with contributors.

#### 8. Use the permanence of the IGF to build sustained engagement

With the IGF now permanent, outreach should shift from episodic efforts to long-term engagement strategies, building trust, continuity and cumulative participation across cycles.

See my answer above. It seems like those high level sessions are undermining the fostering of inclusive multistakeholder participation. Therefore I suggest to refrain from that approach. I also suggest to approach governments explicitly to engage them in the IGF in order to enable more participation of parliamentarians. The same counts for industry which should not only show case their products and services on IGF stages but should engage also in critical questions like safety issues etc.

The Secretariat needs a dedicated communications team with a communication strategy, plan, and budget

Continued updates and information sharing, including how working with the NRIs.

This heavily depends on more concrete and actionable IGF outcomes. Actionable outcomes that are targeted to relevant societal issues, from one side, and to specific stakeholders (and particularly decision-making bodies and spaces), from another side, would attract much more attention from these various types of stakeholders. They would be much more interested in helping shape the IGF programme, in attending the event, and in influencing its outcomes.

A better staffed Secretariat, or a hired third-party service, could prepare these targeted outcomes, under close supervision of the MAG and taking into account the contributions from all sessions of the annual IGF, from all intersessional workstreams and from the NRIs. A dedicated MAG working group on outreach and engagement, which already existed in past years, could be permanently responsible for this task, together with the Secretariat.

Secretariat needs more capacity to do this work and MAG Members should support them.

I think we should be also much more inclusive also with Europe. Youth we should include, but I think with this new technologies - generation Z could have a big problem in the work. So we should be very actual.

16. How could the MAG better explore fundraising opportunities for contributions to the IGF trust fund?

The MAG could strengthen fundraising by actively engaging UN agencies and supporting partners, highlighting IGF's formal integration into the UN following the last WSIS High-Level Event. This includes aligning proposals with UN development and digital policy priorities, showcasing IGF impact, and fostering partnerships that encourage financial and in-kind contributions.

Leveraging MAG networks to engage governments, the private sector, and donors in the IGF and communicating its impact. More transparency on funding needs and uses, with diversified contribution models, would encourage sustained support.

Dedicated MAG Members — particularly those from the private sector and governments — could be supported through a donor-management system, including appropriate information materials, established by the Secretariat.

After the December 2025 agreement in UN, and the world geopolitics nowadays, there may be more countries and/or private enterprises, willing to contribute.

Apart from supporting the IGFSAs, members can dedicate a session to discussing the subject matter. It is in such discussions that actionable ideas evolve.

While remaining within its advisory role, the MAG could support a more diversified, inclusive and predictable fundraising approach for the IGF Trust Fund.

In particular, the MAG could:

- encourage the exploration of tiered and smaller-scale contributions, enabling participation also from universities, research centres, SMEs, civil society organisations and other smaller stakeholders that are strongly engaged in the IGF ecosystem but unable to provide large contributions;
- support the development of simple and transparent online fundraising mechanisms, including user-friendly digital donation tools and clear communication on how contributions support specific IGF activities (e.g. intersessional work, NRIs, youth participation, multilingualism);
- act as a network of voluntary ambassadors, helping raise awareness within members' own communities and institutions of opportunities to support the IGF financially;
- encourage recognition mechanisms that acknowledge contributors in a transparent and non-preferential manner, consistent with UN financial rules.

Such an approach would broaden the IGF's funding base, strengthen community ownership and enhance the long-term sustainability of the IGF ecosystem.

1. Clarify and communicate the value proposition for contributors

Fundraising efforts should be grounded in a clear narrative explaining:

- what the IGF Trust Fund supports (participation, inclusion, intersessional work, Secretariat capacity);
- how contributions translate into concrete outcomes (e.g. broader Global South participation, youth engagement, improved outputs);
- why supporting the IGF strengthens global digital cooperation.

A clearer value proposition makes it easier for potential contributors to justify support.

2. Diversify the donor base

The MAG could encourage a more diversified funding base, reducing reliance on a limited number of contributors, by engaging:

- governments beyond traditional donors;
- private sector actors with a demonstrated commitment to responsible digital governance;
- foundations and philanthropic organisations aligned with digital inclusion, development and rights;
- regional and sectoral organisations.
- Diversification strengthens resilience and perceived neutrality.

### 3. Use MAG members as facilitators of outreach (not fundraisers)

While the MAG should not directly solicit funds, MAG members can:

- identify potential contributors within their networks;
- facilitate introductions or informal conversations;
- help communicate the IGF's relevance to different constituencies.

This “connector” role respects governance boundaries while expanding opportunities.

### 4. Link funding appeals to clearly defined priorities

Fundraising is more effective when linked to specific, well-defined priorities, such as:

- support for participation from the Global South and marginalised groups;
- youth engagement and capacity-building;
- intersessional work producing policy-relevant outputs;
- improved accessibility and multilingualism.

Clear priorities increase confidence and accountability.

### 5. Strengthen transparency and reporting on use of funds

Clear, accessible reporting on:

- how funds are allocated;
- what outcomes they enable;
- lessons learned and impact,
- would build trust and encourage repeat and new contributions.

Transparency is a key enabler of sustainable funding.

### 6. Coordinate closely with the Secretariat on fundraising strategy

- The Secretariat is best placed to manage fundraising operationally. The MAG can support by:
- providing strategic guidance on priorities;
- helping align fundraising messages with IGF objectives and WSIS+20 follow-up;
- ensuring coherence between programme ambitions and available resources.

### 7. Explore innovative and non-traditional funding approaches

Without compromising independence, the MAG could encourage exploration of:

- multi-year pledges rather than one-off contributions;
- pooled or thematic funding windows;
- in-kind contributions (e.g. services, expertise, outreach support), where appropriate.

These approaches can enhance predictability and sustainability.

An additional avenue worth exploring is whether a modest and predictable contribution from the domain name ecosystem could support the sustainability of the IGF Trust Fund.

In particular, consideration could be given to whether a certain percentage of revenues or profits from ccTLD managers, on a voluntary and context-sensitive basis, could be allocated to support the IGF. This would recognise the fact that ccTLDs benefit directly from a stable, secure and globally coordinated Internet governance environment.

This approach would be consistent in principle with existing practices in the gTLD space, where ICANN already allocates resources derived from gTLD-related activities to support the IGF and broader Internet governance ecosystem.

Any such exploration would need to:

- fully respect the autonomy, diversity and national contexts of ccTLD managers;
- remain voluntary and non-prescriptive;
- be developed in close dialogue with relevant stakeholders.

If carefully framed, this could contribute to greater sustainability, predictability and shared responsibility for funding the IGF, while reinforcing its multistakeholder

This is related to my answer to Q29. The more government and industry engage in the IGF as a real platform for exchange the more both will be ready to provide funding. Probably they should be granted the right to have a say how and where their funds should be spent, f.e. for travel support etc.

IGF need to participate in events outside of the UN to gain more visibility and provide meaningful contribution

Awareness of value of the IGF, and importance to industry, governments, private sector, entities relying on the Internet and thus the information society.

A dedicated MAG working group on funding could be permanently responsible for this task, together with the Secretariat. A professional third-party service could be hired, depending on available budget or a dedicated sponsorship. Targeted and actionable outcomes, as explained in my answer to the previous question, would be particularly helpful in outreach to potential donors.

The MAG can play a part in generating funding for the IGF; however, it should be understood as an actor working with other institutional IGF actors, particularly the Leadership Panel and the Secretariat. With the WSIS+20 now adopted, there is a focus on the need for a sustainable funding model that draws on diverse sources (i.e. not primarily UN budgetary support); the UN Secretary-General has invited to “submit a proposal to the General Assembly during its eightieth session to ensure sustainable funding for the Forum.” The IGF community, including the MAG, should ensure an active role in developing such a proposal - for the MAG to effectively contribute, this may require a dedicated, one-off MAG working group, or a sub-group within an existing working group (such as the MAG Working Group on Strategy and Strengthening the IGF).

Involve them more in developing a long term strategy and plan which is the basis of fund raising. Do more serious Mand E. Learn and document and apply lessons more effectively.

To be strong and powerful event. Maybe less days event, but very important.

17. Any additional comments or suggestions regarding **MAG working modalities** and/or the **MAG Terms of Reference**?

Enhance MAG effectiveness by clarifying roles, improving workload balance, strengthening intersessional coordination, ensuring transparent decision-making, and integrating performance-based renewal and accountability mechanisms in the Terms of Reference.

Encourage participation of MAG in their own local or regional NRIs

Building on the Tunis Agenda, the WSIS+20 Outcome Document and the Global Digital Compact, the IGF should be increasingly understood and operationalised as a year-round, distributed multistakeholder ecosystem, rather than solely as an annual event.

In this context, the MAG can play a key role—together with the IGF Secretariat and complementing the Leadership Panel—in ensuring coherence, continuity and impact across the IGF ecosystem. This includes supporting the aggregation and synthesis of bottom-up inputs, strengthening linkages with National and Regional IGFs, and facilitating the visibility and uptake of IGF outcomes in relevant UN

and non-UN processes.

These adjustments do not require changes to the MAG Terms of Reference, but rather a more explicit and strategic implementation of the IGF's existing mandate, as reaffirmed through WSIS+20.

The MAG's proposed adjustments aim to operationalize the IGF mandate as set out in the Tunis Agenda, in particular its role in facilitating dialogue across policy bodies, interfacing with relevant institutions, identifying emerging issues and promoting WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.

1. Reflect the permanence of the IGF more explicitly

- With the IGF now permanent, the MAG Terms of Reference and working modalities could more clearly reflect a shift from an annual, event-centric focus to greater continuity, coherence and strategic oversight across cycles, while fully preserving the MAG's advisory and multistakeholder nature.

2. Clarify roles, responsibilities and interfaces

Greater clarity in the Terms of Reference regarding:

- the respective roles of the MAG, the Chair, the Secretariat and other IGF structures;
- interfaces with intersessional work, NRIs and the host country;
- would improve coordination, manage expectations and reduce duplication.

3. Strengthen provisions on working methods and decision-making

The Terms of Reference could more explicitly reference:

- structured decision-making processes;
- clearer distinction between issues for information, discussion and decision;
- use of Working Groups as time-bound, purpose-driven tools.

This would enhance transparency and effectiveness without adding rigidity.

4. Embed stronger onboarding and continuity mechanisms

Working modalities should explicitly recognise the importance of:

- structured onboarding for new MAG members;
- mentoring and knowledge transfer;
- preservation of institutional memory.

These elements are increasingly important given rotation and the complexity of MAG responsibilities.

5. Encourage balanced workload distribution and realistic commitments

- The MAG's working modalities could better acknowledge:
- limits to individual availability;
- the need for realistic workload allocation;
- the importance of commitment-based participation in Working Groups.
- This would support sustainability and effectiveness.

6. Reinforce inclusiveness while safeguarding effectiveness

- While openness remains a core principle, the Terms of Reference could better reflect the need to balance inclusiveness with focused, efficient working methods, including differentiated roles (e.g. core contributors and observers) where appropriate.

The MAG ToR is relatively good but no performance measurements are taken or reported.

A small ad-hoc group of the MAG 2026 should make an overall assessment of the working modalities of the MAG and other components of the IGF ecosystem (particularly BPFs, PNs, and DCs) considering the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines. A report should be prepared, with concrete recommendations of improvements, to be discussed with the MAG and with the community.

As requested by the outcome declaration of the NETmundial+10 event, the IGF should take the role of caretaker of the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines. This could be done, for instance, by a

dedicated MAG working group, although other solutions would also be feasible. The MAG should take a decision on that regard, during the first months of 2026.

Look at the governance and oversight of the entire IGF. There is currently no external oversight or support IGF for the Secretariat. No board or advisory committee . The MAG IS just responsible for the annual event. The LP for outreach. Clarity is needed across the IGF institutional framework.

To ensure that MAG knows each other, that could be a very strong motivator/catalysator of ecosystem and also to have this informal meetings, which could finish earlier (19:00,) and could be on our own charge, (not very expensive) or another activities, not very demandant. It could be a common breakfast, or really something simple, but to create the strong community.