

IGF 2021
First Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group Meeting
22–24 February 2021 | Online

Summary report

Action items & next steps

1. Issues and themes for IGF 2021

- The Secretariat and MAG Chair to produce a document which captures consensus emerging so far (from the Open Consultations, the MAG discussions, and the call for input) around key themes, while also including specific issues/policy questions (where those have been indicated). Timeline: before the MAG meeting on 9 March.
- The MAG to review this document and decide whether it is enough to make a decision on issues/policy questions/themes, or whether further input should be sought.

2. IGF 2021 format and design

- An updated proposal on IGF 2021 format and design to be circulated with the MAG for further input. Timeline: before the MAG meeting on 9 March.
- The Secretariat and the MAG Chair to integrate input (from this meeting, further MAG input, and input from the WG-Hybrid) into a revised proposal to form the basis for a MAG decision.

3. IGF intersessional work

- The MAG to further review and comment on the proposal for the PNMA.
- The Secretariat to assess all proposed BPFs and PNs, consider MAG input, and determine what is possible in terms of allocating resources. The MAG will be kept informed.

4. MAG working groups

- The MAG to take into account the WG-Strategy's proposals on IGF 2021 process and design (e.g. the issue-driven approach to the IGF programme) in its work towards a more focused and outcome-oriented IGF programme and process.
- WG-OE and the proposed WG-Comms to get together and develop a common work plan (to enable the integration of WG-Comms within WG-OE).
- WG-Strategy, WG-Hybrid and the strengthened WG-OE (integrating the proposed WG-Comms) to go ahead with their work.
- Once all working groups have finalised their documentation (work plan/terms of reference/etc.), the Secretariat to ensure all this is published on the IGF website, together with information on facilitators, members, and how others can participate.
- Consideration to be given to the recommendations of WG-Language, which has concluded its work. The Secretariat to:

- Draft a document that outlines the different ways in which the IGF supports and encourages linguistic diversity.
- Launch periodic calls for volunteers to translate IGF documents.
- Follow up with UN DESA on exploring the possibility of producing official translations of key messages from IGF 2020 into UN official languages.
- Work with MAG members and previous IGF host countries to enable the unofficial translation of some of the shorter components of the IGF 2020 outputs.
- The Secretariat and the MAG to consider developing a broad outline on how WGs operate.
- The MAG to consider the need for the Working Group on Workshop Process to be re-activated, once decisions are made regarding the themes/issues for IGF 2021.
- The MAG to take all WGs recommendations into account to the fullest extent as the planning of IGF 2021 continues.

5. Consultations on the proposed MHLB

- MAG members to distribute the [questionnaire on the proposed MHLB](#) among their networks.

1. The [First Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group \(MAG\) Meeting](#) of the IGF 2021 preparatory cycle took place online, on 22–24 February 2021. Ms. Anriette Esterhuysen moderated the meeting as Chair of the MAG, together with Mr. Krzysztof Szubert, as the Host Country Co-chair for 2021. Mr. Juwang Zhu and Mr. Wai-Min Kwok represented the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), and Mr. Chengetai Masango represented the IGF Secretariat.

Attached to this summary report are: a summary of, and reports from the breakout groups on themes and topics for IGF 2021 ([Annex I](#)); a list of collaborative documents used by the breakout groups on IGF 2021 format and design ([Annex II](#)); the meeting agenda and materials ([Annex III](#)).

I. Introductions

2. The [agenda](#) of the three-day meeting focused on a broad range of issues, from the programme, structure and format of IGF 2021, to intersessional activities and MAG working groups. [Transcripts and video recordings](#) from the proceedings can be accessed via the IGF website.

3. The Open Consultations and the MAG meeting were opened by Ms. Esterhuysen and Mr. Masango, who welcomed participants and gave brief overviews of the meetings' procedures, agendas and goals.

4. Mr. Zhu highlighted several key points from [the letter sent to the MAG](#) by the UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, Mr. Liu Zhenmin, and praised the MAG for the time and energy dedicated to implementing the vision and values of the IGF. He commended Poland for having supported IGF 2020 in addition to acting as host for IGF 2021, and thanked the IGF community for the responses to the various calls for input. Mr. Zhu also noted that UN DESA

stands ready to contribute to further strengthening the IGF and bringing its outcomes to policymakers around the world.

5. Mr. Szubert expressed his trust that, based on community input, a highly relevant programme will be developed for IGF 2021, and reiterated Poland's readiness to work with everyone involved for a successful IGF. Mr. Przemek Typiak then gave an update on the state of preparations for IGF 2021 (e.g. logistics, venue, plans for strengthening participation).

II. IGF 2020 stock taking and considerations for 2021

6. Mr. Masango gave an overview of the input received during the IGF 2020 feedback process and the key points raised during the 9 February Open Consultations, highlighting calls for:

- A more concise and coherent IGF programme, with fewer and more interactive sessions. For instance, based on the call for issues, select three-four themes, and three specific policy questions per theme. Invite workshops to explore those questions, while also reserving a space for 'other' workshops.
- Have a more output-oriented meeting. Ensure more clarity on outputs/messages: maybe fewer but clearer outcomes; better integrate the different types of outcomes into a single outcome document.
- A hybrid meeting to ensure that online participants have the same opportunities as onsite participants. Side-events and preparatory events to be held online.
- Attract more participation and engagement from stakeholders such as youth, governments and parliaments, the private sector, and communities not involved so far.
- Improve the connections among intersessional tracks, and between them and other global processes.
- Develop a comprehensive communications plan.
- Simplify access to the online platform and the dedicated meeting page. Enable more interactivity within the online platform. Don't begin the discussion on tech, but on what we need and want; objectives should drive the platform(s), the session design, and how everything is communicated.



- ❖ [Synthesis of the contributions](#) taking stock of IGF 2020 and looking forward to IGF 2021
- ❖ [Summary report](#) of the 9 February Open Consultations and MAG meeting

7. Ms. Esterhuysen presented a summary of community input related to IGF improvements (as received during the stocktaking process):

- Evolve the IGF towards a year-round platform focused on a continuous collection of inputs and addressing them through a multistakeholder effort.
- The IGF could act as an observatory on Internet governance (IG) issues, processes, outcomes and events.
- Foster closer linkages with WSIS processes and with the UN General Assembly.
- Expand the activities carried out by the MAG.

- Support for improving the IGF in line with the IGF Plus model described in the Roadmap for Digital Cooperation. Support for the Roadmap’s proposed Multistakeholder High-Level Body (MHLB) as an integral part of the IGF architecture.
- Expectations of good cooperation between the Office of the Tech Envoy and the IGF.

8. Ms. Esterhuysen called on the community to build on the continuity of the IGF while being open to change and innovation. She took note of the strong support for a hybrid IGF to maximise the opportunities for inclusion and participation, and recalled the need to ensure a balance between the calls for a more focused and outcome-oriented IGF and the need to not exclude the participation of people and communities with specific concerns and perspectives.



[Draft timeline for the IGF 2021 process](#) (with details on next meetings, launch of various calls, etc.)

III. Issues and themes for IGF 2021

9. Ms. Sorina Teleanu, IGF Secretariat, presented an overview of the proposals received in response to the call for issues. The [231 submissions](#) received accounted for 507 individual issues. These issues were grouped into 53 clusters and 10 themes:

- **Inclusion** (116 proposals): Expanding Internet infrastructure; Inclusion of disadvantaged communities; Online education; Universal access; Capacity development; Access to and development of online content/resources; Gender inclusion; Meaningful Internet access; Digital inclusion; Youth inclusion.
- **Security and trust** (70): Internet safety; Online trust and content policy; Cybersecurity – other issues; Encryption; Network/infrastructure security; Responsible state behaviour in cyberspace; Cybercrime; Cyber-resilience; Internet/digital trust.
- **Digital rights and freedoms** (69): Freedoms in the digital space; Protecting human rights in the digital space; Children's rights; Digital rights and equality; Digital authoritarianism and digital surveillance; Internet restrictions.
- **Sustainability and environment** (61): Digitalisation, development and sustainability; Internet, digital tech and environment; Internet, digital tech and climate; Internet and digital tech in the context of COVID-19 crisis and post-COVID recovery; Digital health.
- **Economic issues** (45): Regulating Big Tech; Future of work; Consumer protection; Digital economy, innovation and growth; Digital currencies; Digital tax.
- **Data** (40): Data privacy; Data governance; Data availability and use.
- **IG ecosystem** (36): IGF and national, regional and youth initiatives (NRIs); Inclusion within IG and policy spaces; Challenges to current IG approaches.
- **New and emerging technologies**: Artificial intelligence (AI); Internet of things (IoT); Implications of emerging technologies; Blockchain; New communication technologies; Quantum computing.
- **Digital cooperation** (27): Digital (inter)dependence; Digital cooperation; Digital public goods.
- **Technical issues**: Standardisation; Critical Internet resources (CIR).



- ❖ [Overview of proposed issues](#) (slides)
- ❖ [Spreadsheet](#) with all issues per theme and cluster

10. During the Open Consultations, participants were divided into ten groups and invited to further discuss how to design a narrower and more focused programme for IGF 2021. Below is a synthesis of the groups' proposals on potential key themes. A more detailed summary, as well as the full reports submitted by the groups are available in [Annex I](#).

Potential themes for IGF 2021 to focus on, as suggested by the breakout groups

(listed by how frequently they appeared in the group's reports; variations also counted)

- ❖ *Security and trust* (6)
 - Variations: *Digital cooperation and trust; Security, safety and trust*
- ❖ *Digital rights and freedoms* (5)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Data and digital rights; Digital inclusion, rights and freedoms; Implementing values and rights*
 - It could also be an overarching theme, spanning all others.
- ❖ *(Access and) inclusion* (4)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Digital cooperation and inclusion*
- ❖ *Digital cooperation* (4)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Internet governance and digital cooperation; Governance and cooperation*
 - Also suggested: Digital cooperation as an overarching/main theme
- ❖ *Sustainability and environment* (2)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Environmental, social and economic sustainability*
- ❖ *New and emerging technologies* (2)
 - Variations: Could also be tackled under different themes (Inclusion, Security and trust)
- ❖ *Technology* (merging New and emerging tech, Technical issues, parts of Data) (1)
 - Also support for *Technical issues* to be integrated within other themes
- ❖ *Digital economy* (1)

11. During the MAG meeting, discussions continued on issues and themes, and the following key points were raised:

- While there seemed to be some emerging consensus on the themes, consideration should also be given to **starting with identifying very specific issues/policy questions and using those for finalising the themes/building the programme.**

- The decision on IGF 2021 themes/issues should not be based solely on the Open Consultation discussions; the initial community input should also be considered (it was clear there, for instance, that the Inclusion theme received most proposals). The outcomes of IGF 2020 present a rich pool of issues and questions that could be further considered in the programming of IGF 2021.
- There were also suggestions to further consult dynamic coalitions (DCs), best practice forums (BPFs) and NRIs to identify specific issues and policy questions for IGF 2021 to focus on. This could be done before a call for session proposals.
- A proposal was made to look at issues through the lens of the evolution of IG topics and issues during the global pandemic.

12. Action items & next steps

- The Secretariat and MAG Chair to produce a document which captures consensus emerging so far (from the Open Consultations, the MAG discussions, and the call for input) around key themes, while also including specific issues/policy questions (where those have been indicated). Timeline: before the MAG meeting on 9 March.
- The MAG to review this document and decide whether it is enough to make a decision on issues/policy questions/themes, or whether further input should be sought.

IV. Shaping the IGF 2021 programmes (format, structure, flow)

13. The MAG meeting started with a discussion on the format, structure and flow of IGF 2021. Ms. Esterhuysen presented the following proposal for the IGF 2021 process and format.

Proposals for IGF2021 process and format for the consideration of the MAG

A. Key considerations to take into account based on stocktaking feedback:

- Develop a more focused and outcome oriented programme BUT not at the expense of inclusivity and participation.
- Better integrate intersessional work and youth participation in the overall programme
- Adopt an 'issue-driven' approach to programme development (proposal by the MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy)).
- Decide on format and process early on in the year.
- Adopt a hybrid format and do not revert to only previous forms of a face to face event with 'remote' participation for those not present which, in spite of everyone's best efforts, still results in reduced participation. This would mean ensuring equal participation opportunities for onsite and online participants. To reinforce this, make it a requirement that all sessions have at least one remote speaker. This could contribute to changing the usual way of remote people just listening in to people at the venue. Also consider having at least one session being projected in Katowice with only remote speakers.
- Accommodate non-CET time zones.
- Limit parallel sessions. Having no more than 3 in 2020 received positive feedback. Definitely no more than three.
- Have fewer sessions as a whole.

- No more than three thematic tracks and a limited number of sub-themes within each thematic track.
- Reduce the length of the face to face event to no more than the previous format of 5 days (4 days for the main event plus one additional day).
- Distinguish clearly between pre-events and the 'main event'.
- For virtual participation/events ensure a more participative and friendly platform.
- Simplify the registration process and access to the platform.
- For the online platform, make sure that participants can see who other participants are in the room and be able to chat with them. This will provide further networking opportunities.
- Facilitate inclusion of sessions that address topics that are not related to the primary programme issues and themes.
- Re-introduce lightning talks to unburden the programme (and to accommodate urgent and new issues not part of the primary thematic focus).
- Retain the pre-meeting guide to issues and themes introduced in 2020 but ensure it is available earlier in the cycle.
- Maximum duration of any session to be 90 minutes.
- Networking sessions

B. Proposals from the Secretariat and the MAG Chair for IGF 2021

1. An issue-driven approach to the selection of themes and issues

- a. Consider the MAG WG-Strategy's proposals for 'A more focused and inter-connected IGF agenda'. This approach is not entirely new. The MAG has always looked at issues.
- b. The difference is that this approach would start with identifying specific issues and then based on those agree on main thematic tracks – as opposed to starting with broad generic tracks and then looking for specific issues.
- c. The WG-Strategy proposals include detailed suggestions on how the MAG can use the initial call (which was closed on 31 January) to identify specific policy issues, and then to proceed with a further call for more specific input from the community on these issues prior to putting out a call for session proposals.
- d. Use this issue-driven approach to integrate the IGF programme more closely with that of NRIs, as well as of other policy fora including the WSIS Forum, multi-stakeholder events, stakeholder specific events (e.g. RightsCon) and intergovernmental fora.
- e. A vehicle for facilitating this would be the 'guide to issues and themes' which was introduced in 2020.
- f. View the proposals from WG-Strategy here:
https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/11159/2418

2. Adopt the practice of a phased IGF consisting of:

- a. Phase 1 [6 to 1 month before IGF]: Preparatory phase consisting of virtual events as well as face to face components - where possible - in collaboration with NRIs.
- b. Phase 2 [IGF - 2 weeks] : A few key pre-events which are held virtually prior to the IGF
- c. Phase 3 [Day 0 + IGF]: A hybrid event made up of 4+1 days in Katowice from 6 to 10 December

Note: the week before IGF [week IGF -1] to be kept clear for travelling and other practical preparations

3. More about the proposed 'Preparatory phase' – Phase 1

- a. Maximise inclusion by being virtual.
- b. Include a mid-year virtual event for intersessional modalities such as BPFs and DCs and PNs to present ongoing work, for outreach, get feedback, and to facilitate closer cooperation between modalities and with NRIs.
- c. Include capacity building for session organisers.

4. More about the proposed 'Pre-event phase' – Phase 2

Host a SHORT virtual preparatory phase. In this phase, organise webinars on intersessional work in a leadup to the IGF 2021 in other than CET major time zones, as well as hosting of some sessions (TBD with ones. Maybe offer a choice to session applicants?)

5. More about the proposed 'Annual Forum' – Phase 3

- a. Add a shorter session format to the options currently available. Shorter sessions can help session organisers and participants to be more focused in planning and running the session, for instance through avoiding long speeches/presentations, staying to the point and focusing primarily on the discussion. This can work well with a more focused agenda where shorter sessions can tackle a specific aspect of the main issue/s.
- b. No more than three parallel sessions.
- c. Reduce total number of sessions. One way to achieve this could be to encourage organisations to team up and apply for workshops together. Some have already done this in the past, but if we say from the start that this year there will be fewer sessions, and then we encourage submissions for co-organised sessions (maybe even give them some sort of priority /extra points in the evaluation), that might result in less submissions (making it easier for the MAG to select fewer workshops).
- d. Reintroduce 'flash sessions' to unburden the programme and to accommodate topics not covered by the overall focus.
- e. Hybrid format to be integrated by for example the IGF Village having both face to face and virtual elements.
- f. All session organised to make use of the online platform even if they are present 'face to face' and session moderators to ensure online participants have a priority in the onsite meeting when intervening. Guidelines on this to be developed.

6. More about the hybrid format

The MAG WG on Hybrid Meetings (WG-Hybrid) has just started to do its work but are already recommending the following:

- a. MAG to endorse guidelines for organizers and moderators on how to ensure session interactivity with speakers and other participants; and how to treat online and onsite participants equally. (For instance, the online chats should also benefit from a moderator, someone who can not only engage online participants, but also ensure that what is discussed in the chat is fed into the main debate - (not only direct questions, but the whole discussion in the chat, which often is very rich).
- b. Session organisers to be familiarised with how to maximise interactive nature of different formats and dedicated capacity building to be made available beforehand.
- c. Each session to prepare briefing materials on what to expect from the discussion and gather questions beforehand from those prevented to participate at the annual meeting sessions due to time zone challenges.

14. Discussions on the IGF 2021 format and design followed in six breakout groups. A summary of the group's discussions is presented below. Links to the collaborative documents used by the groups are listed in [Annex II](#).

Breakout groups on IGF 2021 format and design | Summary of outputs

1. Phased IGF annual meeting

- One group asked for more clarity on the presented proposal for a three-phased IGF annual meeting.
- One group concluded that the proposed preparatory phase is too long, given that the last quarter of the year is expected to be very busy with other international events.
- One group noted that a phased IGF could be implemented if the session organizers are comfortable with that.
- One group said that the proposed preparatory phase does not need to exclude the traditional day 0 hosted onsite in Katowice.
- The phased IGF should be structured in a way to include specific types of sessions. The in-person meeting in Katowice could include up to 60 sessions (also counting the opening and closing sessions, the high-level levels track and the parliamentary track).
- Groups supported that the meeting in Katowice is held during the venue's work hours.

2. Tracks and sessions

- Groups supported reducing the number of sessions and having fewer parallel tracks. One group recommended no more than four tracks in parallel.
- In addition to having three main themes, one group called for creating spaces on the margins of the meeting for addressing other themes.
- Groups underlined that parallel sessions should focus on different policy issues.
- One group recommended that the maximum duration of the session is 60 min. Another group recommended retaining longer formats of 90 min. for sessions whose formats require that duration. There was also a group which recommended shorter flash sessions of up to 30 min. are encouraged.
- For the onsite phase, given that the social distancing measures may still be in place, the session formats should allow more time for the meeting rooms cleaning. Therefore, shorter session formats of around 45 min. were recommended.
- The session formats could include one onsite and one online moderator. They need to allocate time for a meaningful Q&A discussion. Use of slides should not be encouraged.
- One group supported merging sessions on a similar topic. Another group, however, underlined that stakeholders well-experienced in submitting session proposals should not be encouraged to merge beforehand, because that could result in privileging these groups against those less experienced, and in diminishing the meeting's diversity.
- Session formats should allow for equal treatment of online and onsite participants.
- For meaningful inclusion of young people, the concept of youth should be defined.
- The phased IGF should allow for different session formats, such as:
 - Breakout rooms (phase 2)
 - Small groups with a notetaker in each
 - Plenary (hosted in the onsite meeting in Katowice, phase 3)
 - Panelist discuss major points discussed in breakouts

- Lightning rounds (10 min.)
- Research results session (30 min.)
- Round tables (90 min). In this format, it was said that a main theme is crucial to guide discussions with no more than 3 key speakers to moderate conversation.

3. Online participation platform

- Groups recommended not to use the webinar-form of Zoom as it does not allow for interaction between participants.

15. Several additional points were raised by meeting participants and further clarified by the MAG Chair and the Secretariat:

- Consider offering a wide variety of types and lengths of sessions to allow session organisers to choose from. While some sessions could benefit from being shorter (45–60 min.), others might still need to be kept within the traditional 90 min..
- Consider developing networking opportunities around existing structures/communities, such as the DCs or BPFs.
- Any discussion on adapting the main event (in Katowice) to other time zones should consider increases in costs. Using the pre-events and the preparatory phases, with events held in various time zones, could help avoid this.
- A hybrid approach does not mean that all sessions have to be hybrid; some sessions could be held exclusively online.
- A question was raised on whether the 4-day main event should include sessions curated by the MAG and UN DESA (e.g. workshops, main sessions, the high-level track) and then have everything else (DCs, BPFs, open forums, NRIs) in the pre-events/preparatory phases (while ensuring that they feed into the main event).
- The function of online moderator should be introduced, to ensure that the audience – including the online one – is kept active.
- A suggestion was made to consider NRIs as potential hosts of mid-year gatherings of DCs, BPFs, etc. This could also help better connect IGF workstreams with NRIs.
- Another suggestion was to offer youth an opportunity to host side-events.

16. Action items & next steps

- An updated proposal on IGF 2021 format and design to be circulated with the MAG for further input. Timeline: before the MAG meeting on 9 March.
- The Secretariat and the MAG Chair to integrate input (from this meeting, further MAG input, and input from the WG-Hybrid) into a revised proposal to form the basis for a MAG decision.

V. IGF intersessional work

17. To set the scene for the discussions on intersessional work, Mr. Wim Degezelle gave an overview of how DCs, BPFs, and the newly introduced policy networks (PN) work and how they related to the MAG and the Secretariat. NRIs were also included into this overview, although they are formally considered stand-alone and independent initiatives.



18. Mr. Markus Kummer, DC Coordination Group facilitator, explained that IGF intersessional work started with **DCs**, which emerged spontaneously at the first IGF in 2006. At that point there was little guidance on how DCs should operate. Later on the [DC Coordination Group \(DCCG\)](#) was formed to foster closer cooperation between DCs; the group also developed a set of common principles for DCs to abide by, and has ensured that DCs are well represented at annual IGF meetings (through the DC main session). In 2021, the DCCG – with Secretariat support – will develop a paper to document past experiences of DCs and look into how they could be improved (in terms of internal work, coordination, and feeding into the broader IGF processes). The intention is to have the paper finalised by the end of October 2021, through a process that will also include open consultations.

19. In response to questions from MAG members, the following clarifications were offered:

- DCs are self-organising communities and have so far produced substantive work. Individual DCs are not supported by the IGF Secretariat, but support is offered to the DCCG.
- BPFs, because they emerged from MAG deliberations, are supported by the Secretariat. Consultants are allocated to act as neutral pen holders, but they are not supposed to lead the process.
- PNs fall under the umbrella of the Secretariat's implementation and coordination and are to be allocated support.
- NRIs are supported in various ways by the Secretariat and UN DESA (coordinating their participation in annual IGF meetings, advising them on principles to follow, funds in support of capacity development, etc.). But there is no involvement in their individual discussions and work modalities.
- The Secretariat has a limited trust fund and budget. When more funds are allocated to a certain activity, less funds are available for other activities.
- In the case of BPFs in particular, decisions on allocating support are based not only on availability of resources, but also on the degree of commitment and engagement from the MAG and the community. The Secretariat takes into account MAG advice, while also looking at the depth of the proposed topics and work to see whether there is potential for meaningful outcomes. Sometimes it happens that the consultants drive the BPF processes, and this should not be the case.
- The parliamentary track is also expected to include intersessional work this year, allowing parliamentarians to produce a document before their session at IGF 2021 meeting.

20. Ms. Anja Gengo, IGF Secretariat, briefly presented the recently-launched [Policy Network on Environment and Digitalisation](#) (PNE). The initiative has received funding from the Swiss government. A consultant will soon be contracted to act as a neutral facilitator for the PNE work, which will be conducted in an open and inclusive manner (with public discussions via the mailing list, surveys, calls for contributions, etc.). A multistakeholder working group is being constituted to help facilitate the work. Ms. Esterhuysen added that the PNE and the proposed BPF on the governance of governmental data have met and started discussions on potential forms of collaboration.

21. Ms. Gengo then presented the **five BPF proposals** put forward by MAG members. Proposals for continuing BPFs:

- A [BPF on cybersecurity](#), to focus on the use of norms to foster trust and security.

- A [BPF on gender and digital rights](#), to explore gendered disinformation and its relation with gender-based violence and hate speech.
- A [BPF on local content](#), to focus on the development of local content in the context of community networks.

Proposals for new BPFs:

- A [BPF on the governance of environmental data](#), to gather best practices in this field.
- A [BPF on committed actions to make access to the Internet sustainable and affordable for everyone](#), to document policies and actions in this field.

22. Ms. Esterhuysen presented a proposal for the establishment of a **PN on meaningful access (PNMA)**, which could integrate two of the proposed BPFs (BPF on local content and BPF on committed actions to make access to the Internet sustainable and affordable for everyone). Such a PN would create a space within the IGF to (a) respond to the Roadmap for Digital Cooperation with regard to global connectivity, digital inclusion and digital capacity building; and (b) act as a connector between the many spaces and groups within and beyond the IGF that work on access issues (DCs, the previous [Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billions](#), BPFs, UN agencies such as the International Telecommunication Union and the UN Development Programme, the Alliance for Affordable Internet, etc.). The PNMA would explore existing recommendations and policies on access-related issues and see what is missing to ensure their effective implementation.



[Proposal for a Policy Network on Meaningful Access](#)

23. During the discussions on the proposed PNMA, the following key points were raised:

- Comments were made that the proposed BPF on committed actions to make access to the Internet sustainable and affordable for everyone would be better suited for a PN.
- Some concerns were raised regarding the integration of BPFs (and in particular the BPF on local content) within the PNMA, as it was felt that the tracks have different work modalities and objectives. Ms. Esterhuysen clarified that BPFs, even if integrated within PNs, would continue their work as planned, but in a way that is connected to the PNs. It was acknowledged that more clarity is indeed needed on how PNs and BPFs would interact and collaborate.
- A suggestion was made to give the PNMA more time to plan its work, while another comment noted that delaying the process should be avoided, even if the PN works in stages. It was also advised that the PNMA's first tasks should be to look at what has been done so far, where that work stands now, who and how continues to work, and how to connect with ongoing work taking place elsewhere.
- Some suggested that a different name is chosen for the PN, while others indicated support for keeping the proposed name.

24. Ms. Esterhuysen clarified that the final decision on BPFs and PNs and how to allocate support is to be taken by the IGF Secretariat, considering MAG input. She also took note of the calls to enable increased collaboration between BPFs, DCs, PNs and NRIs.

25. Action items & next steps

- The MAG to further review and comment on the proposal for the PNMA.
- The Secretariat to assess all proposed BPFs and PNs, consider MAG input, and determine what is possible in terms of allocating resources. The MAG will be kept informed.

26. Ms. Gengo spoke about the **collaboration with NRIs** in 2021:

- Consultations among NRIs have led to the development of a [work plan](#) detailing objectives and activities in areas such as cooperation with IGF intersessional workstreams, the development of an NRI observatory, engagement with governments and parliamentarians, communication and outreach, and capacity development.
- NRIs intend to finalise a publication on youth engagement and update a compendium on topics discussed at their meetings over the past two years.
- Regarding the IGF 2021 meeting, NRIs collaborative sessions are envisioned, as well as a strengthened involvement of NRIs in other sessions.

VI. MAG working groups (WGs)

27. Ms. Concentinna Cassa, former MAG member, and Ms. Livia Walpen, Swiss government (former IGF host country), presented the proposals put forward by the [WG-Strategy](#) in support of a more inclusive, strategic, impactful and sustainable IGF (e.g. a multi-year plan for the remaining years of the current IGF mandate; a more consistent issue-driven approach to the IGF programme development; strengthening and integrating intersessional activities). The WG has also made operational proposals for IGF 2021, suggesting, for instance, a more focused and interconnected IGF agenda, with no more than three focused policy issues/questions. These should be reflected in the workshop proposals, while adequate space should also be provided for discussion on additional topics.



All proposals made by WG-Strategy are detailed in the [group's report](#).

28. During the discussions, it was suggested to involve hosts of future IGF meetings in the work around the proposed multi-year plan. Another point was to enable more engagement in the programme development process, beyond the community submitting session proposals and the MAG scoring those proposals. Elements to be considered include putting out the programme for review, and actively identifying gaps in relation to the issues covered.

29. Ms. June Parris, former MAG member, outlined the key recommendations stemming out of the [WG on Outreach and Engagement](#) (WG-OE) with regard to enhancing communication (including via social media); planning diaries and roadmaps for IGF goals and activities so everyone is aware and can contribute; enhancing participation in IGF activities; and following through via reporting.

30. Mr. Karim Attoumani, MAG member, presented the recommendations made by [WG on Language](#) (WG-Language) with regard to issues such as translating key IGF messages into the six UN languages; giving stakeholders the opportunity to host pre-events in various languages;

considering the option of having sessions proposed and organised in various languages, for more diversity and inclusion.



All proposals made by WG-Language are detailed in [this document](#).

31. Issues raised during the discussions included:

- The need to connect the suggestion of allowing session proposals in multiple languages with the ability of the MAG to assess those proposals.
- A reminder that pre-events can already be held in languages other than English.
- A question of whether the Secretariat could provide statistics on visits to multilingual content on the IGF website.
- Suggestions to translate IGF messages, for instance with the support of previous host countries, previous and current MAG members, etc. These would be clearly marked as unofficial translations.

32. The Secretariat added a few additional points on language-related issues:

- The extent to which interpretation is used depends both on available resources and on justifying proposed uses. For instance, when French interpretation was offered at a previous Open Consultation, the option was not used, so repeating the experience for a subsequent meeting could not be justified.
- With regard to the translation of materials, official translations have to be done through UN channels, and this usually takes time (with the IGF being an extra-budgetary project). But the website is multilingual and some materials have been translated by volunteers.
- For the new IGF website, AI and machine translation tools are expected to be used extensively.

33. Ms. Courtney Radsch, MAG member, spoke about a proposed WG on communications (WG-Comms), which would focus on putting together best practices and approaches for improving IGF communications, both in relation to social media and news media. A suggestion to integrate this proposed work into the WG-OE was well received and is to be acted upon accordingly.

34. Ms. Tereza Horejsova and Mr. Adam Peake, MAG members, gave a recap of the [proposed WG-Hybrid](#), dedicated to focusing on the notion of a hybrid event that provides the same engagement and participation experiences for onsite and online participants. The next steps for the group would be to review what was achieved in 2020, taking into account comments from the community; look into successful experiences and lessons learnt from other organisations in running meetings; and assess how a hybrid event affects the agenda of the entire IGF.

35. Action items & next steps

- The MAG to take into account the WG-Strategy's proposals on IGF 2021 process and design (e.g. the issue-driven approach to the IGF programme) in its work towards a more focused and outcome-oriented IGF programme and process.
- WG-OE and the proposed WG-Comms to get together and develop a common work plan (to enable the integration of WG-Comms within WG-OE).
- WG-Strategy, WG-Hybrid and the strengthened WG-OE (integrating the proposed WG-Comms) to go ahead with their work.

- Once all working groups have finalised their documentation (work plan/terms of reference/etc.), the Secretariat to ensure all this is published on the IGF website, together with information on facilitators, members, and how others can participate.
- Consideration to be given to the recommendations of WG-Language, which has concluded its work. The Secretariat to:
 - Draft a document that outlines the different ways in which the IGF supports and encourages linguistic diversity.
 - Launch periodic calls for volunteers to translate IGF documents.
 - Follow up with UN DESA on exploring the possibility of producing official translations of key messages from IGF 2020 into UN official languages.
 - Work with MAG members and previous IGF host countries to enable the unofficial translation of some of the shorter components of the IGF 2020 outputs.
- The Secretariat and the MAG to consider developing a broad outline on how WGs operate.
- The MAG to consider the need for the [WG on Workshop Process](#) to be re-activated, once decisions are made regarding the themes/issues for IGF 2021.
- The MAG to take all WG recommendations into account to the fullest extent as the planning of IGF 2021 continues.

36. Closing the meeting, Mr. Typiak, Mr. Kwok, Ms. Esterhuysen and Mr. Masango thanked participants for three productive working days and expressed their trust that, through joint efforts, IGF 2021 will be a successful one. Mr. Kwok further added that a donors meeting is to be held soon, and informed participants that a consultant will be contracted to conduct an evaluation of the IGF project (as this is a typical UN process of evaluating activities, happening now because the IGF has just passed half of its new 10-year mandate). Ms. Esterhuysen noted that materials will be made available for the MAG to make decisions on two key issues: (a) IGF 2021 format and design; (b) IGF 2021 thematic focus and issues. The next MAG meeting is scheduled for 9 **March, from 11:00 am UTC**.

During the Open Consultations on 22 February, a meeting was held with Ms. Maria Francesca Spatolisano, the Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs and Officer in Charge of the Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Technology. This was followed by an open consultation on the MHLB proposed in the Roadmap for Digital Cooperation. These discussions are summarised in a [separate report](#).

Annex I Breakout groups on themes and topics for IGF 2021

Summary of group discussions

Following the presentation of the overview of issues submitted by the IGF community, participants in the open consultations were divided into 10 groups and invited to further discuss how to design a narrower and more focused programme for IGF 2021. Below is a summary of the groups' key suggestions on matters such as themes, issues and focus.

Some groups made concrete suggestions on three or more themes to prioritise for IGF 2021 (the six proposals below). Other groups had broader discussions, which are reflected in the sections Other proposals on themes/issues and Other considerations.

A. Themes to focus on, starting from the presented overview of issues (proposals listed in no particular order)

Groups' proposals at a glance

(listed by how frequently they appeared in the group's reports; variations are also counted)

- *Security and trust* (6)
 - Variations: *Digital cooperation and trust; Security, safety and trust*
- *Digital rights and freedoms* (5)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Data and digital rights; Digital inclusion, rights and freedoms; Implementing values and rights*
 - It could also be an overarching theme, spanning all others.
- *(Access and) inclusion* (4)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Digital cooperation and inclusion*
- *Digital cooperation* (4)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Internet governance and digital cooperation; Governance and cooperation*
 - Also suggested: Digital cooperation as an overarching/main theme
- *Sustainability and environment* (2)
 - Variations (merging with other themes): *Environmental, social and economic sustainability*
- *New and emerging technologies* (2)
 - Variations: Could also be tackled under different themes (Inclusion, Security and trust)
- *Technology* (merging New and emerging tech, Technical issues, parts of Data) (1)
 - Also support for *Technical issues* to be integrated within other themes

- *Digital economy* (1)
 - Also suggested that digital economy issues could be discussed within any selected themes, as long as related policy questions are indicated into the themes' descriptions.

(Proposals listed in no particular order)

Proposal 1

- (1) *Security and trust*; (2) *Inclusion*; (3) *Sustainability and environment*.
- Extra: (4) *Digital economy*; (5) *Internet governance and digital cooperation* (as a merged theme).
- *Digital rights and freedoms* could be considered as a broad/overarching theme spanning all others. *New and emerging technologies* could be tackled under different themes too, such as *Inclusion* and *Security and trust*.

Proposal 2

- (1) *Security and trust*; (2) *Digital cooperation and inclusion* (as a merged theme); (3) *Digital rights and freedoms*.
- Extra: (4) *New and emerging technologies* (although they also intersect with other themes).
- *Technical issues* could be addressed under other themes. For instance, TLDs could be discussed under the Internet governance ecosystem.

Proposal 3

- (1) *Access and inclusion*; (2) *Digital cooperation*; (2) *Security and trust* (here the discussions could benefit from keeping the nuances clear between IG, content, and technical aspects).
- *Technical issues* need to be more talked about; they could be integrated into other themes.

Proposal 4

- (1) *Environmental, social and economic sustainability* (merging Sustainability and environment and Economic issues); (2) *Digital inclusion, rights and freedoms* (merging Inclusion, digital rights and freedoms, and parts of Data (privacy)); (3) *Security, safety and trust* (merging Security and trust, parts of Data, and parts of Technical issues (DNS abuse)).
- Extra: (4) *Technology* (merging New and emerging technologies, Technical issues, and parts of Data (portability)); (5) *Governance and cooperation* (merging Digital cooperation, Internet governance ecosystem, parts of Data (governance frameworks for data sharing/data governance), and parts of Technical issues (standardisation)).

Proposal 5

- (1) *Data and digital rights* (merging Data and Digital rights and freedoms); (2) *Trust and security*; (3) *New and emerging technologies*.
- Main theme: *Digital cooperation*.

Proposal 6

- (1) *Implementing values and rights* (looking at moving from values to implementation and how the IGF could contribute to this process); (2) *Digital cooperation and trust*; (3) *Access and inclusion*.

- Also have horizontal considerations along these three themes to consider economic, sociocultural, technical and governance implications.

B. Other proposals/comments on the themes/issues

Merging of themes/issues

- Reduce the ten themes to nine, by merging *Internet governance ecosystem* and *Digital cooperation* into a single theme, with *Digital cooperation* as a sub-cluster.
- Rename the *Economic issues* theme into *Digital economy*.
- Merge *Digital cooperation* and *Inclusion*.
- Under the theme *Economic issues*, rename the cluster *Regulating Big Tech* to replace regulation with governance and expand Big Tech to more broadly encompass a wide range of digital companies. Under the same theme, merge the sub-clusters *Digital currencies* and *Taxation*.
- There are overlaps between themes such as *Digital rights and freedoms* and *Inclusion*.
- *Inclusion* also deals with issues included under *Technical issues* and *Security and trust*.
- *Trust* could be a broad umbrella for governance issues.
- Merge the sub-clusters *Future of work* and *AI*.

Issues indicated as important to tackle

- *Challenges of harmonisation/interoperability of policies and regulations across jurisdictions*, also taking into account asymmetries in access, resources, power, markets, etc.
- *Extraterritoriality of regulations* and its impact on countries and people (this could be a cross-cutting issue affecting several different discussions)
- The discussions on *Digital rights* should also tackle issues related to *culture*.
- Other issues briefly mentioned: *local content*, *cost of Internet*, *digital health*, *education*, *intellectual property rights*, *participative governance*.

C. Other considerations

- Some suggestions were made to consider starting from looking at specific issues and then defining the themes based on the issues (as opposed to the other way around).
- Be careful in merging clusters, not to lose sight of the main issues belonging to them.
- Current clustering is missing the link on where we are in terms of the Internet's role and evolution during the COVID-19 pandemic. COVID-19 as a broad context for all discussions (not a stand alone theme).
- Try not to repeat what has been discussed in the past IGFs. Instead, build on previous outcomes and bring new discussions/aspects.
- Even if we discuss issues that have featured at previous IGFs, we should make sure to discuss them from different angles.
- To have a concise programme for IGF 2021, the thematic tracks should be comprehensible and distinguishable. Participants in the IGF should understand from the names of the tracks and the structure which issues to expect under each of the thematic tracks.
- Use data from previous IGFs to develop curricula for IGF workshops that are based on thematic pillars. The curricula would include case studies, tools, strategies, etc.

Full reports from the groups

Group 1

Members: Joyce Chen Chair; Amrita Choudhury Rapporteur; Gunela Astbrink; Angeline Seiuli; Venus Iosefa Salanoa; Everton T Rodrigues

Discussion on the 10 thematic clusters:

- As a group, we felt that we need to be careful in merging clusters as the main issues related to it should not be lost.
- We would suggest 9 Standalone thematic clusters.
- We suggest merging Internet governance ecosystem (36) and Digital cooperation (27). Have Digital Cooperation as a sub issue.
- We propose changing the name of " Economic Issues" to Digital Economy

In terms of prioritising top three thematic clusters:

- Based on inputs received from : security and trust (5); Inclusion (3); Sustainability and environmental (3), digital rights (2) and digital economy,
- Could digital rights and freedom be a broad theme.
- Discussed how emerging technologies impact inclusion or security
- With IGF+ being much discussed, Internet Governance and Digital Cooperation may be a topic which may be of interest and should it be looked at as a separate theme

Group 2

Chair: Roxana Radu

Members: Jose Amado Espinosa, Berry Cobb, Arthur N'guessan, Raymond Mamattah

Note taker: Anja Gengo, IGF Secretariat

- Goal on thematic focus of IGF: What is it that the IGF will inform us about in 2021?
- Current clustering is missing the open link on where we are in terms of the Internet's evolution during the pandemic - increased attention paid to health, education and nature of work. However, suggest to focus on the things ahead of us, not behind us. COVID is not a standalone theme, but a theme that touches all other ones.
- Digital cooperation and inclusion could be merged under the name. They are interdependent and cooperation could be nested under inclusion.
- Security and trust is a priority area for an Internet that serves all needs.
- New and emerging tech priority (AI, IOT) could be addressed under a separate theme, despite the fact that they intersect with other themes.
- TLDs are also a priority that could be discussed under the Internet ecosystem; overall, the technical issues could be addressed under other themes
- Digital rights are a priority and could be a main theme

Group 3

Participants: Roberto Zambrana, Carlos Alberto Afonso, Ananda Raj Khanal

Nepal,

Sorina Teleanu, Yashasvi Fedhi Channan

It was brought to the table, the discussion on New and Emerging Technologies. Members touched upon the following and considered how the IGF can integrate them into existing global organizations dedicated to:

- I. Server migration.
- II. Protection of Rights.
- III. Inclusion and Access.
- IV. Regulation.

Members reflected on the above points and discussed on the importance of prioritizing the IGF's thematic pillars, whilst integrating them with the above and thanked the team for the ongoing discussion.

Mr. Ananda Raj Khanal proposed developing/ refining structures that can address the performance of existing systems and came up with new principles that can, not only address the IGF thematic issues at hand but streamline them into a more efficient and executable systems. "How many years should it take to address an IGF thematic pillar? 3 years? How long will it take for the agenda to reflect Globally, Regionally and Locally?". (Food for thought)

Mr. Carlos Afonso reiterated that we should take into consideration how the pandemic has changed the way we work in 2021. Some of the issues raised were; What can the IGF do towards refining how we work and restructure our priorities as we integrate New and Emerging Technologies?

The rapporteur, Fedhi Channan (Love Matters Africa) addressed how these new emerging technologies could improve internet security within safe online digital spaces. Such spaces include Sexual Reproductive Health Right services to other human right based bodies. Such integrations would positively impact communities from a grassroots level to an institutional, regional and even global level.

Mr. Raj Khanal reminded the group that IGF is at the moment, only a sensitization body and not yet an implementation body. He added that member states of the IGF need to transition to become implementation bodies. He recommended that the function of IGF at the moment should be to completely prioritize its members on sensitization of IGF policies and outcomes, before finalizing its policy development strategies with intergovernmental bodies.

Mr. Carlos reflected on organizations that have been able to survive within the IGF despite the global pandemic and continue to implement strategies relevant to the IGF thematic pillars. He urged that we need to revise how these organizations succeed and use this to help us refine our existing IGF systems. It was proposed that the IGF use these conferences as a body that can provide workshops to help members refine and improve on previous strategies during annual conferences. The chair suggested that group members consider that each member of the IGF go through different socio-economic and political matters annually, and that we need to take into consideration all these variables so as to enhance the overall performance of the IGF.

Mr. Carlos proposed that we use previous IGF conference data to develop curriculums for IGF workshops that are based on the IGF thematic pillars. The curriculum would include case studies, tools and developing global strategies. He reminded Mr. Khanal and the rest of the group that this has to be done through a Bottom-Up approach as previously mentioned by the rapporteur.

Mr. Carlos added that the tenets of this are independent of the IGF and that it is the responsibility of member states to develop their policies from domestic level to national and International level.

Mr. Khanal clarified his point about IGFs and referred to global governments focusing their agendas on developing their existing policies from a grassroots level to a high body and global level before integrating the IGF thematic pillars moving forward.

Group 4

Rappourteurship done in 4 hands: Nikita Shrubsole and Raquel Gatto

Chaired by Poncelet Ileleji

In total, 7 people attended: Poncelet Ileleji (chair), Nikita Shrubsole (rappourteur), Raquel Gatto (rappourteur), Paul Charlton, Vera Major, Jochen Michels and Unaena Lameko.

Group being named Security and Trust prompt us to go into this path:

1st takeaway - cross pollination

- The group recognize that Security and Trust are fundamental for the IGF discussions, and can be overlapping themes particularly :
 - Technical issues need to be more talked about, there can be an integration between both clusters (4 and 10).
 - Can also benefit from keeping the nuances clear between IG, content and technical aspects. For example, important for end users to understand their own digital rights and for governments willing to regulate on the topics. In the subclusters, suggestion to highlight encryption and network/infrastructure security.
 - Strong link with Digital Cooperation, that's also part of the broader UN agenda. Cross border collaboration s very important. Cooperation among stakeholders itself is also very important. Suggestion to have more transparency into the related processes so that it can make trust viable. Another suggestion to look for the connections and retro-feed with other international fora (UN OEWG, UNIDIR, G20, etc).

2nd takeaway - streamline

- to not repeat with has been discussed in the past IGFs, build on previous outcomes and bring new discussions/aspects
- integrate with intersessional work at BPF CyberSecurity
- COVID-19 impact will be a horizontal theme, but perhaps can have a place in online safety

3rd takeaway - key themes

1. Access and Inclusion
2. Digital Cooperation
3. Security and Trust

invite any members wanting to elaborate further, apologies if anything was missed in the transition.

Group 5

The group was focused on the overarching track of "Economic issues". The discussion focused broadly on raising important topics to be addressed by the IGF and also reflected upon some of the categorization of topics previously made by the organization.

During the discussion, participants pointed out some important topics to be addressed by the IGF inside the scope of the discussions in the economic track:

- The rise of new regulations such as the Digital Services Act and the Digital Markets Act
- The rise of new amendments, regulations and duties for private sector companies, IXes and so on in the European Union
- The new regulations put on new realities for European markets and cover new tech companies that will have to comply with a set of new rules
- The extraterritorial aspects of Europe's new laws
- The challenges and uncertainties within the discussions on regulating "Big Techs"

- The different streams and framing within privacy and data protection discussions (Privacy and Data Protection, Platforms and privacy, Surveillance, Data Governance [very broad] and so on)

Other than that, the group also addressed other topics that were raised within the thematic call for inputs, mainly in relation to connectivity, infrastructure and issues of access and inclusion. Participants mentioned aspects of challenges and solutions, and how countries know the best recommended solutions for the main problems in the field, even if they are not able to fully implement those solutions. The group also discussed what could be the reasons for that. Especially with regards to the discussion of regulating Big Techs, there was a broad discussion on concepts, definitions, regulations and the main challenges for the field. Participants drew upon previous discussions within global Internet governance and put on concerns of how we are framing this discussion and pointing out the asymmetries involved, in terms of all the imbalances between big providers like the well-known GAFAM group and the various others within the digital context, including asymmetries in relation to SMEs and also the disparities between US and other countries, due to the dominance of the digital markets in this sense. There was also a brief comment of the difficulties involved in using the terms “Big techs” and “Regulation”, as “Big techs” exclude a set of other companies that are part of the digital environment, and, with regards to regulation, there was a suggestion to change it to governance, as regulation could be something very limited to deal with overarching issues like this one.

Some participants also reported on their local realities and experiences, mainly in relation to new regulations. Following that, the group also addressed the extraterritorial aspects of European laws and that led to an overarching discussion on “extraterritoriality” and its effects to countries and peoples. Participants raised the idea of extraterritoriality as an emerging crosscutting issue that affects several different discussions. There were specific comments on jurisdiction issues and the challenges involved within interoperability of laws, norms and all the national frameworks that govern specific Internet governance processes throughout the world.

There was also a comment in the chat about the Samoa context, which was “In Samoa Office of the Regulator, the Regulatory and Legal division are working on the research paper on OTT what are the disadvantages and advantages of regulating ott according to our small island but I agree with you @carol the small island needs more resources and funding if we are to regulate the ott and how we going to localize the overseas agents like FB google etc.... also we launched Digital TV in 2019 and switched off from Analogue last year 2020, the status is now 90% coverage and 10% for the grey areas...”

The group finalized the discussions framing the various challenges raised under the idea of “harmonization”. It was a common understanding that harmonization is something to be addressed on the multiple levels of the various issues discussed within Internet governance. From radio-frequency, access to infrastructure and digital services, locally and globally, to interoperability of laws, norms and national frameworks, there was strong consensus that asymmetries must be addressed and harmonization should be in some sense sought for countries to be able to cooperate better, address issues appropriately, and also to minimize the imbalances that affect users in the digital world.

Some final discussions dealt with some possible merging of themes to possible thematic sessions, such as digital currency and taxation, and also future of work and artificial intelligence.

Group 6

Participants: Gabriela Nardy, Brazil; Flavio Wagner, Brazil; Brett van Niekerk, South Africa; Alfredo Calderón; Przemyslaw Typiak, Polish Government; Jutta Croll, German Digital Opportunities Foundation.

To end up with a concise programme for IGF 2021 the thematic tracks should be comprehensible and distinguishable. Participants in the IGF should understand from the names of the tracks and the structure which issues to expect under each of the thematic tracks.

We have analysed the sub issues under the 10 issues' clusters and we see that some of the sub issues are overlapping while others are complementary to each other.

Based on our groups' analysis we suggest the following re-structuring

Sustainability and Environment + Economic issues = **Environmental and Economic Sustainability**

Digital inclusion + Digital rights and freedoms + part of data (privacy) = **Digital inclusion, rights and freedoms**

Security and Trust + part of data + part of technical issues (DNS abuse) = **Security, Safety and Trust**

New and emerging Technologies + technical issues + part of data (portability) = **Technology**

Digital cooperation + Internet governance (IG) ecosystem + part of data (Governance frameworks for data sharing / data governance) + part of technical issues (standardisation) = **Governance and Cooperation**

Post Covid 19 recovery should be addressed in the track on Digital inclusion, rights and freedoms, since after the pandemic many countries will face a deeper digital divide than before

Thus we end up with the following **five** tracks

- Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability
- Digital Inclusion, Rights and Freedoms
- Security, Safety and Trust
- Technology
- Governance and Cooperation

Group 7

Participants: Maria Paz Canales, June Parris, Rosa Delgado, Lianna Galstyan, Winston Roberts, Makonde Faye, Ben Wallis. Maria Paz lead the discussion.

Looking at the goal for issues the document was relevant in terms of issues with use of data in terms of Big Tech being prioritized. However the discussion was customized to relate to human rights issues and safety issues connected to data.

What was actually missing from the discussion was the HR focus, last year was focused on Data, Environment, Security and inclusion. Same topics and roles and responsibilities of the private sector with advocates mentioned and legal rights.

Covid has created the opportunity for some human rights issues like increase in prices for data as big companies are inflating costs and putting the price of data out of the reach of people within lower earnings brackets.

Human Rights issues are not only occurring in emerging countries but even in countries such as Hungary with marshall law and in Switzerland with the potential retirement age being increased. Equality should be equality and the discussion on rights is not being discussed, there are so many things about that . Taking note of these issues does not only include the price of the internet, a lot of money is being made and there is a concentration of power. Issues such as health care and where rich countries have more vaccine distribution.

Data needs to be managed especially in countries where there is limited data. For developing countries inclusion is the issue. There is still a digital divide. Groups are left out.

Policies need to be implemented to ensure gender access and that language is being taken care of, however there are cross cutting discussions, we need data. This was classed as a separate theme during the IGF.

There was a concern over accessibility where library facilities are available but storage of massive amounts of data long term is not possible.

All should be captured in a bucket under data. Digitalization, sustainability and inclusion should become a team and become inclusive especially now in the covid arena.

With Covid-19, education in the global south and developing countries are one and the same, developed countries just don't have the same problems, they don't have problems with language and access, as the working language of the internet is in English.

An example used was the indigenous people of New Zealand, where people are unable to communicate due to data issues. How can this be related to Big tech. number 4 of the classification. There are 20 different references with regard to this but only the 3 most popular were brought up, is this relevant?

The gap in subjects is access to culture, many issues circle around this gap.

Intellectual property and massive data needs to be preserved and culture is missing from the IGF. The focus seems to be more technical, we need to address this issue, language is important.

How can culture be included into the IGF. Cultural archives, as indigenous people lose archives losing the quality of their historical existence.

Potential solutions are similar to local content, this is well known at the IGF. When examining inclusion culture needs to be included. Has the BPF thought about this? Where will big tech. fit in, should it be a separate discussion?

Support of digitization in developing countries has accelerated due to covid. This is running into 5 g, artificial intelligence, new technologies. When one is developing and now has to move to 5 g, emerging countries need to be pushed faster.

Regulation is a major tool for governments in order to solve problems. Regulation of big tech is the solution to many topics.

The approach on topics can be problematic, the IGF has very little input from Governments. There is a struggle to cope with technical problems, operating levers that could produce solutions.

Governments are silent on some issues, as they keep them close to their chests and only let the public know what they want them to know. Do they actually want the same solutions we need? . They are not easy to engage and are not always open and transparent. They seem not to want to discuss issues. A good example is cyber security when hospitals are being attacked.

Generally, there is a need for international rules. Our discussion came to a close.

Group 8 & Group 9: reports not submitted

Group 10

The group considered the themes proposed by the community from the perspective of moving from values to implementation and what the IGF can do to move the conversation along and contribute to the implementation of the UN Secretary General's Roadmap for Digital Cooperation.

Therefore the group proposed to consider the IGF's agenda on three so-called "value clusters" under which all topical issues would fit. These 3 clusters would be:

1. implementing values and rights;
2. digital cooperation and trust; and
3. access and inclusion

The group also discussed having horizontal considerations along these 3 themes to consider economic, social-cultural, technical and governance implications.

Annex II

Breakout groups on IGF 2021 format and design

The six working groups formed to discuss issues related to the format and design of IGF 2021 were invited to use collaborative documents to capture their discussions. Below are the links to these documents:

- [Group 1](#)
- [Group 2](#)
- [Group 3](#)
- [Group 4](#)
- [Group 5 \(French\)](#)
- [Group 6 \(Spanish\)](#)

Annex III
Meeting agenda and materials

Agenda of Day 1: 22 February 2021 – Open Consultation and MAG Meeting

<u>Time in UTC</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>
09:00 - 09:45	<p>1. Opening statements and adoption of the agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Message from UN DESA b. Welcome by MAG Chair c. Welcome by MAG Host country Co-chair 2021 d. Presentation and update from IGF 2021 host country e. Adoption of the agenda
09:45 - 11:15	<p>2. IGF 2020 stock taking and considerations for 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overview of the IGF2020 stock taking process (5 min) b. Report on the 9th February Open Consultation on IGF 2020 stocktaking and presentation of key points to consider in 2021 (10 min) c. Feedback from the IGF community on IGF improvements d. Discussion on the IGF 2021 process, annual meeting and intersessional work
11:15-11:45	BREAK
11:45-13:15	<p>3. Issues and themes for IGF2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The idea of a more focused IGF b. IGF Secretariat's summary of inputs received to the open call for issues c. A multi-year approach to IGF issues and themes d. Discussion in groups on issues, themes and policy questions IGF2021 can focus on (1 hour) e. Reports from breakout groups followed by discussion
13:15-13:45	<p>4. The IGF 2021 process and timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Annual meeting b. Intersessional work

13:45-14:00	BREAK
14:30-15:00	Meet with Ms. Maria Francesca Spatolisano, the Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs and Officer in Charge of the Office of the Secretary-General's Envoy on Technology
15:00-16:00	<i>OPEN CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED MULTI-STAKEHOLDER HIGH-LEVEL BODY (para 93(a) of the Secretary-General's Roadmap for Digital Cooperation)</i>
16:15-17:00	<i>Online social event hosted by Switzerland together with the DiploFoundation and the Geneva Internet Platform</i>

Agenda of Day 2: 23 February 2021 - MAG Meeting (open to observers)

<u>Time in UTC</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>
10:30-11:00	1. Opening of the MAG meeting <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Remarks from UN DESA b. Remarks from host-country chair c. Remarks from MAG chair and review of the agenda and meeting goals
11:00-12:30	2. Shaping the IGF2021 programme - discussions in groups <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Event format and flow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>How can the IGF retain its open and bottom-up character while also being more focused?</i> b. Type and number of sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>How to approach types of sessions, e.g. intro/closing sessions, workshops and open forums, main sessions and what could be the total number of sessions?</i> c. Session proposal and selection criteria and process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <i>Timetable and process for calling for proposals and how to approach selection of sessions.</i>
12:30 - 13:00	BREAK

13:00-14:00	<p>3. Shaping the IGF2021 programme continued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reports from group discussions <p>4. *Other factors to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Youth engagement b. Engaging parliamentarians c. Strategies for collaboration and complementarity across intersessional work
14:00-15:00	<p>5. Recap of input on issues/themes from the open consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Capturing consensus if possible on IGF2021 main issues and themes b. Next steps <p>6. Recap of overall programme structure and flow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Capturing consensus if possible b. Next steps

Agenda of Day 3: 24 February MAG Meeting (*open to observers*)

Time in UTC	Agenda item
09:00 - 09:10	7. Review of the agenda and meeting goals
09:15 - 11:15	<p>8. BPFs and Policy Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Final approval b. Strategic workplan including cooperation with other processes <p>9. Annual workplan of DCs</p> <p>10. Collaboration with the NRIs in 2021</p>
11:15 - 12:15	BREAK

12:15-14:15	<p>11. MAG Working Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reports and recommendations from 2020 MAG Working Groups b. Forming the IGF 2021 Working Groups c. Discussion and next steps
14:15-14:30	<p>12. Meeting closure and evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Closing remarks from host-country chair b. Closing remarks from MAG chair c. Evaluation (online poll)

Meeting materials

Introduction

- **UN DESA USG Letter to the MAG**
- **IGF 2021 Host Country Presentation**
- **IGF 2021 Draft Timeline**

IGF 2021 Call for Thematic Issues and Stocktaking

- **Synthesis Output Document of the Taking Stock of IGF 2020 and Suggesting Improvements for IGF 2021**
- **Summary Report of the 3rd MAG meeting and open consultations on the IGF 2021 format and design**
- **Analysis of Proposed IGF 2021 Thematic Issues (annex: spreadsheet of all issues per cluster)**
- **Guidelines on breakout groups**

Digital Cooperation

- **UN Secretary-General's Roadmap for Digital Cooperation (para 93(a))**
- **Options Paper for the Future of Global Digital Cooperation of the Governments of Germany and the United Arab Emirates**
- **IGF 2020 MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy's response to the above paper**

IGF 2021 Intersessional Work (BPF Proposals) and NRIs

- **Intersessional work modalities**
- **BPF Cybersecurity | Presentation**
- **BPF The Governance of Environmental Data**
- **BPF Gender and Digital Rights**

- **BPF Local Content | Presentation**
- **BPF Committed actions to make Internet sustainable and affordable for everyone**
- **Webform for MAG members to provide feedback on BPF proposals**
- **Proposal for Policy Network on Meaningful Access (PNMA)**
- **About Dynamic Coalitions**
- **Policy Network on Environment (PNE)**
- **NRIs 2021 Work Plan | Youth Engagement Publication | NRIs Compendium**

IGF 2021 WG Proposals:

- **WG Hybrid Meetings**