

## IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Virtual Meeting I 4 April 2018

### Summary Report

1. The first Virtual MAG Meeting of the 2018 IGF preparatory cycle took place on 4 April. Ms. Lynn St. Amour moderated the meeting as Chair of the MAG and Mr. Chengetai Masango represented the IGF Secretariat. The meeting marked the first MAG meeting following the 1st face-to-face Open Consultations and MAG meeting which took place from 19-22 March in Geneva, Switzerland. The agenda (**ANNEX I**) focused on [follow-up items from this first face-to-face meeting](#), namely IGF Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and the Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) (CENB) initiative; MAG working groups; and the revised call for issues and workshops process, which was launched on 26 March.

2. The meeting began with a brief update from the Chair on ongoing efforts to secure the IGF 2018 venue. It was reported that the Chair and IGF Secretariat/UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) were continuing to pursue a likely host country arrangement in Asia, with a second plan involving the use of a UN premises in Asia in lieu of a Government-level arrangement, thus ensuring the IGF remains a UN-hosted event. In parallel, UN venues in two other countries were being explored. Should an IGF in Asia be agreed upon, the dates for the meeting would be in early December 2018. The Chair informed that further talks with UNDESA would take place later in the week and that the MAG would be notified of any developments as they occur.

3. Speaking on the first agenda item, Mr. Markus Kummer, who was the co-facilitator of the BPF on Cybersecurity in 2017 as well as other BPFs in previous years, shared with the MAG a BPFs introductory document (**ANNEX II**). It was explained that BPF intersessional activities were established in 2014 in an effort to reinvigorate the IGF and show it could produce tangible outputs. Their original intent was to gather existing practices on well-established and narrow themes. Structurally they are open and inclusive groups, with anyone free to opt into their activities. Each BPF, Mr. Kummer further emphasised, has the flexibility to define its own methodologies and working modalities. The document additionally outlined the role of MAG co-facilitators, substantive experts and the IGF Secretariat in the BPFs' work, as well as a template for the submission of BPF proposals to the MAG. The document also suggested that the reports of existing BPFs, in which it is indicated whether or not they wish to continue into the next year, be considered before new proposals. Given that BPF activities are not resource-neutral, it was noted that the MAG had agreed in its last face-to-face meeting to cap the number of BPFs in 2018 to three.

4. With the understanding that the MAG would finalize a selection of BPFs at its next virtual meeting, and that all BPFs would submit proposals in writing before that time, an initial discussion took place on those that had been put forward thus far. Short presentations were given on each, specifically a proposed BPF on [Cybersecurity](#) for a second year; on [Local Content](#) for a second year; on

[Gender and Access](#) for a fourth year; on Artificial Intelligence as a new BPF; and on Big Data Analysis in the Cloud Environment, also as a new BPF. MAG members were advised to consider these proposals as written and to continue discussing them on the MAG list before the next virtual meeting. The proposers were further urged to think about whether their topics were suited to the format and purpose of BPFs, whether they could potentially be channelled into other IGF formats or community groups, and whether there might be the possibility of consolidation with other proposals. A final short briefing was given on a proposal to continue the [CENB initiative](#) for a fourth phase.

5. Possible MAG working groups for the 2018 cycle were then discussed. The Chair gave an overview of the working group she had facilitated in 2017 and proposed to continue in 2018, on a Multiyear Strategic Work Programme for the IGF ([WG-MWP](#)). The group will endeavour in 2018 to more deeply engage BPFs, DCs and NRIs in order to collectively put together an outline of the multi-year programme, which will also include long-term proposals for these activities. The group may also draw inspiration from the community call for issues to help understand which Internet governance themes may have longer-term resonance. A drafting team within WG-MWP had also examined how the IGF's mandate as outlined in the Tunis Agenda could form a basis for stronger outcomes in the IGF process; it was said the document by this team would be taken up anew by the working group and then shared with the wider MAG. The Chair briefed on a further proposed working group on fundraising in 2018, an issue that had been advanced last year by an ad-hoc group. Its focus would be squarely on improving outreach efforts and better communicating the work of BPFs, DCs and NRIs to potential new donors. Regarding this topic, a couple of questions were asked as to whether it could be possible to hire a professional fundraiser as part of the IGF Secretariat, and whether guidance could be sought from UN organizations such as UNICEF that conduct extra-budgetary fundraising. While adding a fundraising professional would require serious review of IGF Trust Fund resources and consideration of the limitations placed on the UN in conducting commercial activities, external advice could be solicited and any MAG member with fundraising experience was strongly encouraged to join this new working group.

6. Additional short briefings were given by the other working groups intending to continue their activities this year. The MAG heard from the Working Group on IGF Improvements ([WG-IMP](#)), which will seek to further its mapping of existing improvement recommendations – by the CSTD working group established in 2012, those outlined at the IGF retreat in 2016, and others – as well as from the Working Group on the Workshop Review and Evaluation Process ([WG-WREP](#)), which will integrate the new call for issues into its outline for a workshops process this year and perhaps better classification of proposals in terms of stakeholder and regional groups. The Working Group on New Session Formats ([WG-NSF](#)), which had successfully introduced new formats into the annual meetings in 2016 and 2018, suggested it would like to see these formats regularly integrated and transition the efforts of the group into the larger MAG.

7. Lastly, an update was given by the Secretariat on the [call for issues](#) put out to the community and open until Friday 13 April. It was reported that the most submissions had been received from the African regional group (at 35 to date), followed by the Asia Pacific Group, the Western European and Others

Group (WEOG) and the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC). In descending order, the highest number of submissions were received from civil society, followed by the private sector, the technical community, intergovernmental organizations and Governments. It was agreed that the consideration of results and the next steps would be taken up by an ad-hoc group which had been partially formed at the MAG's face-to-face meeting and which had helped to provide [background and context to the issues call](#). More volunteers for this group were welcome to join before the next virtual meeting.

8. The meeting ended with agreement that the MAG would continue to meet in this period roughly every two weeks, with time rotations to accommodate members in different regions. A meeting calendar with upcoming dates and times would be shared with the MAG as soon as possible.

## **Annex I**

### **2018 MAG Virtual Meeting I – 4 April 2018 – Agenda**

- 1) 2018 Best Practice Forums
- 2) Connecting the Next Billion Phase IV?
- 3) 2018 MAG Working Groups
- 4) Review of the Call for Issues and the Future Workshop Process
- 5) Dates for the Next Virtual Meetings
- 6) AOB

## **Annex II**

### **IGF Best Practice Forums Background note & Templates**

*Version as of 3 April 2018*

#### **I. IGF Best Practice Forums - definition and purpose**

Best Practice Forums were introduced in 2014 as part of the intersessional programme to complement the IGF community's activities and develop more tangible outputs to 'enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy'.<sup>1</sup>

BPFs offer unique platforms for multistakeholder discussion on topics relevant to the future of the Internet, with the aim of facilitating dialogue and collecting emerging and existing practices to address specific issues or themes. The objective is not to develop new policies or practices, but rather to collect existing good practices. Like other intersessional activities, BPF outcomes are designed to become robust resources, to serve as inputs into other pertinent forums, and to evolve and grow over time.

BPFs are in nature open, bottom-up and collective processes. Their open and transparent working approaches aim at encouraging and gathering broad stakeholder input and their outcomes are intended to be community-driven, bottom-up and a true reflection of the multistakeholder nature of the IGF's intersessional activities. Within these general principles BPFs have the freedom to define and delineate the parameters of their work in consultation with their respective multistakeholder communities; to define their own methodologies; and to tailor their work to the requirements of their theme's specific needs and requirements.

BPFs have been formed around the following themes:

#### **2017**

---

<sup>1</sup> This intersessional programme was designed in accordance with the recommendations of a [2012 report](#) by the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD)'s Working Group on IGF Improvements.

- Cybersecurity - [Cybersecurity for an enabling environment for ICTs and Internet technologies to contribute to development](#)
- [Gender and Access](#)
- Local Content - [Local Content: Internet cultural and linguistic diversity as an engine for growth](#)

## **2016**

- Cybersecurity - [Building Confidence and Security in the use of ICTs through Enhanced Cooperation and Collaboration](#)
- Gender and Access - [Overcoming barriers to enable women's meaningful Internet Access](#)
- IPv6 - [Understanding the commercial and economic incentives behind a successful IPv6 deployment](#)
- IXPs - [Contributing to the success and continued development of Internet exchange points \(IXPs\)](#)

## **2015**

- [Strengthening Multistakeholder Participation Mechanisms](#)
- IPv6 - [Creating an Enabling Environment for IPv6 Adoption](#)
- IXPs - [Enabling Environments for Establishing successful IXPs](#)
- Security - [Establishing and supporting Computer Security Incident Response Teams \(CSIRTs\) for Internet security](#)
- Spam - [Regulation and Mitigation of unsolicited Communications](#)
- Gender - [Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence Against Women](#)

## **2014**

- [Developing meaningful multistakeholder participation mechanisms](#)
- Spam - [Regulation and mitigation of unwanted communications \(e.g. 'spam'\)](#)
- Security - [Establishing and supporting Computer Emergency Response Teams \(CERTs\) for Internet security](#)
- Local content - [Creating an enabling environment for the development of local content](#)
- [Child online protection](#)

## **II. BPF working modalities and timelines**

### **Modalities**

- The [IGF Code of Conduct](#) should be followed by all stakeholders involved in IGF community activities, including BPFs.
- BPFs have the freedom to define their own methodologies; tailored to each group's specific needs and requirements.
- Each BPF should discuss and decide on their respective working modalities in an open and transparent way on mailing lists and during virtual meetings.
- Decisions on working modalities should have support of the participants of the BPF and should also be made in an inclusive and transparent manner.
- MAG facilitators should act as stewards of the groups, assist in scheduling and chairing the working virtual meetings, guide work being carried out on the mailing lists and carry out outreach to encourage participation from all stakeholders in the work.
- The IGF Secretariat should primarily be acting as a neutral rapporteur, including responsibility for drafting meeting summaries and providing logistical support to the work of the groups.
- In this regard, in developing outputs the format of such outputs should aim to cover the elements of the structure suggested below, but also be dependent on the working methods of the respective BPF.

- Based on consultation with BPF participants, the output should indicate in a final segment whether or not it wishes to carry forward the work into the next year, and if so, what new substantive areas it would seek to explore.

### **IGF output documents**

Rapporteurs of each Best Practice Forum (BPF) may incorporate the below elements into their respective outputs, also following the advice of BPF co-facilitators and those participating in the BPF's discussions. The reporting structure/outputs may differ depending on if the BPF theme has already been worked on previously by the IGF or if it is a new BPF topic, etc.

1. Definition of the issue(s)
2. Regional specificities observed (e.g. Internet industry development)
3. Existing policy measures and private sector initiatives, impediments
4. What worked well, identifying common effective practices
5. Unintended consequences of policy interventions, good and bad
6. Unresolved issues where further multistakeholder cooperation is needed
7. Insights gained as a result of the experience
8. Proposed steps for further multistakeholder dialogue

Note: The means employed to achieve a solution are as important a learning experience as the actual ends achieved. A discussion of unintended consequences, both positive and negative, of mistakes that were made, and of lessons learned will further enrich an understanding of what has been accomplished.

### **Timeline**

1. Existing BPFs report on their activities at the first MAG meeting of the year, including whether or not they wish to continue their work.
2. The MAG would first examine the reports of existing BPFs before considering proposals for new BPFs, which should also be submitted to the first MAG meeting of the year, as in the template below.
3. Based on the desirability of advancing certain themes and an assessment of available resources by the Secretariat, the MAG decides which BPFs to approve for the following year / and whether to add (a) new BPF(s).
4. BPFs begin to meet as soon as approved and channel their discussions into an eventual output document.
5. Approximately six weeks prior to the annual meeting and into the meeting itself, the BPFs' draft outputs should be made available for public comment online. (\*The six-week timeframe for outputs will be as consistent as possible across all IGF intersessional groups.)
6. Each BPF will be responsible for organizing a dedicated session at the annual meeting where they will present their work.

7. Following this, the outputs will be updated incorporating all comments and suggestions made by the community online and at the meeting.
8. MAG facilitators of the individual BPFs, as well as all MAG members generally, should carry out outreach activities to help disseminate the BPF outputs into other relevant fora and future meetings.

### **Proposals for new BPFs**

MAG members that wish to propose a new BPF should submit a proposal (around 2-3 pages) ahead of the first MAG meeting of the year. The proposal should indicate the following:

- Names of at least two Co-Facilitators (MAG member + non-MAG members as appropriate)
- Background  
*This should include the relationship to multistakeholder internet governance discussions and the relevance for the different stakeholder communities.*
- Description: topics covered, proposed objectives and focus of the BPF
- Outreach plan and multistakeholder engagement in the work  
*This should mention the anticipated engagement from different parts of the multi-stakeholder community, including the names of organisations which have signaled a desire to participate, and intended outreach to attract further involvement in the work of the BPF.*

**List of Participants**

<b>MAG Chair</b>			
Ms.	Lynn	St. Amour	Internet Matters
<b>MAG Members</b>			
Ms.	Abdulla	Rasha	The American University in Cairo
Ms.	Banial	Dalsie	Telecommunications and Radiocommunications Regulator, Vanuatu
Mr.	Bello	Pablo	ASIET
Ms.	Bou harb	Zeina	Ogero Telecom
Ms.	Cadena	Sylvia	APNIC Foundation
Mr.	Candia Ibarra	Miguel	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay
Mr.	Casasbuenas	Julián	Colnodo/APC
Ms.	Cassa	Concettina	Agency for Digital Italy
Ms.	Chung	Jennifer	DotAsia Organisation
Ms.	Clarke-Hinds	Shelley-Ann	Ministry of Public Administration and Communications, Trinidad and Tobago
Ms.	Croll	Jutta	Digital Opportunities Foundation / Stiftung Digitale Chancen
Ms.	Dahmani	Wafa	Tunisian Internet Agency ATI
Mr.	Donkor	Wisdom Kwasi	Ghana Open Data Initiative Project
Ms.	Erramuspe	Alejandra	Agesic, Office of President, Uruguay
Mr.	Estrada	Miguel Ignacio	LACTLD
Ms.	Galstyan	Lianna	ISOC Armenia
Ms.	Gatto	Raquel	ISOC
Mr.	Gridl	Rudolf	Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy
Mr.	Ilishebo	Michael	Zambia Police Service
Mr.	Jevtovic	Danko	Jugodata
Mr.	Lo	Mamadou	CNCAS
Mr.	Malcolm	Jeremy	Electronic Frontier Foundation
Mr.	Mansoor Ansari	Omar	TechNation
Mr.	Markovski	Veni	ICANN
Mr.	Mochizuki	Kenta	Yahoo Japan Corporation
Ms.	Muñoz	Maricela	Permanent Mission of Costa Rica to the United Nations Office at Geneva
Mr.	Ndicho Bambo	Samuel	Ministry of External Relations Cameroon
Ms.	Parris	June	Halaqah Media
Mr.	Regoje	Nebojsa	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Mr.	Rhijn van	Arnold	Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy
Ms.	Ribeiro	Renata Aquino	E. I.
Mr.	Rowney	Paul	ISOC Namibia



Mr.	Sabir	Sumon Ahmed	Fiber@Home Limited
Mr.	Sibul	Heiki	Estonia Internet Foundation
Ms.	Soriano	Jianne	NetMission.Asia
Mr.	Steck	Christoph	Telefonica
Ms.	Suto	Timea	ICC BASIS
Ms.	Teleanu	Sorina	DiploFoundation
Ms.	Uduma	Mary	Nigeria Internet Governance Forum
Mr.	Wallis	Ben	Microsoft
<b>Former IGF Host Country Representatives</b>			
Mr.	Rosas	Israel	Coordination of the National Digital Strategy, Mexico
Ms.	Walpen	Livia	Federal Office of Communications (OFCOM), Switzerland
<b>Other Participants</b>			
Ms.	Cade	Marilyn	ICT Strategies - mCADE llc
Ms.	Chalmers	Susan	National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S Department of Commerce
Mr.	Degezelle	Wim	DUERMOVO - DRMV
Mr.	Kummer	Markus	IGFSA
Mr.	Mazzone	Giacomo	European Broadcasting Union (EBU)
Mr.	Prendergast	Jim	The Galway Strategy Group
Mr.	Wagner	Flavio	NIC.br
<b>IGF Secretariat</b>			
Mr.	Masango	Chengetai	Programme and Technology Manager
Mr.	Garcia Bobo	Luis	Associate Information Systems Officer
Ms.	Gengo	Anja	Focal Point for the National and Regional IGFs