

Input by Wout de Natris, De Natris Consult

Haarlem, The Netherlands, 8 January 2019

A) Taking Stock of [2018 programming, outputs, preparatory process, community intersessional activities](#) and the 13th annual IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?

Within the IGF community there is a consistent wish to become more output driven in the form of a tangible outcome that is able to make a difference. The fact that most people still have difficulty to mention more than a couple IGF successes, attests to the fact that the IGF is far from delivering the desired, meaningful tangible outputs.

From personal experience I would like to share how hard it is to come to a timely concrete output within the process of a MAG Working Group. Of course, it goes without saying that all work is voluntary and highly appreciated as such by all involved. Yet, it is possible to make better use of available time, to receive more and diverse input and arrive at an advice within the allotted time. Something which is now considerably under strain given current timeframes and availability. Due to lack of time it happens that input or comments on input is delayed or positions are made available late in the process. The result being that output is held up beyond a fatal date, i.c. the IGF. Although all participants see this moment coming, it seems impossible to adapt and change. The result being a year is basically lost.

To be more successful and this also could go for MAG processes itself, it is important that an online process is added to the virtual meetings. An online process can assist all involved in creating clear positions up front that are used as the basis on which the work is to continue. That way all is clear at the earliest possible moment in the process.

Also it could be made clear that an advice to the MAG can hold different positions. It is up to the MAG to decide after all positions have been heard. Consensus in a working group is not necessarily an aim, as otherwise no advice may ever be given.

More detailed suggestions are delivered in a second iteration of the 'Strengthened cooperation within the context of the IGF' report, which is attached to the WG MWP rapport and can be seen as an integral part of this contribution.

B) What suggestions for improvements could be made for 2019? (Please focus on programming, the outputs preparatory processes, community intersessional activities and improvements for the 14th annual meeting and beyond.)

There are several improvements possible.

- An online preparatory process allowing all participants to share positions and comments online, making it possible to create a consensus on how to proceed early in the IGF cycle, whether in the MAG, BPFs, Working groups, Pilots, etc.. Months are won this way.

- If the IGF wants to create a more important position for itself, it needs to focus on the most urgent topics in a way that allows for progress and not just talk without consequences. Through an intersessional process questions can be put to those involved that lead to positions, to suggestions for solutions, ways forward, working parties, etc. The online solution, as suggested above, can assist here.

- A clear process allows for the invites to "non-usual suspects" to contribute to the process, which at first is online. This may create commitment to future in situ participation and commitment to outcomes.

- The IGF process could be split in two: the current process of workshops, open fora, etc. and a process of intersessional activities aimed at delivering a form of (tangible) outcome at the IGF. It is recommended to pilot some of these in 2019.
- The IGF could be used for working sessions in which ways forward are decided on, instead of having an x number of workshops on one topic without an outcome.
- Funding and moderation of these processes could be carried by interested participants and do not necessarily have to come out of the IGF budget.
- The outcomes of these processes are finalised at the IGF. A tangible outcome in some form is guaranteed and published after the IGF.

Can this work? Yes. The strengthened cooperation report of 2018 itself is prove that such a dedicated process within IGF context works, as did the 2019 suggested pilot turned workshop, #40 2018. The IETF through the IGF reached out successfully to other communities on "Internet mega trends' impact on the Internet's architecture". This reach out among others led to an offer to co-organise presentations to politicians in the Netherlands, the EU, and global level as well as to an insight that active reach out to consumer organisations by the IETF might be of importance. Two examples of interaction that did not exist before the 2018 IGF. Two outcomes, although not yet tangible. By the way, both mentioned processes came with zero cost to the IGF, but were funded by other organisations.

C) How could the IGF respond to the recommendations made by the UN Secretary-General during [his speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony](#)?

The engagement of "missing" specialities as mentioned in the opening speech can only happen if relevant players are actively invited and be assured of having a relevant role. The past IGFs have proven how hard it is to move beyond the usual suspects.

This may change by actively inviting representatives to submit proposals and explain why they should do so. This would mean providing active assistance to make such proposals work and get accepted. Innovative proposals do not always match with the MAG scoring system.

Perhaps a travel fund in some cases could do miracles as well.

D) How could the IGF respond to President Macron's "call for action" made during his [speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony](#)?

By focusing on and prioritising the most urgent topics. Through engaging with the most relevant players. By taking the topic out of an atmosphere of non-commitment into one where potential differences are made by forcing participants to focus on the most urgent questions that are in need of answers and solutions. Put people to work, invite them to stimulate their minds to offer potential, out of the box, solutions. The brightest minds are at the IGF, use them!

The MAG could lead more by selecting the respective most urgent topics and through supporting each other's most urgent topics. By working together and discuss ways forward, the most urgent topics will be addressed and urgency felt among each other as these topics are bound to be looked at from different angles. By identifying up front which players are not among the usual suspects and delve into respective networks to catch their attention, new interactions will be created, leading to more input and different outcomes. The combination will make the IGF more relevant, potential outcomes may render the call for regulation less urgent.

E) What other organizations/disciplines should the IGF be collaborating with and how/to what purpose?

Each selected topic tells you that. Then act on it.

F) The Secretary-General set up a [High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation](#) (HLPDC) to *"identify good examples and propose modalities for working cooperatively across sectors, disciplines and borders to address challenges in the digital age"*

1. How can the IGF contribute to the work of the HLPDC to help foster these aims?
2. Do you have any specific inputs for the HLPDC in relation to the IGF?

Above are several suggestions on how to continue.

Topics could be the following.

- How can data gathered by industries, smart cities, IoT, etc., be shared, anonymised, and used by researchers and others to create a better world for all? Leading to innovation in broad segments of society, to a safer world, a more healthy one, measure climate change, etc., etc..
- The Hague is the city of peace and justice of the world, the analogue one. What would a digital version look like? Is it needed and if so what sort of topics would be brought there?
- There is a strong need for a safer Internet. Solutions are abundant yet often not implemented. This topic so far has been carefully avoided to be taken head on. There is not much time left for voluntary action. So what is stopping industry from voluntarily implementing existing solutions and which stakeholders need to learn more about these options to be able to apply relevant pressure, where needed, on industry? E.g. consumer organisations, politicians, policymakers, etc..