

- 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?
- 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.)

IGF Secretariat and MAG members have done an outstanding work last year to have an IGF more inclusive and more focused on tangible outputs. An important aspect was the introduction of *the call for issues* in the preparatory process. The results of the call for issues give the opportunity to the IGF community to better classify and focus on the IG main themes and subthemes when submitting the workshop proposals.

Some aspects of preparatory process and community intersessional activities that could be improved in order for IGF to have more impact in shaping digital policies worldwide.

- 1) More should be done to increase the participation and foster the inclusion of global multistakeholder community (governments, businesses and other institutions) to IGF processes and activities. A stronger communication campaign could be activated. Video messages, letters, notes and other tools could be used to inform the community. NRIs networks and IGF partners could support IGF spreading the information over the network and support IGF Secretariat (ICANN, European Commission ecc.) for a better connection between IGF and key representatives of the global multi-stakeholder communities working at national and regional level.
- 2) IGF should increase communication and relationships with Governments and other international, national and regional stakeholders involved in the definition of digital policies. It should play a central role in promoting the application of IG recommendations and guidelines all over the world. For doing that it could be useful to:
 - a. Build a map of the main government leaders, actors and institutions involved in the definition of digital policies at national and international level. Use NRIs networks to build the map.
 - b. Issue and spread a monthly newsletter reporting IGF main activities, asking for feedback, suggestions and participation.
- 3) Internet Governance is a multidisciplinary issue but people are not aware about its meaning and most of them do not know how to get involved in IGF processes. It could be useful to include on the IGF website some online lessons explaining IG and IGF processes.
- 4) IGF should promote inclusion of IG in the educational program at schools. Collaborations with other partners should be activated in order to reach this objective.
- 5) Workshop proposals. After the evaluation of the workshop proposal, it could be useful to give a time slot to the workshop organizers dealing with the same theme/subtheme so they could have the possibility to merge their proposals if they wish.
- 6) The evaluation of the workshop proposals should include some criteria to promote pilots and experimentations after the annual event and to push youth participation.
- 7) After the IGF event takes place, for several workshop organizers the main questions are: what are the next steps? How to implement the results of the discussion? Key messages are very useful but it should be possible for IGF to call for concrete actions related to the key messages. An online platform made available to workshop organizers could support them with the follow up activities.
- 8) The IGF multistakeholder model includes four stakeholders: government, technical community, business and civil society. Civil Society is represented mostly by academics. The number of stakeholder should be increased. Citizens, for instance, should have a stronger participation. They are the most important Internet users and the evolution of internet governance should be centered on human needs. NRIs should also be included as an additional stakeholder as they represent the perspectives of different countries, regions and of Youth over the world.

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

Only a more central coordination role in the IG debate could make IGF more relevant. The IGF should have the possibility to call for actions based on the main results of IGF events. IGF should work closer to the other forums established in the last years. New forms of collaboration should be identified and adopted to create synergies and to focus on tangible outputs. IGF should work closer to the governments and to other stakeholders supporting regulation of digital policies. If needed, the IGF mandate should be updated to consider its new role. The IGF Secretariat should be strengthened to better support the new activities. More relevance should be given to the role of MAG members. Further IGF should become a more stable project with more funds assigned by UNDESA.

Multidisciplinarity is as important as the multistakeholder model. At the same time, it is important for philosophers, anthropologists to have a common background on the Internet and IGF processes. Hence, it could be important to promote the study of Internet Governance in academic courses.

Youth participation to IGF processes is fundamental as they represent a high percentage of Internet users. Their perspectives should be taken into consideration, promoting their participation through the NRIs networks. Youth should be more aware of Internet processes.

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

IGF should support "The Paris Call for Trust and Security in Cyberspace" and reply in a positive way to the request made by the President Macron.

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

IGF should collaborate with all organizations and disciplines involved/related to shaping digital policies worldwide, sharing and spreading the results over the global multi-stakeholder communities.

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 reach these goals?

2. Do you have any specific inputs for the HLPDC in relation to the IGF?

IGF can support HLPDC in the application of results and provide the perspective of the IGF multistakeholder community on the issues that are under discussion.

Concettina Cassa, Rome 15 January 2019