

Giacomo Mazzone on behalf of WBU and EBU

1. Sorry I had no time to contribute in writing before. So this is our contribution to IGF future reflections
2. I stick to what we agreed in the NY retreat (as correctly remember by way min) three years ago and that has not been implemented, even if some points have been already tested but not permanently adopted
3. The problem we have is not (anymore) with the deliverables, but especially with the impact of IGF
4. IGF special and unique role is -without any doubt- to be the only structured hybrid body where multistakeholders sit and participate on equal footing. So we can play a unique role to test, discuss and reflect (from a multistakeholder perspective) all topics that cannot be discussed in such a way in multilateral for a;
5. If we assume -as in our mandate- IGF is not a decision making body, but mainly a sounding body, we need to be coherent with that and bring the outcome of our discussion to the attention of the decision making bodies
6. This is not made properly. We need more tools to make it better
 - A direct link with UN SG (as it was when we have Nitin Desai) that could eventually act HIM as the person handing over the IGF ideas/concepts/documents
 - A direct link with the IGO where IGF suggestion could become matter for treaties or for improving existing instruments
 - In this sense the Opening ceremony (where many institutions are attending) could be transformed/ followed into a series of sessions where IGF ideas that could be improved by ITU are discussed with ITU representative; those that are related to WIPO are discussed with WIPO and so on. Eventually instead than Opening could become Closing ?
 - Or the inputs could be provided by the IGF intersessional work if better structured and organized
7. For instance the intersessional work needs to feed the IGF programme
8. And the IGF programme needs to identify the next issues on which IGF want to focus and then bring all the intersessional activities to contribute to is.
For instance, if we decide to discuss about disinformation matters, than all related dynamic coalitions, all BPF that have a word to say could contribute in a structured way, making their meetings as contributors to the plenary where the main interest topic of the IGF of that years is implemented
9. Fundamental also to define (and here the MAG can make a real contribution) a pluriannual work plan, in which is known which topics will be focused on this year, which next year and which in the third year.
10. The already de facto created "troika" of the host countries (Switzerland, France & Germany) could contribute to this effort of continuity across the years
11. NRI also could play a crucial role in this sense, to testing ideas and proposals for the global IGF and the regional NRI (EuroDIG) could play even an enhanced role in filtering/screening/better shaping the topics to be bring to the attention of global IGF
12. Also IGF could sponsor project that are relevant to solve some issues that Internet faces today, such as the IGF pilot proposed by Wout and Lousewies .
13. Good luck to the German host if could start to pick up already -even if on an experimental basis- some of these ideas to be implemented in Berlin at IGF 2019.