

Option Paper on Methodologies for the Development of Written IGF Outputs

To the IGF Working Group on Multi-Year Strategic Work Programme

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Criteria for a successful process | 2 |
| Factors to identify appropriate issues | 4 |
| MAG overview | 7 |
| Existing examples of processes, practices, or methodologies | 8 |
| Existing IGF Processes | 8 |
| Other Internet Governance Institutions | 9 |
| Outside of Internet Governance | 9 |
| Analysis of options | 11 |
| Resources to support implementation | 12 |
| Conclusion | 12 |
| Schedule A | 14 |

Introduction

This paper focuses on several suggestions made by members of the IGF Working Group on Multi-Year Strategic Work Programme on how to derive more concrete, useful outputs from the work of the IGF than the current IGF structures allow them to do. If the IGF is to become more relevant to all stakeholders, it is of importance the IGF not only becomes more useful to stakeholders, but also more inclusive. Besides promoting multistakeholder dialogue, addressing emerging issues, and motivating national and regional debate through the NRIs, there rises a need for a stronger focus on a pre-formulated direction, within a defined time frame and a desired outcome, for those topics that get selected to produce some form of tangible outcome. In fact all this information can assist the MAG in the selection process to decide on priorities.

When the Tunis Agenda speaks in paragraph 72(g) of the IGF having the capacity to “Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations”, it is these sorts of outputs that we believe could add value to the IGF. This option paper asks what kind of processes would allow different stakeholder communities to come together at the IGF with the focus, dedication, and prioritisation needed to allow it to produce such outputs.

If the IGF is to attempt to address its mandate in paragraph 72(g), this can be done by focusing on one or a small number of pressing, apolitical problems and producing actionable, tangible outcomes, e.g. in the form of best practices, recommendations, defined way forwards, actions, programs, etc., that can help to solve these problems through multi-stakeholder collaboration. From this point onwards external stakeholders from government, the private sector (eg. equipment manufacturers, Internet platforms), the technical community (eg. IETF, ITU) can take the IGF's recommendations to implement in their own work and return to the IGF to discuss the results and outcomes together once more.

Over the past months many participants have been heard and stakeholder communities asked for their opinions. Several revealing answers have been provided that could allow for the IGF to change, under certain conditions, into a more output driven organisation. Although several participants think or fear the IGF cannot or will not change, hardly anyone said it should not do so. This provides the IGF with the opportunity to try and operate from a more strategic point of view and set aims for concrete outputs in the form of provided advice, agreed upon work programmes outside of the IGF, or formulated best practices with an approach or intention on implementation.

In the months preceding the Geneva IGF a study was undertaken into strengthened cooperation within the context of the IGF. This culminated in a session under that title during the so called Day 0 at the IGF. The report of this study has been disseminated. It presents the advice provided by representatives from all the different stakeholder communities within the IGF. Hence this WG is able to use these views and suggestions for conditions, practical approaches and necessary choices that need to be made in order for strengthened cooperation to have a chance at success. These results underscore strategic choices as advised here.

The most relevant conclusion in this body of work is that the IGF needs to realise that most Internet governance work is done successfully within other organisations. Where the IGF can play a role is seen from two angles: First, where a topic or a part of undertaken work is broader than one specific organisation can fulfill on its own and needs a wider approach; Second, where work in one community directly touches on the work undertaken within other communities or impacts other stakeholders in some way, information could be shared and/or requested to address these impacts. A possible third role could be by creating circumstances within the IGF that could speed up the global adoption of work within one community by others, especially when the first two roles are being successfully fulfilled.

The IGF will need to take strategic choices to be able to grow to this potential and make choices on what approach works best for each individual topic that presents itself. Choices in how to gather the correct inputs, how to acquire the overview of the playing field needed, how to build trust, how to prioritise, how to execute the priorities and how to disseminate the results.

Criteria for a successful process

In evolving the IGF, we do not wish to risk losing what makes it successful already. There is a risk that making the IGF more outcome driven may marginalise some stakeholders at the same time as it increases the IGF's value for others. For example, if the IGF were to incorporate intergovernmental-style text negotiations (which we do *not* propose), many fear that this could politicise the IGF and detract from its value as an open, neutral forum for discussion.

However, we are confident that such adverse outcomes can be carefully avoided, and to this end we have developed a number of suggested criteria for any possible new IGF process or session format, to eliminate those that may be incompatible with the IGF's existing successful and valuable functions as a non-binding forum, or could otherwise disadvantage or isolate particular stakeholders.

Although some of these criteria are specific to the IGF's circumstances (such as the desirability of having both online and face-to-face mechanisms of participation), others are drawn from scholarly research, and in particular from the literature and applied practice of deliberative democracy.

The relevance of deliberative democracy is that in international Internet governance, the democratic legitimacy of policy recommendations cannot be built upon voting (for there is no polity to cast such a vote), nor on decision-making by a single stakeholder group (which would be incompatible with the ideal that the legitimacy of Internet governance derives is "based on the full participation of all stakeholders, from both developed and developing countries, within their respective roles and responsibilities" as expressed in the Tunis Agenda).

Instead, an alternative source of legitimacy must be constructed, and this derives from factors such as the inclusiveness of the policy process, and the degree of reasoned deliberation undertaken in the development of its outputs. In terms of the theoretical literature on deliberative democracy, legitimate outcomes can be derived from a process of reasoned deliberation among all those who have an interest in the outcome of the decision, treated as equals.

In application of this theoretical literature, various methodologies have been developed to construct processes that actually lead towards this ideal, for example by ensuring that all significantly affected interests in an outcome are represented in the process, by flattening hierarchies that exist between participants, and by ensuring all participants are equally well informed about the technical issues; some of these methodologies will be discussed in the section "Existing examples of processes, practices, or methodologies" below.

Criteria proposed below are classified into four different dimensions: inclusiveness, balance, accountability, and outcome-orientation. Criteria are further classified into three levels of relevance: essential, highly desirable, and desirable.

Inclusiveness

- **Essential:** allows for multi-stakeholder participation
- **Essential:** processes are not too resource intensive, either for the IGF (to impede their execution), or for participants (to create high barriers to participation)
- **Highly desirable:** incorporates online and face-to-face modes of participation
- **Highly desirable:** must include options and tools to attract missing stakeholders to allow balanced deliberation
- **Desirable:** allows for broad participation (including a significant proportion of all IGF delegates if possible; for example, not cross-scheduling with workshops)
- **Desirable:** multilingual and multimodal (compliance with accessibility standards)

Balance

- **Essential:** must include safeguards against domination by powerful stakeholder participants
- **Essential:** balanced briefing and information materials are provided
- **Essential:** A deliberative process is conducted, which requires participants to engage with views other than their own
- **Highly desirable:** robust protection against harassment, gaming, trolling, capture
- **Highly Desirable:** compliance and adherence to the IGF Code of Conduct
- **Desirable:** outputs meet with a rough consensus standard, and/or well-balanced reporting of dissenting outcomes

Accountability

- **Essential:** process must be transparent and open to the public
- **Essential:** trusted neutral facilitator or facilitating organisation
- **Highly desirable:** self-selected multi-stakeholder representation in every working group/council/committee

Outcome-orientation

- **Essential:** text-based, in the sense that that the outcome is recorded in textual form
- **Essential:** must fit with the IGF's non-binding mandate; no binding resolutions
- **Desirable:** outcomes are supported and agreed upon conclusions to continue work elsewhere
- **Desirable:** outputs (or at least conclusions thereof) are extremely short (like "the IGF resolves that Internet shutdowns should not be allowed except in emergency circumstances")
- **Desirable:** outputs are generated by the group itself, not just a chairman's summary
- **Desirable:** outputs are actively promulgated by the participants to their respective communities
- **Desirable:** inclusion of academia, also to ensure chances of citations.
- **Desirable:** outcome reporting format can be multilingual
- **Desirable:** outcome report/document can utilise version control and management, for transparency of changes

Factors to identify appropriate issues

Even once a format or process has been found that succeeds in meeting the most important criteria identified above, it does not necessarily follow that just any issue or topic should be subjected to deliberation through that process.

This document does not attempt to specify what issues or topic to be dealt with, but it does spend some time on which ones shouldn't be. This is because there are some issues that are clearly not suited to be addressed by the IGF, and can be swiftly eliminated as possible candidate issues for a new format or process. In particular, in its first incarnation, any new format or process should be treated as a pilot, and this points towards a conservative choice of topic.

One approach to the choice of topic would be to let stakeholder groups identify a topic they want to work on together, and use the IGF structure to do so and invite others to join. This would be the most suitable approach if the MAG were to take a hands-off approach during the pilot stage. Alternatively more hands-on involvement by the MAG during the pilot stage could point towards the selection of a topic or issue at the MAG level on the basis of community feedback and the recommendations below.

Here are the criteria that we have developed to help identify the appropriateness of particular issues or topics being selected for the development of multi-stakeholder norms or policy recommendations at the IGF.

- **Global:** geographically or culturally specific topics would not be suitable. Examples of topics that might be suitable based on this criterion include:
 - **Content regulation:** the role of global platform terms of service vis-a-vis role of national law.
 - **Jurisdiction:** circumstances in which national courts or governments should be able to enforce content rules extraterritorially.
 - **Internet shutdowns:** although this occurs mainly in certain countries, it is still more than just a localized regional issue.
 - *BUT NOT*, for example: domestic application of FCC rules on net neutrality
- **Enjoys strong consensus already**, so that reaching an outcome is achievable. Should be defined, agreed upon starting principles within each "project". Examples may include:
 - **Internet of Things security:** already a BPF and DC topic, but a simple, single resolution that stakeholders should work to improve IoT security would be an easy win. Most stakeholders are present and current knowledge present is severely underused.
 - **Internet shutdowns:** another example, previously mentioned, of a topic that's easy to understand and has broad consensus.
 - **Child online protection:** maybe too banal, but a resolution against dissemination of child abuse images could be easy to get consensus around
 - **Internet literacy:** the importance of achieving basic Internet skills for users

- *BUT NOT*, probably, intellectual property enforcement, data protection, or net neutrality which are highly contentious and divisive
- **Non-duplicative** of work done by more specialized bodies, especially if they are also multi-stakeholder. Thus examples of topics that would *NOT BE* suitable include:
 - **ICANN .amazon dispute**, or indeed other ICANN-specific topics, which already have a home there.
 - **Internet technical standards**, which belong in standards bodies such as the IETF, W3C, etc (but swifter implementation of security standards does qualify as a possible topic).
- **Not too sensitive**, which criterion overlaps with "strong consensus already", but is specifically meant to demarcate issues that are politically sensitive for states, for example:
 - **Cyberwarfare and cyber defence** may be too inherently political for this sort of process and also are being dealt with in other UN bodies.
 - **State censorship** is an important issue for the IGF to discuss, but maybe not a good issue to start with.
 - **Trade** may also be politically difficult for states to weigh in on.
- **Need for action.** This should be a hot topic on which an authoritative global voice of the multi-stakeholder Internet community would be helpful to policymakers, for example:
 - **Fake news** and platform (private) censorship is a hot issue not already being addressed by a dedicated multi-stakeholder body.
 - **Internet of things security** provided that we do not try to propose technical solutions.
 - **Internet shutdowns** again, for the reasons previously given.
 - **Collaborative ethics in consensus building** would be a possible "meta-topic" addressing governance processes as a governance issue
 - **Consensus on implementation of protocols, best practices, etc.** is a topic wider than one stakeholder community and can make the Internet safer more quickly.
- **Not too technical.** Although briefing of stakeholder prior to deliberation is inherent to most of the processes, practices, and methodologies explored below, the IGF is not a technical body too much time would be wasted on in-depth technical briefings. The aim of deliberative processes is to understand and seek for the common ground. Thus:
 - **Blockchain** issues could be addressed, but a topic like "Which existing blockchain standards should stakeholders support?" would be better than "What would be a good design for a new blockchain project?"
- **Links to existing IGF work and stakeholder priorities.**

- Agenda-setting could be suggested by outputs from the IGF's existing processes, to ensure that they reflect reflects recommendations made in the previous cycle.
- Each stakeholder group could identify its own priority topic(s) at the start of the IGF cycle. Those topics could get a form of precedence in the selection process.
- Input from other, more specialised Internet governance bodies on work that will affect other communities.
- Input from NRIs.

MAG overview

If tangible outcomes are to become a more important drive for the IGF, broad participation is a necessity. Without it the outcomes will have no or significantly less meaning. It brings the MAG, at least in part, in a different position. It needs to be not only better but more widely informed on current issues and from different angles. Representatives from different stakeholder communities have indicated that without prioritisation, a clear focus, a timeline and a predefined desired outcome, chances are they will not participate in intersessional work. Current IGF intersessional work does not adequately address all those requirements. If these are prerequisites, what can the MAG do to create favourable circumstances for potentially more successful intersessional work?

The MAG can create a position for itself in which it is able to oversee the total playing field and, where necessary is in a position to make choices of direction. Prioritising is a necessity, something many see as a critical factor for active participation. Without it most participants from business, government and technical community drift away, as they have in the past. How can the MAG get to this position? A few suggestions are presented here.

A. Stakeholder communities

Each stakeholder community will have its own priorities. A process can be developed that allows for these communities to bring forward their respective priorities. Once identified they are treated as equals. These priorities can be developed, through inclusive IGF standard guidelines, into programmes, workshops, BPFs, informative sessions, etc., as participants deem necessary to reach their goals.

B. Work under the previous IGF cycle

At the end of each cycle an inventory could to be made that allows the MAG an overview of unfinished business and/or advice to continue current work. This allows for continuation of debate. If this is coupled to better defined guidelines for output, focus is given to this work, results presented upon and disseminated.

C. Workshop input

The MAG each year is provided with an overview of current issues from different sides. This gives it the opportunity to bring together the best minds available to join and use their ideas on the topic at hand to provide the IGF with concrete programs on ways forward within and/or beyond the IGF. E.g. Blockchain, artificial intelligence, women's rights on the Internet

and cyber security could have profited in Geneva from a more focused approach instead of individual workshops.

D. Multistakeholder processes and active cooperation

In order to provide the MAG with an overview of the current playing field the MAG can invite other multistakeholder Internet governance organisations to share their current agendas/workload with the MAG. This puts the MAG in a position to connect the dots and create program(s) that allow(s) these organisations to share vital information to others to incorporate into their respective workloads and to receive information that they can use to perfect their own programs. Liaisons could be instated between organisations.

Another form of interaction between the IGF and other organisations is to actively cooperate or incorporate work from other communities into the IGF and vice versa. An example is the invitation of the Global Forum of Cyber Expertise to work together in the field of capacity building and the development of best practices. A much versed wish is to involve the NRIs more in prioritisation and thus create a less western centred environment within the IGF.

E. Intersessional work

In order for intersessional work to gain prominence, there is a need for the IGF program to have a measure of flexibility that allows work programs like BPFs to stage sessions that need more in-depth information gathering or hands on work than an online session can provide. Work that was not foreseen at the start.

F. Dissemination and acceptance

Where work within one silo has been concluded, often there is a need for dissemination and acceptance/adoption of these programs. If the IGF has a successful role in cross-pollination between programs, it can also assume a role in the dissemination of concluded programs and provide a platform where the importance of adoption is presented on. The combination of these two stages may allow for greater understanding of and support for these programs, leading to speedier adoption than is currently the standard.

Having this level of overview allows the MAG to prioritise and decide on directions where necessary. It creates a level of overview no one else in the world has and brings the IGF into a position of more and greater importance to all stakeholder communities.

Existing examples of processes, practices, or methodologies

There is no need to suggest a new format or process if existing IGF processes could be used to produce the kind of focused, tangible outcomes that are required to evolve the IGF in fulfilment of its mandate. Therefore here we list those existing processes, and later we will assess these against the same criteria that were developed above for the assessment of new processes.

Existing IGF Processes

The following existing IGF processes are taken as a starting point. However the shortcomings of these are acknowledged. In general because these were developed for freeform discussion only, they are not designed to be outcome-oriented, they leave no room for spontaneity or urgency, and they lack any sort of commitment after decisions have been made concerning ways forward, or by assigning specific responsibility for the best possible outcome.

- **Intersessional policy programme** - This is a MAG-led initiative to collect submissions from the IGF community and national and regional initiatives to create a summary report.
- **Dynamic Coalitions** - Some of these already produce recommendations, but they are not official outputs of the IGF and are not very widely vetted or endorsed outside the self-selected DC membership.
- **Best Practice Forums** - Their topics are officially selected by the MAG, but they also have quite minimal participation at present and are not widely read or cited outside the IGF.
- **National and Regional IGFs** - Are quite heterogeneous in structure and format, and many of these do not result in activities that would fulfil the IGF's Tunis Agenda para 72(g) mandate.
- **Main sessions** - Currently, main sessions are organised by the MAG and held concurrently with workshops. This makes it difficult to get a critical mass of IGF participants at any meeting, such that any output that the session could endorse could have ownership by the IGF.
- **New session formats** - There is also a working group led by Miguel Estrada proposing and experimenting new session formats. This could serve as a mechanism through which more outcome-oriented processes could be introduced into the IGF.

Other Internet Governance Institutions

As noted above, most Internet governance work that results in tangible and actionable outputs takes place within other organisations, using their own working methods. The IGF could consider some of these other working methods as inspiration for the adoption of analogous processes for the development of recommendations at the IGF.

- **IETF RFCs** - Requests for Comment are IETF working standards documents, facilitated by a formal process of notice comment, which can be adopted voluntarily once they reach a mature stage.
- **NETmundial Declaration** - A multi-stakeholder policy document adopted through a multi-stakeholder drafting committee, online notice and comment, face-to-face interaction and rough consensus adoption by a plenary meeting.
- **ICANN PDP** - Probably too heavyweight; a rather baroque policy development process, which can be too lengthy and intensive for some stakeholders and tends to be dominated by well-resourced stakeholders.

- **M3AAWG** - The Messaging Malware Mobile Anti Abuse Working Group produces recommendations in a similar, but simpler process to the IETF and World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).

Outside of Internet Governance

If tangible outcomes are to become more tangible and influential, this will require different ways of gathering inputs, encouraging and resourcing participation, and ensuring better proliferation of outcomes. That most probably entails a stronger commitment and involvement to the existing processes by those who instigate them, perhaps by a dedicated supporting body or external consultant. If it is left only to the voluntary efforts of the overworked and under-resourced MAG, the chances of meaningful change seem low.

Below are some of the possible processes, practices and methodologies that could serve as inspiration for the IGF, that come from outside the Internet governance regime. Some of these models include a new group of stakeholders, the ordinary citizens. This group is at the same time the most affected by the consequences of the policies discussed during IGF and the least represented. The participation of ordinary citizens is progressively being introduced in international negotiations and discussions for example in the Climate negotiations. It is backed by more and more international declarations (e.g. the Taormina G7 final declaration).

- **Speed dialogues** - Was once used at the ITU and proposed for a previous IGF meeting, but never took place. A participatory process involving participants questioning experts to gain understanding; not necessarily outcome-oriented.
- **Idea Rating Sheets** - Probably too lightweight for the IGF, but this was trialled during two of the previous IGF meetings to gain feedback on outputs generated by the IGF Dynamic Coalitions.
- **Citizens' Assembly** - Takes a cross-section of the public to study the options available on certain questions and to propose answers through rational and reasoned discussion and the use of various methods of inquiry such as directly questioning experts.
- **Citizens' Jury** - A smaller public whose deliberation on a policy issue is expert-facilitated, but probably would involved a too small population size for the IGF.
- **Consensus Conference** - Like a larger version of a Citizens' Jury.
- **Deliberative Poll** - Can be of a larger size, with hundreds of participants or more, and is particularly designed to measure shifts of opinion prior to and following expert-facilitated deliberation.
- **Global Citizens' Debate** - A deliberative format which allows ordinary citizens from all over the world to articulate their preferences on policy options and priorities. Such a debate takes place in around 100 countries of the world on the same day. A first Global Citizens' Debate is being prepared for IGF 2019 and could be a proof of concept for a strong deliberative format.
- **D-CENT** - A set of online policy collaboration tools developed for "21st century democracy". Includes tools for policy development, deliberation, and voting.
- **Loomio** - An open-source software platform for proposition development and decision making. (Some other alternatives are Kialo and LiquidFeedback.)

In order to work together within the IGF there most likely is a need for rules of some form and conditions that allow for multistakeholder cooperation and inclusion. Rules that need to be decided upon. All else could be fluid and to be decided by the groups working together on a specific topic. They can decide on the form within which they expect to achieve success. The MAG and the secretariat are there to facilitate these processes, to liaise with constituency groups and to allow for requests for input and a successful dissemination of the results to reach other communities when desired respectively necessary.

Analysis of options

Schedule A assesses how each of the above identified methodologies etc. may or may not meet the criteria earlier developed above. Although the ratings given are subjective, some broad patterns can be observed:

- The **most inclusive** options tend to be those that are based around a mostly online mode of participation, which allows the number of participants to scale to a high number without greatly increasing cost. These include options such as *D-CENT* and *Loomio*. However their main deficit is their lack of a face-to-face mode of engagement.
- The **most balanced** options tend to be those that are explicitly modeled after the ideals of democratic deliberation, and which take to place face-to-face with trained facilitation. These include options such as *Consensus Conference* and *Global Citizens' Debate*. However, these also tend to be resource intensive, and also tend to lack an online mode of engagement.
- The **accountability** of most of the options considered is comparable (with the exception of some of the existing IGF formats such as *Dynamic Coalitions*), so accountability criteria are not a deciding factor for distinguishing between them.
- The best **outcome orientation** is found, unsurprisingly, in those options that are actually used to develop policy outcomes. These include the *IETF RFCs* and, to some extent, the *NETmundial* meeting process. These do incorporate both online and offline modes of engagement, but can be lacking in inclusivity and balance.

Clearly, there is no existing option identified that is capable of immediate and simple adoption into the IGF. Since none of the identified methodologies etc. fully meets all of the essential criteria, a hybrid or multiple-stage methodology is suggested, that makes the most of the strengths of each of its components while ameliorating their weaknesses.

As an example, these stages might involve:

1. An agenda-setting process that draws upon IGF's existing processes. For example, key messages from Dynamic Coalition reports, Best Practice Fora, and the intersessional policy program could be used to identify possible suitable topics.
2. Once identified, a medium scale facilitated face-to-face deliberation, or perhaps a geographically distributed series of deliberations (such as the *Global Citizens' Debate*), could take place for exploring concrete policy options.

3. Points of consensus reached during the deliberation would be used to construct an online facilitated discussion (using something like *Loomio*) to broaden outreach and to refine the points of agreement into the framing of a draft text.
4. At the next IGF meeting, a plenary main session (preferably not overlapping with workshops) could be held for presentation and formal endorsement of that final text.
5. Allow for a liaison system with other Internet governance organisations so the text can be widely promulgated and its implementation by other Internet governance organizations monitored.

Resources to support implementation

Knowing that the Secretariat is very stretched for resources, here are some options for partnering with other projects to implement the recommendations put forward in this option paper as a pilot for the 2018 IGF cycle:

- ISOC's Collaborative Governance project is a funded project to convene stakeholders to solve concrete problems and develop norms on a consensus basis. Its Executive Director Larry Strickling has agreed that we can put it forward as a possible partner for implementation of the recommendations that we are making in this option paper. Please see <https://www.internetsociety.org/collaborativegovernance/> for more information.
- Missions Publiques also has a proposal for a Global Citizens' Debate on the future of the Internet to be piloted across the world during 2018 and deployed at full scale in preparation of IGF 2019. The international coalition of stakeholders that will implement this debate is being finalized until June 2018. It could be a testbed for the above mentioned principles and criteria of success as well as for the topics to be addressed.

If an external organization takes responsible for the implementation of the pilot, this will reduce the burden on the Secretariat. The Secretariat however would retain oversight of the rollout of the pilot process. Although previous pilot projects (notably Deliberative Polling) have been trialed as IGF side events, the official sanction of the IGF for new activities is important to build the confidence of stakeholders in their legitimacy, to encourage participation of those now aloof or absent, and to ensure outputs have a high profile.

Responsibility for dissemination and implementation of the outputs of the process would be shared, and this would require the establishment of a two-way communications channel between the IGF and the external stakeholders and stakeholder groups. They would each provide a liaison who is responsible for the communication to and from the IGF and the continuation of the workflow.

Conclusion

Based on our analysis, there is something to be said for the adoption on a pilot basis of a hybrid online and offline deliberative process at the 2018 IGF. Unlike current IGF processes,

it would be designed to enable the community at large to reach a rough consensus on a short, sharp, focused output text on an important issue of current concern.

As an example of this kind of hybrid approach in action, the Dutch organization Synmind provides a program aimed at creating an environment in which all participants share visions and experiences in the form of a productive dialog. It has an online module where ideas and potential solutions are exchanged, discussed and participants actively learn from each other (similar to Loomio). It culminates in a physical workshop (similar to a Citizens' Jury) where processes can be finalised. This way of preparing participants is a way of working that could assist participants in a multistakeholder environment to better understand each other's points of view and discover similarities beyond potential disputes.

To give a concrete example of how this might work, if the topic selected was IoT security, we could aim to have the IGF reach a recommendation that within two years, no products should be sold that do not have a specified fundamental level of security.

This could be done holding a pilot session at the 2018 IGF that would incorporate the recommendations given in this option paper to allow the IGF community at large (online and at a full plenary session) to express endorsement for a short, simple recommendation that had been developed in a facilitated deliberative multi-stakeholder process.

This recommendation would be passed by liaisons, established by IGF stakeholders, to the appropriate technical standards body, to the device manufacturers, and to governments (perhaps trade negotiators, consumer protection agencies, technical standards assessment bodies). Monitoring of the implementation of the recommendation would follow.

A new process of this kind would build upon and complement rather than replacing existing IGF processes. It would not change the fundamental character of the IGF as a discussion forum, but would simply make the IGF more useful by enabling the fruits of its existing work program and use the minds of all the experts available to be expressed in a more useful, tangible, and authoritative form.

| CRITERIA | Existing IGF processes | | | | | Processes from other IG institutions | | | | | Outside of Internet Governance | | | | | Global Citizens Debate | D-CENT | Loomio | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| | Intersectoral policy program | Dynamic Coalitions | Best Practice Forums | NRIs | Main sessions | New session formats | IETF RFCs | NETmundial Declaration | ICANN PDP | Speed dialogues | Idea Rating Sheets | Citizens' Assembly | Consensus Conference | Citizens' Jury | Deliberative Poll | | | | |
| Inclusiveness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multi-stakeholder participation | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | |
| Resource intensiveness | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | |
| Online and offline modes | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Poor | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | |
| Can attract missing stakeholders | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Broad participation possible | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | |
| Multilingual and accessible | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | |
| Balance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Safeguards against domination | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Balanced briefing materials | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Deliberative process | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | |
| Resists harassment, gaming, cap | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | |
| Compatible with Code of Conduct | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Rough consensus standard | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Good | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | |
| Reporting of dissenting outcomes | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Good | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Accountability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transparency | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Openness to public | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Neutral facilitator | Good | Poor | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Multi-stakeholder organization | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Outcome-orientation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Text-based outputs | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | |
| Non-binding | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Actionable by other institutions | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | |
| Short/concise outcomes | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | |
| Not just chairman's summary | Poor | Good | Poor | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | |
| Promulgation role for participants | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Moderate | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | |
| Format can be cited academically | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | |
| Multilingual output possible | Good | Good | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | |
| Change tracking possible | Moderate | Good | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | Good | Good | Poor | Poor | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Good | |
| Notes | The current example is "Connecting the next Billion" | Dynamic Coalitions vary considerably, so "Moderate" here means "it varies". | The existing BPFs have had limited participation. | Ratings are a bit arbitrary as NRIs vary a lot and contain various types of sessions. | This is based on the traditional panel format with Q&A, held in parallel to workshops. | "Moderate" here means that it depends on the nature of the new session format. | Assuming a similar model could be applied to policy issues. | Assuming a similar meeting format could be organized again. | ICANN PDP is very intensive and stakeholder balance is imperfect. | Was used by ITU and considered (but never used) for IGF. | Was used, with minimal resources, for the IGF DCs in 2015 and 2016. | Generally large and long-term, involves a "mini-public" in deliberation on policy issues. | A larger scale version of a Consensus Conference. | A smaller scale version of a Consensus Conference. | Is not usually used to make decisions but to track changes of opinion after deliberation. | Can be shaped by the community to reach better score | Suite of online democracy applications, see d-cent.eu. | Web application for collaborative drafting and decision-making. Compare LiquidFeedback and Kialo. | |