IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Virtual Meeting III
11 April 2017

Summary Report

1. The third Virtual MAG Meeting of the 2017 IGF preparatory cycle took place on 11 April. Ms. Lynn St. Amour moderated the meeting as Chair of the MAG and Mr. Chengetai Masango represented the IGF Secretariat. Following up items from the previous meeting, the agenda (**ANNEX I**) focused on proposed Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and MAG working groups for 2017, BPF and Working Group modalities, as well as an update on a discussion within the NRIs community regarding IGF program opportunities and possible additional "channels" between the MAG and the NRI network.

2. The meeting began with a brief update from the Secretariat on the status of IGF 2017 workshops and open forums. Calls for proposals for each were launched on 17 March and 5 April, respectively. Historically the vast majority of proposals are received in the week or few days before the deadlines, and the Secretariat has already received some proposals. Submitters have responded well and, thus far, have not reported any issues with the new electronic submission platforms. It was mentioned a note to inform permanent missions and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) in Geneva about the calls for proposals had been drafted and would be circulated through the UN Office at Geneva (UNOG)'s communications channels. The Secretariat was requested to share this note with the MAG, so Government and IGO members could further disseminate.

3. The Chair introduced the agenda item on IGF National and Regional Initiatives (NRIs), explaining it had been agreed during the first face-to-face meeting in Geneva that further efforts to integrate NRIs in the annual IGF meeting programme and intersessional activities were desired. In parallel, NRIs have been discussing what additional "channels", if any, they would find helpful with the MAG or Secretariat. In the past an NRIs Substantive Coordinator had been appointed by the MAG Chair, but with the growth and evolution of the NRI network and the addition of an NRIs Focal Point to the Secretariat, it was felt any future positions should reflect the bottom-up nature of IGF and NRI processes, and be done with the communities. NRIs have sent an update to the MAG Chair and discussions are continuing.. The Chair suggested the factors to consider in these discussions are: 1) the NRIs own organization/coordination needs, 2) the MAG's need to build the best possible programme (IGF and Intersessional activities), and 3) organizational bandwidth/channels between the NRI and MAG in order to best address global policy and Internet governance issues.

4. The Secretariat NRIs Focal Point gave an overview of the role followed by a briefing on the consultation happening among NRIs on describing their potential connections to the MAG. Three proposed scenarios have been considered (**ANNEX II**, with inputs summarized) – one in which a designated MAG member represents the NRIs' interests in terms of the annual meeting

programme; a second in which MAG members already active in NRIs collectively play this role; a third in which a non-MAG member takes up this role and interfaces with the MAG. Although no consensus could be reached at the time of the meeting, NRIs agreed to submit the inputs as received to the MAG Chair and await a further decision. At the same time, there was strong agreement among NRIs to request space in the IGF programme for collaborative NRIs-dedicated sessions (details also in **ANNEX II**). The MAG Chair will continue working with the MAG and NRIs on these matters.

5. The MAG then reviewed the working groups that have been proposed to date and their general status and support (as outlined in **ANNEX III**). While a new charter is forthcoming for the Working Group on Workshop Review and Evaluation Process (WG-WREP), support is strong for this group and it was determined it should continue to carry out its activities. The Working Group on New Session Formats (WG-NSF), which is also very clearly supported and was successful in its work last year, was agreed upon for continuation. The Working Group on Communications and Outreach (WG-CO) enjoys very good support and was approved. Given its broad remit, it was suggested the group's objectives be prioritized and that the roles of the relevant actors be clarified (e.g. will the members speak as individuals or MAG representatives?), clearly distinguish between the responsibilities of this group and the Secretariat. A lot of interest was shown in the newly proposed Working Group on IGF Improvements (WG-IMP), which was also approved. Regarding the possibility of its overlapping with an effort to develop an IGF "multiyear strategic work programme", it was clarified that WG-IMP would focus on the progress toward improvements to date, and that any topical issues would be best taken up in the context of a strategic framework. A separate working group may be formed on this. It was proposed that the discussion on a possible new Working Group on Fundraising (WG-FUN) be combined with a later item in the agenda.

6. Six proposed Best Practice Forums (BPFs) were considered by the MAG (**ANNEX III**). There was strong agreement on the continuation of two from 2016 – BPF: Cybersecurity and BPF: Gender & Access – and therefore consensus to move ahead with these in 2017. A number of MAG members expressed support for a potential BPF on Remote Participation, with some expressing the view that remote participation in general is either not an appropriate substantive topic for a BPF, or indeed too important for a BPF given how critical practical implementation is (one MAG member suggested a "Task Force on Remote Participation"). It was decided that the remote participation issue would be best incorporated into the future effort on a multiyear strategic work programme, and that efforts should continue this year to improve RP in the IGF context, perhaps through the WG on Communications and Outreach. Regarding the two new proposed BPFs on Local Content and Enhanced International Cooperation, both of which received a good deal of support, a decision on them will be deferred to discussion on the mailing list or the next virtual meeting. While a BPF had been suggested on Combatting Corruption Online, no proposal was received and so was removed from consideration. Due to time pressures review of a third phase of the Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) initiative (CENB III) will similarly be deferred to the mailing list, while noting there was good support for it.

7. The latest versions of the documents on guidelines and modalities for BPFs and WGs shared with the MAG (**ANNNEXES IV & V**) were approved. Concerning the BPF document, a comment was made that the MAG might benefit from some written description of BPF issues before they are proposed in a face-to-face meeting, but that this can be requested by the Chair beforehand. The approved BPF document was ultimately considered sufficiently precise in terms of establishing procedures.

8. The Chair elaborated on a memo that was sent to members on the exceptional extension of her responsibilities. In light of short-staffing within the Secretariat and need for increased funds, on a temporary basis, the Chair has been asked to focus her efforts on specific key areas, namely: securing funding commitments; increasing/improving IGF outputs; helping to secure future annual meeting venues; increasing outreach; and developing a multiyear strategic work programme.. It was made clear that this would not expand the Chair's decision-making capabilities, will complement the Secretariat's work, and not put any kind of lasting structure in place where the traditional role of the Chair is concerned. A significant portion of the role would focus on enabling implementation. The Chair made it clear that all strategies will be developed and approved through traditional MAG/IGF community processes, and UN processes where appropriate. Several of these areas were approved as topics of MAG working groups and will require everyone's support to advance. There was strong support for the Chair to take on these additional responsibilities (on the MAG list and in this meeting).

9. Members were informed the Chair and Secretariat were working on a calendar of future meetings and that this would be shared as soon as possible. The next virtual meeting is scheduled to take place on **Tuesday, 25 April.**

Annex I – Draft Agenda

2017 MAG Virtual Meeting III - 11 April 2017, 22:00 - 23:30 UTC
(approx. 90 minutes)

1 - Adoption of agenda (5 minutes)

2 - Update on WS Call for Proposals and Open Forum Call (5 minutes)

3 - NRIs Update - follow up from 1st MAG meeting (15 minutes)

4 - Follow-up from MAG Virtual Meeting III (50 minutes)
- a - Status Update/Formation of MAG WGs
- b - Status Update/Formation of BPFs,
- c - Status Update of CENB
- d - Review Status of WG and BPF Process documents

5 - MAG Chair, Key Priorities, Fundraising (10 mins)

6 - AOB (5 minutes)

Annex II – NRI Inputs

IGF 2017: National and Regional IGF Initiatives

Public Call for Describing the additional IGF support to the NRIs - Summary of Received Inputs –

About

1. During the first IGF 2017 face to face meeting of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group in Geneva, the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point informed that the NRIs have submitted a joint submission to the IGF 2016 Taking Stock process that among other things, calls for the NRIs to organize a main session for the 2017 IGF as well as for the MAG to reconsider giving more space for the NRIs individual, substantive representation.

2. The MAG advised the NRIs to submit a concrete proposal on the possible models of their representation and integration in the IGF 2017 annual programme.

3. The IGF Secretariat launched a public call for the NRIs to submit their inputs, within a one-week long initial deadline, that later on request of some of the NRIs, was extended for another week. The Call, as sent to the NRIs through the NRIs mailing list, is attached to this summary Report as Annex A1.

4. The IGF Secretariat will share and discuss the content and format of this summary with the NRIs before submitting to the MAG for their further discussion. The NRIs discussion on this matter is scheduled to be during the NRIs Virtual Meeting IV on 4 April 2017, at 15:00 p.m. UTC.

Number of received inputs and purpose of this summary

5. Until the given deadline, the IGF Secretariat received in total thirty-three (33) submissions. Out of these, thirty (30) inputs were submitted by the NRIs coordinators, as per the IGF Secretariat's list of the NRIs coordinators. Other three (3) submissions came from individuals as members of the NRIs community, including among them, one MAG member. All inputs, in their original text as received, are attached to this summary as Annex A2. Distinction is made among the submissions that came from the NRIs coordinators and the ones came from the wider NRIs community members, as indicated in the table within the Annex A2.

6. The purpose of this summary report is providing formatted input to the NRIs to discuss how the final submission to the MAG should be constructed.

Summary of received inputs

7. Summary of received inputs is done in line with the structure of the sent Public Call. Namely, the section A of the call asked the NRIs to describe the NRIs additional support, offering three broad options. Thus, the section below summarizes the section A, per each of three offered potential alternatives. The section B of the Call, asked for the integration of the NRIs into the IGF annual programme, and is summarized after the section A summary.

Section A Summary

8. The section A asked for inputs on three broad possible alternatives, taking into account previously suggested ideas by some of the NRIs.

- **Section A, Option 1**

9. The section A, option 1 called for inputs on the following: ‘’*In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme.’’*

10. Support for this option came from thirteen (13) initiatives. Three (3) individual submissions that were classified as Others did not support this option.

11. In terms of the provided content, the following key points were raised:

a) In line with informing that the submitted input does not represent a consensus based view of the members of their Organizing Team, one initiative gave a narrow preference to this option, with noting that this alternative does not provide clear explanation on how the NRIs representation in the MAG will improve linkages into the global IGF. It was suggested that this representative should be either appointed by the MAG Chair or selected by a committee or the entire MAG.

b) One initiative stated that it is important to keep strong connection to the MAG given the fact that the development of the annual meeting programme is MAG’s responsibility. It was underlined that this option

allows space for having a more defined function of this representative, where a set of responsibilities will be taken by this dedicated member that will be mandated by the NRIs to

support their interests in the MAG. It was noted that this kind of practice proved to be effective during 2016 year.

c) In terms of this representative's role description, some stated that it should be to coordinate the work of the NRIs regarding their best possible representation at the IGF annual meeting. Others stated that this person should act as a liaison between the NRIs and the MAG, and be knowledgeable of the NRIs work.

d) Some described that the role should include convening the NRIs quarterly meetings; offering assistance where needed; motivation of unrepresented regions to have their own initiatives organized; acting as a mediator between the NRIs and the IGF Secretariat in order to provide advices on financing the NRIs, to disseminate information on the IGF principles and to work closely with the IGF Secretariat's Focal Point to the NRIs.

e) The key responsibilities for this person, according to some views would be to represent the NRIs on the MAG and to report to the NRIs on the developments and outcomes of the MAG meetings.

f) Some described the role in a way that the representative would be chairing the NRIs (virtual) meetings and ensuring the corresponding inputs be conveyed to the MAG.

g) Considering the appointment of this person, some were of opinion that the MAG Chair should appoint one person, while others suggested that the whole MAG should decide on this. Some stated that the NRIs among themselves should decide on this.

h) As some understand that this position would require a significant amount of time, it was suggested that the MAG Chair could appoint one or two 'vice-coordinators'.

i) Some suggested to consider the regional diversity when appointing a MAG member.

j) It was suggested that this representative works closely with the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point.

k) Concerns were raised in light of how the representative would be chosen and how the NRIs would reach a consensus on this matter.

l) Others shared a concern that this option could dilute the NRIs voices. Given the set of responsibilities of the MAG members, it will be difficult for this representative to focus on assigned work.

- **Section A, Option 2**

12. The section A, option 2 called for the inputs on following alternative: ‘*‘The MAG members that are actively affiliated with the NRIs should be representing the interests of the NRIs on the MAG, (in regards to the annual programme) in addition to the interests of their particular stakeholder groups, while keeping in mind that*

all MAG members act in their individual capacity with a commitment to the overall success of the IGF when contributing to the IGF annual programme and intersessional activities during the 2017 term.’’

13. Support for this option came from three (3) initiatives. One (1) individual submission, classified as Others supported this option as well.

14. In terms of the provided content, the following key points were raised:

a) This option represents the spirit of multi-sectorial participation, as there are approximately 15 MAG 2017 members affiliated with the NRIs.
b) It was noted that this option is the most practical, given the total number of the MAG members that are affiliated with the NRIs. It was suggested to make this information available.
c) It was said that the MAG members should communicate with the NRIs on their specific issues.
d) Some noted that it would be challenging for these representatives to balance the position of a stakeholder group they belong to and the NRIs position.
e) Some stated that this option is not a good solution as not all NRIs are represented on the MAG. Also, it was said that this could influence the equality between the MAG members, as some will be given the additional authority with this role.

- **Section A, Option 3**

15. The section A, option 3 called for the inputs to the following: *‘’A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the annual IGF programme. As you know the MAG meetings are open to everyone, and the NRIs could explore this option as well.’’*

16. Support for this option came from fourteen (14) initiatives. Two (2) individual submissions that were classified as Others supported this option as well.

17. In terms of the provided content, the following key points were raised by some of the initiatives:

a) It was noted that the communication between the NRIs and the MAG will be more effective if it would have a speaker coming from the NRIs, and not an external person.
b) The appointed person will be acting as a liaison between the NRIs and the MAG, with the task to channel the communication related to the IGF

   overall programme and other relevant activities between the MAG and the NRIs.
c) Individual communication with the NRIs should also be done by this person, vis-à-vis gathering needed inputs.
d) This option goes in line with the need of the NRIs to create an autonomous position to represent their interests. In addition, this option prevents creating any collision or even the principle of multistakeholderism.
e) As this position requires in depth knowledge about the NRIs, it was suggested by some that Ms. Marilyn Cade should support the NRIs in this role, as previously done.
f) It was noted that the work done by the IGF Secretariat and the NRIs Substantive Coordinator was effective and some called for continuation.
g) It was noted that a driver of the overall process could be a past MAG member that understands both the MAG and the NRIs.
h) It was suggested that the role of the appointed person be discussed by the NRIs on the dedicated virtual meetings. Possible work tasks of this representative could include the collaboration with the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point regarding the work related to the NRIs; speaking on behalf of the NRIs at relevant meetings (e.g. MAG meeting); improving the visibility of the NRIs and working on the NRIs representation at the IGF annual meeting.
i) Appointed person must have in depth knowledge about the NRIs, individually and collectively.
j) It was suggested that the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point should be taking the responsibility of representing the NRIs interest and liaising with the MAG members on regular basis to create synergies.
k) Some were of opinion that this option raises concerns related to the accountability and transparency, in line with expressing that there is no good mechanism for the NRIs to choose this person.

Section B Summary

18. Within the section B, it was explained that the joint submission of the NRIs was read during the first IGF 2017 MAG face to face meeting, where it was noted that the NRIs showed interest to organize a main session for this year's IGF, as well as to host a Coordination session as during the IGF 2016 meeting. The submission also called for more representation of the NRIs within the IGF annual meeting's programme. In this regard, the NRIs have been asked if there will be an interest
    for some of them to partner with other individual NRIs and organize substantive sessions on a topic of their mutual interest.

19. Twenty-one (21) initiatives expressed their interest to partner with other NRIs and organize a substantive session on a topic that is of mutual interest.

20. For some the so far practice was that the Government, that was given a slot for the Open Forum, offered a space within it for the national IGF of their country to organize a session.

21. Some noted that this could be opportunity to learn about the issues in other countries and regions, as well as to create synergies among the individual NRIs.

22. Some expressed concerns that collaboration with other NRIs on the organization of the joint session is challenging as it requires significant amount of time and coordination.

23. It was proposed that the length of these sessions could be between 60 and 90 minutes, depending on the topic. Some noted that the most optimal time would be 60 minutes as the 90 minutes sessions are too long for the audience.

24. Some noted that the posed question in the initial call was confusing, and that it suggests a fragmented process that may not attract the right audience.

25. In any case, these sessions should not be a substitute to the main session that brings visibility to the NRIs. Many reiterated the importance of having a main session.

26. One initiative proposed the topic on digital rights for joint organization by interested NRIs.

Next Steps

27. The IGF Secretariat will summarize the received inputs and distribute the summary report through the NRIs mailing list.

28. The summary report will be an input to the NRIs Virtual meeting IV, scheduled to be on 4 April at 15:00 p.m. UTC. The purpose of the meeting will be to define further actions on received inputs and the format of the final submission to the MAG.

29. For any questions related to the summary report, contact the IGF Secretariat, NRIs Focal Point at: agengo@ungo.ch.

Annex A1

Call sent to the NRIs

A. Your inputs needed: defining the NRIs support

Within the IGF Secretariat, the NRIs will continue to have the support from a dedicated Focal Point.

We would like to kindly ask for the inputs from each initiative, to define what kind of additional support is needed, especially in regards to the options that some of you previously have mentioned, as indicated below:

Option 1
In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme.
If this is the option you would find useful, please inform the IGF Secretariat and describe the role for this position.

Option 2
The MAG members that are actively affiliated with the NRIs should be representing the interests of the NRIs on the MAG, (in regards to the annual programme) in addition to the interests of their particular stakeholder groups, while keeping in mind that all MAG members act in their individual capacity with a commitment to the overall success of the IGF when contributing to the IGF annual programme and intersessional activities during the 2017 term.
Please note that there are approximately 15 MAG members* that are directly affiliated with the NRIs, meaning that they have a seat with the Organizing Committees of their respective initiatives.

Option 3
A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the annual IGF programme.
As you know the MAG meetings are open to everyone, and the NRIs could explore this option as well.

Whichever option you endorse, kindly submit the description of the duties, as you see them.

B. Your inputs needed: NRIs participation at the IGF annual meeting

The NRIs joint submission to the IGF 2016 Taking Stock was read during the MAG meeting. As you know, the submission called for the following:

1. The NRIs to organize a substantive, interactive main sessions for this year's IGF.
2. The NRIs coordination session to be organized.
3. Integration of the NRIs in the overall IGF programme, in a way that a set of dedicated, thematic sessions be offered to the NRIs as an option. The MAG asked for a concrete proposal to be submitted, in order to explore this option in particular. Therefore, in regards to this third option, and if there is interest within the NRIs, we would appreciate if you could submit answers to the following questions:

a) Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting?
b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?
c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?

Annex A2

DESCRIBING THE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO THE NRIs: LIST OF RECEIVED INPUTS AVAILABLE HERE.

Annex III – Table of Proposed IGF 2017 Intersessional Activities & MAG Working Groups

The following table outlines the status of various IGF intersessional and MAG working groups and intersessional activities as of 11 April 2017.

****Asterisked groups are newly proposed in 2017.**

MAG members are listed under "Support" and "Other Comments" based on their messages to the MAG mailing list between Virtual Meetings II and III (28 March - 11 April). Names of facilitators are tentative.

Please note: all of the groups are open to all MAG members and MAG involvement. Broad MAG support for each of the approved groups in 2017 is encouraged.

2017 MAG Working Groups	
Proposed Groups	**Status / Support**
Workshop Review & Evaluation Process (WG-WREP) **4/10/17 Update: Significant Support**	*Still active and helping to guide this year's process. Request to continue WG in order to evaluate this new process and update as needed.* **Support:** Flávio, Miguel, Israel, Julián, Renata, Wisdom, Liesyl, Miguel Ignacio, Sala, Kenta, Jac, Carolyn, Arnold, Zeina, Krzysztof **WG Proposal/Facilitation:** Rasha Abdulla
Outreach and Communications (WG-CO) **4/10/17 Update: Significant Support**	*Draft charter out for review.* **Support:** Flávio, Renata, Miguel, Julián, Wisdom, Liesyl, Miguel Ignacio, Sala, Kenta, Jac, Carolyn, Arnold, Zeina, Krzysztof **Other Comments:** Israel **WG Proposal/Facilitation:** Segun Olugbile **Doc Link:** https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-d-EIIQWsUiMkR2ZnNsVTdzeXc/view?usp=sharing

New Session Formats (WG-NSF) **4/10/17 Update: Significant Support**	*Review of 2016 New Sessions and some thoughts on "Hot Topics".* **Support:** Israel, Flávio, Renata, Wisdom, Elizabeth, Miguel, Zeina, Carolyn, Julián, Igor, Liesyl, Sala, Kenta, Jac, Arnold, Krzysztof **WG Proposal/Facilitation:** Miguel Ignacio Estrada **Doc Link:** https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HNPvUeP6RO8vublqwveCB2t-_TTmCxYDV7njzmsZcnw/edit
****IGF Improvements (WG-IMP)** **4/10/17 Update: Significant Support**	*Good support for this WG generally, some questions on scope (improvements only or to include recommendations for multi-year strategic work plan).* **Support:** Lea, Ginger, Mamadou, Miguel Ignacio, Igor, Julián, Flávio, Alejandra, Ginger, Miguel, Israel, Wisdom, Sala, Kenta, Jac, Carolyn, Arnold, Krzysztof **Other Comments:** Mamadou **WG Proposal/Facilitation:** Avri Doria **Doc Link:** https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-WSFh9XQV0hutxuAlxsAJCs8XNtiCDSktADcEYKdFrI/edit
****Fundraising (WG-FUN)** **4/10/17 Update: Background document sent, proposal to follow after discussion.**	*This is a POTENTIAL new WG. Details to be shared during MAG call on 11 April.* **WG Proposal/Facilitation:** Lynn St. Amour
2017 Best Practice Forums (BPFs)	
Proposed BPFs	**Status / Support**
Cybersecurity **4/10/17 Update: Significant support.**	*Proposal out for review.* **Support:** Flávio, Israel, Arnold, Julián, Liesyl, Miguel Ignacio, Carolyn **BPF Proposal/Facilitation:** Markus Kummer Doc Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-d-EIIQWsUiZEhqX0p3ZHJIbnM/view?usp=sharing
Gender & Access	*Proposal out for review.*

4/10/17 Update: Significant support.	**Support:** Flávio, Israel, Arnold, Julián, Liesyl, Miguel Ignacio, Carolyn, Ginger **BPF Proposal/Facilitation:** Jac SM Kee Doc Link: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jaPnOcL0fKroPvrxxzRiZHCzUA8k1XBqxpKOInvGjSk/edit
****Local Content** **4/10/17 Update: Significant support.**	*Concept paper open for comments.* **Support:** Zeina, Miguel, Flávio, Israel, Julián, Liesyl, Carolyn **BPF Proposal/Facilitation:** Miguel Ignacio Estrada, Raquel Gatto **Doc Link:** https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fILDME-2swKoshbQgXkBJtG8CqxW50ky0Mt0Rw1zYy4/edit
****Combatting Corruption Online** **4/10/17 Update: No proposal sent, so this BPF is not under consideration.**	*There was strong support for this based on a concept note circulated last year by Mike Nelson. Updated proposal to be sent, with a focus on ensuring we can resource the effort.* **Support:** Zeina, Flávio **Other Comments:** Arnold, Julián, Liesyl **BPF Proposal/Facilitation:** Mike Nelson Doc Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-d-EIIQWsUidTFpVVlmb0FZYTQ/view?usp=sharing
****Remote Participation** **4/10/17 Update: Proposal requires further discussion on scope (per Liesyl's comments) then if appropriate discussion on required format.**	*Proposal out for review.* **Support:** Zeina, Rafael, Miguel Ignacio, Miguel, Israel, Shita, Slobodan, Avri, Wisdom **Other Comments:** Flávio, Haojun, Segun, Arnold, Julián, Michael, Laura, Liesyl, Carolyn **BPF Proposal/Facilitation:** Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Israel Rosas, Mamadou Lo **Doc Link:** https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fYChgZI1YUCLwI43gTWGoTHp0aW8EEsTLlvPkfmxpg8/edit
****International**	*Proposal sent to MAG list 10 April.*

Cooperation **4/10/17 Update: To be discussed.**	**Support:** Arnold, Laura **BPF Proposal/Facilitation:** Wout de Natris (TBD) **Doc Link:** https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-d-EIIQWsUiWEdlTlFqVnhPVms/view?usp=sharing
Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) (CENB) Phase III	
CENB Phase III **4/10/17 Update: Significant support.**	*Proposal out for review.* **Support:** Flávio, Wisdom, Israel, Zeina, Arnold **CENB Proposal/Facilitation:** Constance Bommelaer, Raquel Gatto Doc Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-d-EIIQWsUiRWVvRld5ZW1scGs/view

Annex IV – BPF Modalities and Guidelines

IGF Best Practice Forum's (BPFs): About BPFs, Formation and Working Modalities and Guidelines

Introduction: About BPFs

The Report of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum[1] made, among others, the following recommendation:

11. While maintaining the IGF as a non-binding, non-decision-making and non-duplicative forum, it is important to improve the quality and format of IGF outcomes to enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy. For this purpose, it is necessary that IGF outcomes clearly reflect the full diversity of opinions on key policy issues of the multi-stakeholder IGF community. In addition, ***more tangible and visible IGF outcomes*** *combined with enhanced communication tools and strategy would also improve outreach.*

This recommendation was reaffirmed by the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 2015 on the overall review of the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society[2]:

63. We acknowledge the role of the Internet Governance Forum as a multi-stakeholder platform for discussion of Internet governance issues. We support the recommendations in the report of the Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, 10 which the General Assembly took note of in its resolution 68/198 of 20 December 2013, and we call for their accelerated implementation. We extend for another 10 years the existing mandate of the Internet Governance Forum as set out in paragraphs 72 to 78 of the Tunis Agenda. We recognize that during that period, the Forum should continue to show progress on working modalities and the participation of relevant stakeholders from developing countries. We call upon the Commission, within its regular reporting, to give due consideration to fulfilment of the recommendations in the report of its Working Group.

In 2014, the IGF developed an intersessional programme consisting of best practice forums (BPFs) and other initiatives intended to complement other IGF community activities. This intersessional programme was designed in accordance with the recommendations of the 2012 report of the CSTD Working Group on IGF Improvements that called for the development of more tangible outputs to 'enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy'.

Since 2014 the United Nations including the IGF Secretariat as well as the MAG have received significant feedback and suggestions on how the BPF work could be improved moving forward, some of which is included herewith in **ANNEX I**.

[1] Doc. A /67/65– E /2012/48, http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65corr1_en.pdf
[2] Doc. A /RES/70/125, http://www.un.org/Docs/asp/ws.asp?m=A/RES/70/125

Formation of BPFs and MAG responsibilities

- The Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) of the IGF is responsible for selecting themes for a BPF. This task is part of the core functions of the MAG, namely to define the substantive strategy and priorities for the IGF, including a multi-year programme. Generally, the topics/themes/issues[3] are discussed and selected by the MAG, taking into account community views and inputs, in a face-to-face meeting and/or in virtual meetings and online.

- Themes or issues can be of any nature - technical or non-technical - and are generally chosen if they are perceived to be topical and important to the future of the Internet and related public policy challenges. Topics may be covered/worked on for multiple year(s) if there is a consensus desire to continue the work by the community of participants of a respective BPF and if the MAG approves continuation.

- Some proposed BPF themes which enjoy community support and for which there is demand and interest – but on which the MAG does not conclusively agree – may be suggested for channeling into other IGF processes or discussion platforms, such as Dynamic Coalitions, MAG working groups or annual meeting sessions of various types.

- The formation and continuation of BPFs is a MAG responsibility and should be undertaken in consultation with the IGF Secretariat as this work is not resource-neutral.

- Once the MAG has selected a theme it asks one of its members to act as facilitator or co-facilitator and to set up a group of interested experts to develop a paper as a basis for the work of the BPF. The IGF Secretariat will be responsible for drafting the paper which will serve as an input document for the annual IGF meeting. The facilitators are required to actively participate in periodic meetings of the BPFs and steer their work as outlined in the section on “Working Modalities and Guidelines” below.

- BPFs wishing to continue their work from the previous year should make this clear in their output document for review and consideration by the MAG and should orally propose continuation in the first meeting of the programme cycle.

- Once constituted, BPFs should give periodic updates to the MAG and Secretariat and if it is determined by the MAG that sufficient progress has not been made on the work, BPFs may be subject to dissolution.

Working Modalities and Guidelines

- BPFs have the freedom to define their own methodologies; tailored to each theme’s specific needs and requirements. While BPF outcomes have already been useful in informing policy debates, they are also viewed as iterative materials that are not only flexible but also ‘living’ in the sense that they can

[3] As of March 2017 IGF BPFs have been carried out on the following topics: Developing meaningful multistakeholder participation mechanisms; Regulation and mitigation of unwanted communications (e.g. "spam"); Establishing and supporting Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) for Internet security; Creating an enabling environment for the development of local content; Online child protection; IXPs; IPv6; Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence Against Women; Access and Gender; Cybersecurity

be updated at any time to accommodate the pace of technological change faced by Internet policymakers.

- The IGF Code of Conduct should be followed by all stakeholders involved in IGF BPFs.

- Each BPF should discuss and decide on their respective working modalities in an open and transparent way through mailing lists and during virtual meetings. Decisions on working modalities should have the 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, guiding work being carried out on the mailing lists and carrying 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/meeting minutes and any outputs and providing other logistical support as needed to the work of the groups.

- The format/length of BPF outputs will be dependent on the working methods of the respective groups.

- BPFs are given space at IGF annual meetings to present their outputs and discuss the work, and possible ways forward for it, with the broader global community.

- In the lead-up to and at the annual IGF meeting and post-annual meeting - MAG facilitators/coordinators (and all MAG members) are encouraged to carry out outreach activities to help disseminate BPF outputs and messages to other relevant fora and future meetings.

- A BPF Participant's guide has been developed over the years to help orient newcomers to BPF work.

ANNEX I

Community feedback on IGF BPFs:

From the contributions received from the IGF community Taking Stock of IGF 2015 and Looking Forward to IGF 2016[4]:

26. Leaders of the Best Practice Forums and other stakeholders involved in the day-to-day BPF work recommended that each BPF have the ability to decide on its own methods and approach as this was deemed to be very valuable and contributed to the success of the BPFs. Should the BPF work continued, it was suggested that ideally, the choice of topics, coordinators and consultants should be made as early as possible. This longer period would make it easier to reach out to more stakeholders and parties that are usually not involved in IGF processes. It was also suggested that at the start of the BPF's term, an agreement be reached on the terminology used for key actors, timelines and procedures, use of BPF space on the IGF website and that all BPFs be advised to adhere thereto for the sake of consistency.
27. It was suggested that coordinators and/or consultants involved in IGF BPFs invest more in outreach and engage with broader communities, including at conferences and meetings relevant to the BPF topic, in order to present on the BPF process and its desired outcomes, as well as to learn from community members, have one-on-one meetings with them, ask for help, involvement, input, etc. It was also suggested that the BPFs discuss and prepare a strategy to promote and disseminate the outputs of the BPFs post-publication. Various channels could be used for such promotion, including the IGF mailing lists, cooperation with N/RIs and using the IGF's social media accounts.

From the IGF community consultation regarding the working retreat on "Advancing the Ten-Year Mandate of the IGF"[5]:

170. It was suggested that some form of liaison could be set up between the BPFs working groups and the MAG. It is also suggested that BPFs work groups could submit their annual work reports for review by the MAG supported by the Secretariat.

171. Some suggested that BPFs could better reflect the multi-year thematic focus areas of the IGF (should there be one). This could be a more effective way in determining resource implications and end objectives. It was also recommended to continue the practice of having a neutral third party to support the logistics and writing components of the BPF work.

172. Guidelines for facilitators of BPFs could be developed to ensure consistency and inclusion of all members of the community.

From the 1st 2017 IGF Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting[6]:

19. There was then a good discussion about the current status of IGF Best Practice Forum(s). There was agreement amongst the community and the MAG that further work should be done to be sure that the outputs of the IGF BPFs are widely disseminated and that those who might find such outputs beneficial be made aware of both the outputs and ongoing work of the BPFs. For example, while it was agreed that the IGF BPFs on IXPs and IPv6 would not continue in 2017, there was a strong push to make sure that the useful work carried out by these BPFs over the past two years were better promoted.

---

[4] Synthesis Paper of the Open Consultations and MAG Meeting, 4-6 April 2016, Geneva, Switzerland, https://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/igf-meeting/igf-2016/takingstock/708-igf-synthesis-paper-taking-stock-2015-2016

[5] See https://www.intgovforum.org/review/igf-retreat-proceedings-ideas-and-suggestions/

[6] Synthesis Paper of the 1st 2017 IGF Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting, 1-3 March 2017, Geneva, Switzerland, https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/4146/544

Annex V – MAG WG Modalities and Guidelines

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Working Groups (WG): About WGs, Formation and Working Modalities and Guidelines

Background:
Since the inception of the first IGF MAG in 2006, the MAG has occasionally decided to form issue-specific Working Groups (WGs) to advance work on specific issues related to the MAG's primary responsibilities as described in the MAG terms of reference.

Formation of MAG Working Groups:
Generally, the MAG should strive to fulfil their mandate with the concurrent participation of all MAG members, taking advantage of face-to-face meetings, online meetings and email communications. If an individual MAG member, or a group of MAG members, feels there is a specific item of work that would be better addressed by a smaller group of MAG members in a working group format then the individual or group of MAG members should propose the formation of a working group to the full MAG and MAG Chair for consideration. A written proposal should be presented which states clear objectives and a timetable (if applicable) for the work. If a consensus of the MAG feels the working group should be formed, then the MAG Chair can approve such a Working Group.

MAG Working Group Guidelines/Modalities

1. Working groups should be inclusive of all views and have balanced participation from all stakeholder groups.
2. Working groups must seek and receive feedback from the full MAG when defining goals and objectives of the group and prior to making recommendations.
3. Working groups should be fully transparent and mailing lists/face-to-face and virtual meetings should be open to all MAG members.
4. Proceedings from any Working Group activity/meeting should be publically available on the IGF website.
5. The IGF Code of Conduct should be followed at all times.
6. Working groups have the freedom to define their own working methodologies and can include non-MAG members in the work if appropriate.
7. Decisions on these working modalities should be made by consensus of the Working Group.
8. There should be two MAG co-facilitators from different stakeholder groups appointed by the MAG Chair.
9. MAG facilitators should act as stewards of the groups, assist in scheduling and chairing the working virtual meetings, guiding work being carried out on the mailing lists and carrying out outreach as appropriate to encourage participation.
10. The IGF Secretariat should be a part of these Working Groups, with their role defined by each Working Group and the IGF Secretariat.
11. MAG Working Groups are assumed to have a lifetime of one (1) IGF cycle, and must be approved anew each year.
12. Once constituted, Working Groups should give periodic updates to the MAG and Secretariat and if it is determined by the MAG that sufficient progress has not been made, a Working Group may be subject to dissolution.

Submission Process/Template For Proposed New Working Groups
(2-3 Pages)
Purpose of the WG:
Objectives/Goals of the WG:
Expected Output(s):
Implementation Plan (if appropriate)
Timeframe for the work:

List of Participants

MAG Chair	
Ms. St. Amour, Lynn	Internet Matters
MAG Members	
Ms. Aquino Ribeiro, Renata	Researcher and teacher, E. I. Consulting,
Mr. Dengate-Thrush, Peter	Counsel, Barrister
Mr. Donkor, Wisdom	Information Technology Manager, Technical Lead for Ghana Open Data Initiative, National Information Technology Agency
Ms. Doria, Avri	Independent Researcher, DBA Technicalities
Mr. Estrada, Miguel Ignacio	CEO, 1977 SRL
Mr. Fernández González, Juan Alfonso	Advisor, Ministry of Communications, Cuba
Ms. Gatto, Raquel	Regional Policy Advisor, ISOC
Mr. Ilishebo, Michael	Officer, Zambia Police Service
Ms. Inne, Anne-Rachel	Vice President for Government Engagement, ICANN
Mr. Ji, Haojun	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations Office at Geneva
Ms. Kaspar, Lea	Programme Lead, Global Partners Digital
Ms. Laksmi, Shita	Programme Manager, HIVOS Regional Office Southeast Asia
Mr. Lo, Mamadou	Head of Communication and Information Department, Credit Agricole Bank (Senegal)
Mr. Moisander, Juuso	Commercial Secretary, Information Society and ICT, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Ms. Paque, Virginia	Director, Internet Governance Programmes, DiploFoundation
Ms. Tamanikaiwaimaro, Salanieta	President, South Pacific Computer Society
Ms. Thomas-Raynaud, Elizabeth	Senior Policy Executive, Digital Economy and Project Director at International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)
Mr. Wagner, Flávio	Board Member, Brazilian Internet Steering Committee (CGI.br)
Mr. Wanawit, Akhuputra	Deputy Executive Director, Electronic Transactions Development Agency, Ministry of Information and Communication Technology, Thailand
Ms. Watkins, Laura	Policy Executive at Nominet

Former IGF Host Country Representatives	
Mr. Rosas, Israel	Internet Policy Analyst at the National Digital Strategy Coordination, Government of Mexico
Other Participants	
Mr. Asly, Alaa	Digital Citizen Association
Ms. Cade, Marilyn	CEO, Strategies mCADE llc
Mr. Faye, Makane	African IGF Secretariat
Mr. de Natris, Wout	Consultant
Ms. Nava, Gabriela	Government of Mexico
IGF Secretariat	
Mr. Masango, Chengetai	Programme and Technology Manager
Mr. Garcia Bobo, Luis	Associate Information Systems Officer
Ms. Mazzucchi, Eleonora	Programme Management Assistant
Ms. Gengo, Anja	Consultant