**Input from the Federal Office of Communications (OFCOM, Switzerland) to the stocktaking consultation conducted by the IGF Secretariat**

OFCOM thanks for the opportunity of taking part in this stocktaking exercise and in view of past meetings would like to share the following suggestions for the 2017 IGF.

**General suggestions**:

* Raise the **political relevance and profile** of the IGF:
We consider that the IGF would benefit from returning to a broader approach to “Internet Governance”, i.e. allowing and fostering discussions on issues that are of **interest of citizens and businesses** in their daily lives and that are thus relevant for **political debates**. This means that the focus should lie more on issues related to the sometimes disruptive digital transformation of our societies and economies through the use and development of the internet - **in line with the broad approach on IG as established in the UN working definition of the Tunis Agenda,** instead of focusing too much on a narrow definition of “Internet governance” understood as being equivalent to critical internet resources.
* **Raising the level of political and governmental participation** in the IGF, especially from the global south, would be desirable. This could be achieved, inter alia, through working with the national diplomatic missions already present in Geneva, informing them and involving them as early as possible in the preparatory process.
* The **presence of the UNSG** would be a valuable improvement, strengthening with his attendance the profile and visibility of the IGF and its outcomes. Also the re-appointment of a Special Advisor to the UNSG could help in raising the profile of the IGF.
* Benefitting from the **potential of Geneva as an international hub for global governance and dialogue** on a broad range of issues relevant to Internet Governance and digitization by taking advantage of the large international community already present in Geneva, including international organizations and international NGOs, scientific and academic networks, etc. involving them as much as possible in the preparatory work.
* The outreach to **sectors undergoing deep processes of digitization**, which nonetheless are **not yet sufficiently present** in the IGF environment, should be strengthened. We consider that, in particular, a higher presence of the wider business community would be welcome, and therefore, specific outreach actions to involve them in the preparatory work should be envisaged.
* “**Data” related policy issues** (e.g. transborder flow of data, balance between data use and protection, industry 4.0., Big Data, etc.) might constitute a common thread for the IGF 2017, allowing for a holistic discussion of it - and with the IGF acting as shared multistakeholder space for such debates. **Debates around IG and digital policy revolve increasingly around access, use, misuse, ownership and protection of data and progressively play a key role in all aspects of societal and economic life** as well as in the evolution of artificial intelligence and the Internet of Things.
* Establishment of clear **linkages to the Agenda 2030 / SDG process**, also using the Geneva international network in this field. As was called for by some participants in the last meeting held in Guadalajara, the **presence, as panelists, of community members and practitioners**, especially in what concerns the SDGs and their linkage to WSIS, could be further strengthened.

**Further suggestions** on preparatory process, format of dialogue, and strengthening a more tangible and accessible reporting and outcome:

* The community should agree early in the preparation process on specific topics to be discussed and elaborated in the **intersessional lead up to the IGF**, with a view to **starting substantive dialogue** and publishing short and meaningful outcomes **before the IGF** takes place. Such outcomes would be integrated into the workshops and/or main sessions according to their thematic focus (instead of e.g. dedicating one main session to presenting all different but unrelated BPF outcomes).
* **Dynamic and interactive discussions** should be ensured in all main sessions (and workshops), possibly with a more limited number of panelists – ensuring an appropriate regional, gender and linguistic diversity. Main sessions and workshops could benefit more from already tested **new formats and settings** in this regard.
* The **information sources** at the disposal of the participants during the IGF (such as instant “session reporting”) might be further developed and improved, e.g. by strengthening and entering into partnerships with, inter alia, GIP, GIPO, IG Schools.
* The IGF should continue **improving the tangibility and usability of “outcomes”** of the meeting, e.g. by producing short non-negotiated “messages” (as was already called for by the CSTD WG on IGF improvements), which may be considered by relevant organizations in the course of their agenda-setting and decision-making processes.

Biel/Bienne, 31. January 2017