

**IGF Open Consultations and MAG Meeting**  
**1-3 December 2014**  
**Geneva, Switzerland**

**Summary report**

**Brief:**

*Members of the IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) and other stakeholders present, onsite and online, in the Open Consultation and MAG Meeting defined the next steps for the preparations for IGF 2015 and discussed a number of issues related to the overall IGF process:*

- a) **MAG working groups.** *Several working groups were created in order to further explore a number of issues: inter-sessional activity leading up to IGF 2015, overarching theme and sub-themes for IGF 2015; guidelines for main/focus sessions; workshop selection criteria and mechanism; remote/online participation; self-assessment of the IGF (progress made with the implementation of the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF); IGF strategy for outreach and communication. These groups will be open to any interested stakeholder.*
- b) **Milestones for IGF 2015.** *Two Open Consultations and MAG Meetings will be held in 2015: one in May/June, mainly dedicated to selection of workshops, and one September, focused on an analysis of the state of play of inter-sessional work. The MAG will continue its work through regular virtual meetings.*
- c) **Inter-sessional work.** *Building on the recommendations in the IGF 2014 Chair's Summary, inter-sessional activities will be undertaken in the period leading to IGF 2015. A draft work plan defining types of activities and modalities for involving different stakeholders is to be developed by the middle of January.*
- d) **Communication and outreach.** *The MAG will work on defining activities intended to better promote the IGF, to better communicate its work and to consolidate its linkages with other Internet governance entities and processes.*
- e) **Participation of the IGF/MAG in the NETmundial Initiative's Coordination Council.** **A consensus was not reached by the MAG on this issue.** *Several questions raised during the discussions will be conveyed to the NETmundial Initiative and the MAG may re-discuss its participation in the Coordination Council at a later stage.*

## **I. Introduction**

1. The first Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group Meeting in the IGF 2015 preparatory process took place on 1-3 December 2014 at the ITU headquarters, in Geneva, Switzerland. The purpose of the three-day meeting was to take stock of IGF 2014, looking at what worked well and what did not, and to start preparations for IGF 2015.
2. Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho, Director of the Department of Scientific and Technological Affairs, Ministry of External Relations, Brazil served as honorary co-chair of the meeting. Ambassador Jānis Kārklīņš from Latvia moderated the meeting as chair of the MAG and Mr. Chengetai Masango represented the IGF Secretariat. Ms. Aysel Kandemir, Chief ICT Expert at the Information and Communication Technologies Authority, Turkey represented the Host Country of IGF 2014. Ms. Elia Yi Armstrong, Chief of Development Management Branch of the Division for Public Administration and Development Management, represented the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

(UN DESA). Mr. Francois Rancy, Director of the ITU Radiocommunication Bureau welcomed the MAG and other joining stakeholders to ITU headquarters in his opening remarks.

3. To ensure full transparency and openness to the multistakeholder community, the Open Consultations and the MAG meeting was open to observers, who were also encouraged to actively participate. The meeting was webcasted on the IGF website. Live text streaming as well as remote participation were available for all interested stakeholders. More than 90 registered participants attended the three-day session.

## II. Taking stock of IGF 2014

4. The first part of the Open Consultations was dedicated to taking stock of the IGF 2014 meeting, while setting expectations for IGF 2015. The IGF Secretariat presented a summary of the contributions submitted by stakeholders in advance of the meeting<sup>1</sup>. A number of additional comments were made during the discussions, namely:
  - a. Appreciation was expressed for the outstanding work done by Turkey, the IGF 2014 Host Country in organizing the meeting.
  - b. **Participation.** It was noted that the IGF 2014 meeting saw the highest number of participants, with more than 2400 onsite attendees, representing 144 countries (around 74% of all UN membership); nearly 60% of these were coming from developing countries; civil society had the highest representation. This demonstrates that the IGF is continuing to make progress in becoming more inclusive and attracting more participants.
  - c. **Elements that distinguished IGF 2014 from previous IGFs** were outlined, such as: the Best Practice Forums, the new format and substance of the Chair's Summary, the discussions on net neutrality and on the transitions of the IANA functions among others.
  - d. **Main/focus sessions.** Some noted that the topics of the main/focus sessions were well chosen and reflected priority issues. It was mentioned that the U-shape format for these sessions and the fact that, in some instances, the moderator moved around the room helped enhancing interaction with the audience. Some comments were made on the fact that the main/focus sessions seemed too long, while others noted that this has not prevented participants' engagement throughout the sessions. It was also mentioned that some sessions had a large number of panelists, and this limited the time allocated for interactions.
  - e. **Workshops.** It was noted that the workshop evaluation and selection process used for IGF 2014 saw improvements compared to previous years. Appreciation was expressed for the fact that some positive consideration was given to proposals coming from new proponents and from developing countries. Some noted that the large number of workshops held in parallel was a challenge for participants and that, in some instances, workshops focused on similar themes were scheduled at the same time.

---

<sup>1</sup>Contributions taking stock of IGF 2014 and looking forward to IGF 2015 – Synthesis Paper, <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/open-consultations/2014-december/408-synthesis-paper-contributions-taking-stock-of-igf-2014-and-looking-forward-to-igf-2015/file>

- f. **Session formats.** IGF 2014 featured a variety of sessions (main/focus sessions, workshops, dynamic coalition meetings, open forums, flash sessions and best practice forums). The openness of the IGF Secretariat to accept a certain number of parallel sessions, such as side-events, was noted with appreciation, and it was mentioned that this approach helped broadening participation and better integrating participants. Some concerns were raised concerning the planning of the day 0.
  - g. **Logistics.** It was noted that the IGF 2014 venue was modern and spacious; more efforts could have been done to improve room signage. The “Sched” tool used for the IGF 2014 schedule was mentioned as a laudable improvement. Appreciation was expressed for the timely availability of sessions’ transcripts and video recordings on the IGF website, as well as for the multiple ways to remotely participate through WebEx, Twitter, webcasts and YouTube. It was noted that Wi-Fi capacity was limited, especially during the first two days of the meeting.
5. It was concluded that the overall assessment of the IGF 2014 meeting was very positive and that the MAG and the entire IGF community needs to continue working and advancing in the same direction and with the same approach, under the guidance of the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF.

### III. Preparations for IGF 2015

6. Based on the IGF 2014 experience, the MAG and other stakeholders present at the meeting started discussions on the preparations for the IGF 2015 meeting, with a significant number of issues being addressed, ranging from the structure and programme of the meeting, to inter-sessional work.

#### Logistics

7. The IGF 2015 Host Country (Brazil) made a presentation on logistical aspects related to the IGF 2015 meeting, including: transportation from the airport and between hotels and the IGF venue; accommodation possibilities; provision of free visas, etc. It was noted that detailed information would be provided on the Host Country website, which is expected to be made available by the end of January 2015. Some participants expressed concerns regarding the high costs that many participants would have to bear for travelling to João Pessoa and asked whether the Host Country is in the position to offer funding for some of these participants. It was noted that the costs supported by Brazil are related to the infrastructure of the meeting and that, unfortunately, no funds are available for participants. The Host Country mentioned that it would do its best to minimize costs for participants.
8. A new flexible approach in terms of working hours was proposed by the hosts for the IGF 2015 meeting: sessions to start at noon with lunch (sessions would formally start at 13.00) and continue up to 20.00, with a half-hour break between two three-hour blocks. This proposal attracted both supporting and diverging views. Those supporting the idea mentioned that such an official working programme would allow for networking and for more educational or orientation sessions in the morning. Others noted that it would be challenging to justify their participation in an event that only starts work in the second part of the day. While some alternatives were proposed to the initial suggestion of the Host Country (such as starting the sessions at 10.00 or 11.00), it was also mentioned that certain limitations need to be taken into account when discussing about this issue, such as: security

considerations; the impact on the possibility of having social events in the evenings; the working hours for interpreters; transportation between the hotels and the IGF venue, etc.

### **Participation and engagement of participants**

9. It was noted that efforts should be continued in order to attract and engage those communities whose participation in IGF meetings has been limited, including stakeholders from developing countries and representatives of sectors such as health, education, finance, agriculture etc. The participation of local stakeholders in the IGF should also be encouraged.
10. Preparations for remote/online participation should start much earlier and the rationale and modalities of remote/online participations should be better explained, especially for newcomers. Remote participation training and strategies need to be developed in order to ensure more inclusiveness of remote/online participants, including those with disabilities. Guidelines would also need to be developed for session organizers and onsite moderators on how to integrate online participants. MAG work on enhancing remote/online participation will be coordinated by Ms. Virginia Paque.
11. There were suggestions that the current distinction between panelists and audience should be eliminated, and efforts should be made to ensure that everyone is viewed as a participant, thus making the IGF a more dynamic forum for discussions among all in attendance, both onsite and online.
12. With regard to welcoming and integrating newcomers in the IGF, it was mentioned that it might be useful to develop a guidebook for effective participation in the IGF; this would also include tips and recommendations for new participants. The idea of having a “help desk booth” at the IGF, to be manned by MAG members, was also noted.
13. Several recommendations were made on modalities for enhancing youth participation, such as: developing a youth-friendly toolkit regarding the IGF; engage more youth representatives in sessions’ panels; encourage youth to build a list of resource persons for sessions organizers to reach out to when preparing their sessions; have MAG members act as mentors for youth participants, etc.
14. **Capacity building** was emphasized as a priority area that needs to be improved, in order to provide newcomers to the IGF and to the Internet governance environment with more opportunities to build the knowledge and capacities necessary for their full participation in this environment. The tagging of workshops as capacity-building sessions and the organization of the pre-IGF webinars and the dedicated round table would continue, while other modalities for enhancing capacity building would be explored.

### **Main/focus sessions**

15. Discussions were held on such issues as: the number of main/focus sessions, formats, relations with sub-themes and workshops, engagement of participants etc. It was agreed that, while there is no “one size fits all” solution, it would be useful to develop guidelines for main/focus sessions, to address all the aspects that have been raised during the discussions and to make recommendations for session organizers. A MAG working group coordinated by Ms. Subi Chaturvedi, Ms. Virginia Paque and Mr. Flavio Wagner, and was created with the aim of developing such guidelines.

**Workshops**

16. A discussion was held on whether to reduce the number of workshops accommodated in the IGF schedule. Some participants argued in favour of such an approach, noting that the high number of parallel workshops makes it difficult for participants to attend the sessions they are mostly interested in. Others mentioned that the workshops provide value to the IGF and reflect its multistakeholder nature while also justifying the participation of many stakeholders. If the slots available for workshops are reduced, this would lead to a high number of rejected proposals, and such an approach may alienate people from the IGF.
17. With regard to the workshop evaluation and selection process, it was agreed to continue to follow a number of principles used for IGF 2014, such as limiting the number of workshop proposals submitted by an organization and not allowing MAG members to propose workshops, but rather have them involved as mentors and coaches for workshop proponents.
18. It was noted that a criticism was related to the insufficient explanations provided to proponents of workshops that were not retained for inclusion in the IGF schedule. In response to this, it was proposed to publish the results of the initial scoring given by MAG members. This would be accompanied by an explanation of the final selection process: the fact that a number of workshops are automatically accepted based on their scores, while the remaining available slots are filled in, based on an approach meant to allow more newcomers, new types of sessions and proposals coming from developing countries.
19. Under the coordination of Ms. Fiona Alexander and Ms. Susan Chalmers, work will continue on refining the workshop evaluation and selection process used for IGF 2014, on aspects such as: merging of workshop proposals and the need for MAG members to act as neutral facilitators in this process; the challenging request for workshop proponents to indicate panelists and to confirm them early in the process; the scoring format; new, more engaging workshop formats; workshop reporting, including the gender report card; and evaluation of workshops after the IGF meeting. These issues would be addressed by a MAG working group, which is expected to finalise its work by mid-January.

**Best practice forums**

20. The IGF 2014 best practice forums (BPF) were seen as an important step towards the IGF achieving more concrete outcomes, while maintaining the non-negotiating nature of the forum. It was outlined that the BPF outcome documents are useful and substantive (for example, the best practices on Computer Security Incident Response Teams - CSIRT and spam) and that it is now important to identify modalities to effectively disseminate these results within the wider community. It was also noted that the outcome documents should not be viewed as final, but rather as open materials that can be updated at any time.

**Other sessions**

21. While there is value in having other types of sessions within the IGF framework, such as pre-events and side-meetings, it was noted that more transparency and clarity on such sessions is needed. Although the MAG has not been traditionally involved in preparing or selecting these sessions, it would be useful if the Secretariat keeps the group informed about the requests for such events and the allocations made.

22. The issue of Host Country sessions was also brought up, and it was highlighted that clear guidelines are needed: either decide to accept a certain number of such sessions, on the condition that they are in line with the general IGF criteria for workshops, and do not evaluate them together with other proposals, or have the Host Country sessions proposals go through the normal selection process, together with all other proposals.

### **New session formats**

23. It was noted that the IGF structure could be reshaped in any way that would bring more benefit to participants. This could be a combination of traditional sessions and new types of sessions that would serve to enhance participation and active involvement.

### **High level event**

24. The high level event usually organized by the IGF Host Country on Day 0 was brought into discussions. While it was noted that the planning of this event is the prerogative of the Host Country, MAG members commented that it would be useful to have more clarity on the process and purpose of this event. Some suggestions were made to have this event combined with the IGF opening ceremony or to move either towards the middle or the end of the Forum. Others noted, however, that having the high level event at the end of the IGF would send the wrong message that the IGF is seeking endorsement from high level governmental officials.

### **IGF schedule**

25. Suggestions were made to have each IGF day focused on a specific theme, with different types of sessions being held in parallel in the morning and then a dedicated main/focus session held in the afternoon, with no other session running in parallel. Some noted that the idea of having the main/focus sessions not running in parallel with other sessions could prove to be counter-productive, as it would either force some participants to attend a session they are not really interested in or simply lose such participants, while also limiting the overall number of workshops and other sessions. It was mentioned that participants should be given the opportunity to choose from a wide variety of sessions, while more attention should be paid to avoiding sessions on similar topics being scheduled in parallel.

26. Another proposal was to concentrate the main/focus sessions on the last two days of the IGF and have the first days dedicated to parallel sessions of different types. Thus, the workshops and other types of sessions could better feed into the corresponding main/focus sessions.

### **IGF 2015 overarching theme and sub-themes/tags**

27. A large number of suggestions for the IGF 2015 overarching theme and sub-themes were proposed during the meeting, adding to those suggested in the contributions submitted by stakeholders before the meeting.

28. It was underlined that overarching theme should provide the strategic guidance for the development of the various sessions in the IGF 2015 schedule. One suggestion that was considerably debated was related to having the overarching theme gravitate around the topic of “sustainable development” and the relation between Internet and sustainable development. It was mentioned that this theme, which is seen as “the topic” for 2015 in the world, would help attract attention by matching the IGF with the Sustainable Development Goals. Others suggested that such a theme would be too broad. The IGF 2015 Host Country

proposed “Advancing the Internet governance ecosystem: from the NETmundial outcomes towards sustainable development goals” and “The future evolution of Internet Governance: an agenda for sustainable development”. Other proposed themes are listed in Annex I.

29. With regard to sub-themes, some called for the retaining of some of the sub-themes used for previous IGFs, such as the one on access, while others noted that a focus on themes that have been debated largely at previous IGFs should be avoided. Several suggestions for new sub-themes were made, among which include: human rights, cybersecurity, Internet economy, economic development, etc. Other proposed sub-themes are listed in Annex II. One suggestion was to try to organize clusters of sub-themes, while another proposal recommended replacing sub-themes with tags.
30. The idea of having a permanent motto for the IGF was also discussed and the proposed motto was “IGF - shaping the evolution [and use] of the Internet”. This proposal received support from many participants.
31. Given the large number of suggestions for both the overarching theme and the sub-themes, some MAG members proposed to have an open consultation asking for community input on these themes and on other possible themes. Those supporting this idea noted that it would help enhance the transparency and accountability of the IGF. Others underlined the fact that the community had already been invited to contribute, via the call made by the Secretariat, and that going into additional consultations would significantly delay the preparatory process. It was suggested that all the proposals for themes and sub-themes collected before and during the meeting could be compiled and then made publicly available for comments until the end of the year, with the goal for the MAG to make a final decision on the theme and sub-themes by mid-January. The MAG work on defining the overarching theme and sub-themes will take place online and will be coordinated by Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho from Brazil.

### **Inter-sessional work (including best practice forums)**

32. The issue of inter-sessional work was extensively discussed during the meeting and an attempt was made to define what type of inter-sessional activities the IGF community should be engaged in.
33. It was noted that the aim of the inter-sessional work is to respond to the calls for the IGF to produce more tangible outcomes. The IGF 2014 Chair Summary suggested that this work could focus on a theme of a developmental nature. In this context, a proposal to have inter-sessional activities focused on the theme of “Menu of policies for enabling the next billion online” was discussed. Activities around this theme would be meant to result in a type of document compiling policies that have helped different countries to promote Internet deployment and use. This document, the exact type and format of which are to be decided, would then be presented in Brazil and endorsement upon it would be sought from participants as a tangible outcome of the IGF. National and regional IGF initiatives could be invited to address this theme, and their input would become part of the compilation document.
34. One type of inter-sessional work that would lead up to the Brazil meeting will take the form of **best practice forums**. The aim is to have somewhere between three and five topics for best practice forums: these would either be totally new topics, or a combination of new

topics and further work on some of the IGF 2014 best practice forums (such as the ones on spam and CSIRT, which outlined a number of suggestions for future work). Several themes for new best practice forums were suggested (Annex III) and three of them seemed to receive the largest support: Internet and gender, Internet Exchange Points (IXPs) and IPv4 to IPv6 transition. Coordination of this work will initially be done by Ms. Constance Bommelaer.

35. As inter-sessional activities represent an opportunity for better engaging stakeholders from developing countries in the IGF process, many suggestions were made to reach out to national and regional IGF initiatives and to invite them to contribute to the work and propose experts to be engaged in the best practice forums. It was also noted that the IGF initiatives are independent, and the MAG cannot impose on them, but rather invite them to take up suggestions and to contribute to the IGF process.
36. A MAG working group (coordinated by Mr. Virat Bhatia, Mr. Mourad Boukadoum, Ms. Avri Doria and Ms. Lynn St. Amour, ) was created with the task to develop a work plan for inter-sessional work, including best practice forums, by mid-January. The group will look into several issues: how the inter-sessional work can be constructed; how to involve national and regional IGFs; what would be the theme for the work. The overall aim would be to have some sort of draft results on inter-sessional work ready by September 2015. It was noted that there should be caution with regard to the planning of inter-sessional work, in order to avoid over-stretching or setting too high expectations that could not be delivered upon.

#### **IGF dynamic coalitions**

37. A discussion was held on the role of the IGF dynamic coalitions (DCs), their relationship with the IGF in general, and how they can be better incorporated into the IGF programme and engaged in inter-sessional activities.
38. It was noted that the 12 active dynamic coalitions are very heterogeneous; for example, not all of them are equally resourced and at the same level of maturity. Most DCs have not been doing much other than having annual meetings. Others have been engaged in more intensive work, but not all have brought the results of their work back to the IGF community, for validation. There is, therefore, a perceived need to create a feedback loop between DCs and the broader IGF community.
39. It was proposed to invite the DCs to join the meeting of organizers of national and regional IGFs, in order to share information about their work and expected outcomes. .

#### **Communication, outreach and linkages with other Internet governance entities**

40. In the afternoon of Day 1, presentations were given on a number of Internet governance initiatives and processes: the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference, the WSIS +10 review by the UN General Assembly, the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, the NETmundial Initiative. A discussion was held on the impact of these initiatives on the IGF process and on the need to develop mechanisms for the IGF to enhance its linkages with such initiatives and processes and to better communicate with them.
41. It was noted that there is a need for a communication and outreach strategy that would allow the IGF to better promote itself, to communicate its works and to attract more support, especially in the context of possible extension of its mandate post 2015.



42. Suggestions were made for types of activities that could help raise more awareness on the IGF and attract more support from UN Member States for the extension of the IGF mandate. One suggestion was to have IGF-related information sessions organized for UN Member States missions in Geneva. A similar idea was proposed for outreach addressed at missions in New York. Brazil volunteered to work on preparing such sessions and invited other missions (such as the missions of previous IGF host countries) to contribute. Another proposal was for the IGF 2015 to develop an output for the UN General Assembly for the sustainable development goal process and also for the WSIS+10 review. The MAG chair also suggested to propose that the consultations on the WSIS+10 review be organized on the margins of the IGF.
43. The related issue of IGF outcomes/outputs and the need to make them more visible was also raised. It was stressed that there is a wealth of materials the IGF has produced during the past nine years, such as the transcripts and video recording of sessions, the Chair's Summary and the outcome documents of the best practice forums. These materials need to be better communicated in such a way that the community is made aware of their existence and, thus, empowered to use them in various ways. For example, the Chair's Summary should be forwarded to various United Nations entities such as the Economic and Social Council and the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly, as well as to other organizations in the larger Internet governance ecosystem. This would also respond to the CSTD Working Group's recommendations on improving IGF's linkages with other entities. It was also mentioned that one modality for having a broader outreach for the IGF outcomes would be to have them translated into other languages.
44. A MAG working group was formed to start working on a communication and outreach strategy for the IGF. The work of the group will be coordinated by Ms. Dominique Lazanski.
45. Another MAG working group (coordinated by Ms. Marilyn Cade) was created in order to prepare a self-evaluation or self-assessment of the IGF, in terms of implementing the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF. Based on the work done by the MAG in 2013, this group would work on an updated report documenting the progress made by the IGF in implementing these recommendations. The document will then be submitted as an input to CSTD and widely distributed among the community, as a mean to communicate the progress made by the IGF. The group will develop a detailed work proposal at its initial working call, with a commitment to have a draft document prepared by early March 2015.

#### **Outline of MAG work for 2015**

46. The preparatory process for IGF 2015 will include two additional Open Consultations and MAG Meetings in 2015: one in May/June, mainly dedicated to the selection of workshops, and another meeting in September, concentrated on an analysis of the state of play of the inter-sessional work. The exact date and location for the May/June meeting is to be decided upon, based on space availability and the opportunity of having the meeting on the margins of other major events, such as the CSTD meeting in May, the WSIS review forum in May or the EuroDIG meeting in June. It was suggested that it would be useful for the September meeting to be held in New York, in early September, and to use it also as an opportunity to interact with UN Member States' missions. There were also discussions about holding another meeting in March, in conjunction UNESCO's "CONNECTing the Dots: Options for Further Action" conference in Paris, but the suggestion was not carried. The MAG was

reminded about the practice of holding regular virtual meetings to build progress with the necessary preparatory work. A more detailed outline of the work is presented in Annex IV.

#### **Participation of the IGF/MAG in the NETmundial Initiative's Coordination Council**

47. A discussion was held on the NETmundial Initiative (NMI) and the invitation submitted to the IGF/MAG to take a seat on the Coordination Council of this initiative. Two proposals were made: one proposal was for the MAG chair to act as the MAG representative on the NMI Coordination Council, while the other suggested the IGF Secretariat Programme and Technology Manager to act as liaison or observer with the NMI.

48. Some noted that the NMI is a welcomed initiative, and the IGF/MAG should be present and contribute to influence the direction of the initiative, especially given the fact that it is supposed to contribute to strengthen the IGF. Others noted that there are still many questions regarding the initiative's aim, its modalities and the direction towards which it would evolve. Some suggested that the invitation for the IGF to join the Council should have been addressed to the United Nations Secretary General. Concerns were also expressed regarding the requirement for individuals that represent organizations on the Coordination Council to confirm that their organizations embrace the NMI principles. In the case of the MAG, this would mean that each MAG member and their organizations would have to confirm that they embrace the NMI principles, and this would become a very complex legal issue.

49. As no consensus was reached on this issue, the MAG chair will communicate to the NMI that the group is not yet in a position to take a decision on its participation in the NMI Coordination Council. The concerns and questions raised by MAG members will be conveyed to the NMI. The channels of communication would be kept open and, if the explanations provided by the NMI will satisfy the MAG, the MAG could re-discuss its participation in the Coordination Council at a later stage. At this point, the MAG/IGF will not be represented and will not formally liaise with the initiative. A call was made to Brazil, as the host of the IGF 2015 meeting and a founding partner of the NMI, to make sure that no actions hindering the interests of the IGF should be taken in the framework of the NMI. Brazil confirmed that it will be in its best interest to make sure that IGF interests are in no way harmed.

#### **IGF Support Association (IGFSA)**

50. A presentation of the IGFSA was given, and stakeholders were invited to join the association and participate in its work. It was mentioned that almost 190,000 dollars were received and pledged so far, and there is now a discussions on criteria for using this money. There are three areas towards which funds will be allocated: support for the IGF Secretariat, funding participation of MAG members in meetings, and supporting national and regional IGF initiatives. A majority of resources will go to the IGF Secretariat, but it is not yet decided whether the entire contribution allocated for the Secretariat would go to the IGF Trust Fund or a part of it would be retained to be allocated on an ad-hoc basis, based on the needs of the Secretariat.

51. In concluding the meeting, the MAG chair thanked all participants and noted that significant progress was made towards preparing for the IGF 2015 meeting. The MAG will continue to work online, via mailing lists and through virtual meetings and will have the next face to face meeting in May/June 2015. All MAG working groups will be open for participation and contribution from all those interested.

**Annex I**  
**Proposals for an overarching theme for IGF 2015**

1. 10 IGFs - where are we and where are we going (quo vadis)
2. 2015 IGF Joao Pessoa: 10 years shaping the evolution and use of the Internet
3. A decade of Internet Governance: finding our way forward
4. A decade of Internet Governance: looking back to move forward
5. A Trusted Internet for Peace and Prosperity
6. A Trustworthy Net for Peace, Jobs, and Freedom
7. Advancing the Internet governance ecosystem
8. Advancing the Internet governance ecosystem: from the NETmundial outcomes towards sustainable development goals
9. An innovative Internet governance system for the next decade
10. Back to basics - fundamental problems of Internet Governance
11. Building a trustworthy net for sustainable development
12. Building a trustworthy net(work)
13. Enable the next billion online
14. Enabling sustainable development with a trustworthy Internet
15. Finding the way forward for Internet Governance
16. Governing the Internet
17. IGF for the next decade
18. IGF: emitting the wave of peace, prosperity and development
19. IGF: Finding the way forward [for Internet Governance]
20. Internet for sustainable development
21. Internet governance for empowerment, trust and prosperity
22. Internet governance for inclusive development
23. Internet governance for peace, prosperity and trust
24. Internet governance for sustainable development and promotion of human rights
25. Internet governance for the next decade
26. Prosperity and development
27. Sustainable and human development
28. The (future) evolution of Internet Governance: an agenda for sustainable development
29. The Internet governance for sustainable and inclusive development

**Annex II**  
**Proposals for sub-themes for IGF 2015**

1. Achieving and maintaining a people centered Internet
2. Access / development
3. Affordable access
4. Balancing human rights on the Internet
5. Connecting with policy spaces
6. Connections/access
7. Content
8. Content creation
9. Content creation and the importance of IXPs
10. Copyright
11. Cross-border connectivity and services
12. Dealing with violence against women and persecuted minorities on the Internet
13. Diversity
14. e-Agriculture
15. e-Government
16. Emerging issues
17. Equal footing of stakeholders, a must for Internet governance
18. Evolution of youth online involvement
19. Gender equality
20. Human rights
21. Innovation
22. Internet as a tool in education for development
23. Internet economy
24. (Internet for) economic development
25. Internet enabling education
26. Internet enabling healthcare
27. Internet for peace
28. Internet fragmentation
29. Mobile money
30. Multilingualism
31. Multistakeholder development
32. National multistakeholder owned digital ecosystem
33. Online privacy
34. Peace-building
35. Regional IGFs
36. Regional IGFs and their bottom up input to the global IGF
37. Rights of access
38. Security/cybersecurity
39. Standardization in ICT
40. Surveillance
41. Sustainable development
42. The Internet for economic development
43. Trust
44. Understanding the tussle on roles and responsibilities
45. Web accessibility to citizens with special needs

**Annex III**  
**Proposals for themes for IGF 2015 best practice forums**

1. CERT
2. Content creation - telling our story to the world
3. Domain name management
4. Election online
5. Encryption
6. Fostering multistakeholder collaboration online
7. Further work on the existing Best Practice tracks
8. Gender and ICT/Internet
9. Gender equality
10. Hate speech
11. Internet economy
12. IPv4 to IPv6 transition
13. IXPs
14. Multistakeholderism – open and inclusive community building: how this helped address a particular issue/topic
15. National/regional multistakeholder Internet governance structures
16. Online education
17. Security - physical, legislative, procedural, electronic - a working solution to maintaining a reliable internet
18. Spam
19. Youth involvement

**Annex IV**  
**MAG working group mailing lists**

<b>Working group</b>	<b>Mailing list name</b>	<b>Mailing list sign up page</b>	<b>Lead facilitators</b>
<b>IGF 2015 themes</b>	<a href="mailto:igf2015_themes@intgovforum.org">igf2015_themes@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/igf2015_themes_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/igf2015_themes_intgovforum.org</a>	Benedicto Fonseca Filho
<b>Inter-sessional activities</b>	<a href="mailto:intersessional_2015@intgovforum.org">intersessional_2015@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/intersessional_2015_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/intersessional_2015_intgovforum.org</a>	Mourad Boukadoum; Virat Bhatia; Avri Doria; Lynn St. Amour
<b>Main/focus session guidelines</b>	<a href="mailto:ms_guidelines_2015@intgovforum.org">ms_guidelines_2015@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/ms_guidelines_2015_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/ms_guidelines_2015_intgovforum.org</a>	Flavio Wagner; Subi Chaturvedi; Virginia Paque
<b>Outreach &amp; communication</b>	<a href="mailto:outreach_com_2015@intgovforum.org">outreach_com_2015@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/outreach_com_2015_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/outreach_com_2015_intgovforum.org</a>	Dominique Lazanski
<b>Online participation</b>	<a href="mailto:rp_2015@intgovforum.org">rp_2015@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/rp_2015_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/rp_2015_intgovforum.org</a>	Ginger Paque
<b>Self-assessment of the IGF</b>	<a href="mailto:selfassessment_2015@intgovforum.org">selfassessment_2015@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/selfassessment_2015_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/selfassessment_2015_intgovforum.org</a>	Marilyn Cade
<b>Workshop evaluation, selection criteria, and mechanisms</b>	<a href="mailto:ws_selection_2015@intgovforum.org">ws_selection_2015@intgovforum.org</a>	<a href="http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/ws_selection_2015_intgovforum.org">http://intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/ws_selection_2015_intgovforum.org</a>	Fiona Alexander; Susan Chalmers

**Annex V**  
**Preparatory Process for IGF 2015 – Milestones**

Milestone	Timeline
MAG virtual meeting to make a final decision of theme and sub-themes for IGF 2015 and on the workshop evaluation and selection criteria and mechanisms	Mid-January 2015
Draft work plan for inter-sessional work to be ready	Mid-January 2015
Launch the call for workshop proposals	End January 2015
Community submits workshop proposals	End January – End March 2015
Draft IGF self-evaluation/self-assessment report to be ready	Early March 2015
Pre-screening of workshop proposals by the IGF Secretariat and initial evaluation (scoring) by the MAG	April – May 2015
Second Open Consultations and MAG Meeting - focused on final selection of workshops	May/June 2015
Secretariat contacts workshop organizers for necessary adjustments	June – July 2015
First draft of the IGF schedule published	End July 2015
Third Open Consultations and MAG Meeting - focused on progress of inter-sessional work	September 2015
IGF 2015 meeting	November 2015