

MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy

Online Meeting 31

16 December 2021 at 1 p.m. UTC

Summary Report

The 31st virtual meeting of the IGF MAG's Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 16 December 2021 at 1 p.m. UTC. The meeting was hosted and moderated by Amrita Choudhury. The list of participants is annexed to this report. The recording of the meeting is available only to the meeting participants upon request.

The co-chair opened the meeting by introducing the agenda:

Agenda

1. IGF 2021 – results and proposals on how IGF could reform and innovate itself
2. Parliamentarians tracks : results and follow up
3. Youth Track : results and follow up
4. NRIS: results and follow up
5. Leadership panel
6. Draft Letter to the UN SG
7. Update on behalf of the Office of the Envoy on Technology
8. Any other business

1. IGF 2021: results and proposals on how IGF could reform and innovate itself

Wim stated that the outputs on the IGF were just published, which give an overview to all the main tracks as well as the Katowice messages. A shorter way to compile the final messages of each session was also set in place on the IGF website. However, the final summary and the reports will have a professional layout and will be published next week.

Anriette shared the "Draft IGF 2021 summary" and the "Katowice messages" referring to the number of participants: **10,371 from 175 countries and 318 sessions**. Several WG's members shared that the participation to the IGF 2021 was very impressive and that the debate brought up very concrete outputs.

For Roman, the Katowice closing messages came as a surprise as they included contradictory conclusions (e.g. calls for regulation and calls against regulation). He stated that someone (MAG or the WG-Strategy) should take editorial responsibility for the final wording. He (and Parminder) suggested that after people and session organizers provide their comments, we should investigate them to make sure that everything that goes public won't come as a surprise. There were various views on this.

Wolfgang commented that the IGF is not a negotiation body that has to "agree" on language. It is okay if the "IGF Messages" include "contradictory conclusions".

Jorge intervened and said that during the 2017 edition of the IGF in Geneva, the messages were prepared by the IGF Secretariat with some support and help from the host country, Switzerland, as well as the main session organizers. Jorge added that we have to continue improving the mechanism of how these messages are being drafted, but it should remain the task of the IGF Secretariat as a trusted third party who has no interest in the substance itself, but with the support of the MAG and the host country.

Anriette reiterated Jorge's thoughts by saying that the procedure is not new and that it has been presented during the Open Consultation MAG meeting last September. She also stated that it did not appear to her that the messages were contradictory as Roman stated. She highlighted that during the stocktaking process, people will be able to contribute any ideas for improvement for the next edition of the IGF.

Several people added in the chat that the IGF-LP has just a role in "promoting" and "exchanging" IGF outputs.

Anja Gengo explained the process the IGF Secretariat follows to draft the messages highlighting that is an open and bottom up process where inputs and comments are collected from the session organizers and session reports.

It was shared that is still unresolved where messages end and recommendations start and that this topic should be further discussed by the MAG.

Raúl said that the value of the High Level multi-stakeholder session could be much bigger if we could move the session to the end of the IGF. This could be an opportunity to review the key messages in a kind of "Netmundial" meeting of the IGF. This could give more legitimacy and relevance to the IGF messages and avoid any controversy about the takeaways. He confirmed that the IGF Secretariat should have a key role in this process, as the MAG is not involved in all IGF processes. He also suggested having an "Open Drafting Committee" open to all.

2. Update on the Youth IGF

Emilia Zalewska contributed by saying that this year's tracks consisted of two parts: the youth summit and the preparation track to the youth summit. The preparation track was very rich and consisted of many webinars on different topics connected to the IGF. They also had support from the host country, the national research institute from Poland, and the secretariat. There was also a cultural summit which gathered 80 people from different countries, and was organized by Youth IGF Poland, the Youth Observatory, and Youth Question on Internet Governance. Overall, it was a successful idea to collaborate in such a manner as it allowed participants to communicate on what they find particularly challenging in that field of internet governance, uncover the problems as well as the solutions. They also prepared points of action and drafted them, which were presented at the youth summit. Finally, Emilia stated that it was a great achievement that the Youth Summit was included so strongly in the IGF, and that it should be this way for the following editions.

3. Parliamentarians tracks: results and follow-up

Wolfgang stated that the Parliamentarian track could be used to bring the inputs from the IGF back to the national parliaments.

Adam stated that the main problem with the parliamentarian track is that Parliamentarians don't seem to know about it, which is a problem, and there should be more awareness created before for the next editions of the IGF. He added that the invitations should have been sent to the head of the Parliaments.

Several participants shared that there is a need to make sure that Parliamentarians are actually invited and not just sent an email through mailing lists.

Anriette highlighted that the main problem is not about resources, but about the gap between the capacity to do the management and the coordination of everything.

Peace Oliver Amuge added that many Parliamentarians are not involved in the National and Regional IGF and that this could lead to the gap in their meaningful participation in the IGF.

Anja said that there are several ideas to improve Parliamentarians involvement, for instance organizing intersessional activities like those that were organized last year. She added that this will be further discussed in a consultation with the community.

4. NRIS: results and follow-up

N/A

5. Leadership panel

N/A

6. Draft letter to the UNSG

N/A

7. Update on behalf of the Office of the Enjoy on Technology

N/A

Next meeting: February 10th at PM UTC

Annex 1:

List of participants

Anriette Hesterhuysen
Anja Gengo
Amrita Choudhury
Titti Cassa
Roman Chukov
Jim Prendergast
Chris Buckridge
Peace Oliver Amuge
Nigel Hickson
Fiona Alexander
Raul Echeberria
Markus Kummer
Jorge Cancio
Mark Carvell
Poncelet Ileleji
Emilia Zalewska
Chris Disspain
Luis Bobo
Timea Suto
Adam Peake
Velmira Nemiguentcheva-Grau
Jim Prendergast
Raymond Mamattah
Alice Weiss
Wim Degezelle

Parminder
Herman P
Wolfgang Kleinwächter

Links:

<https://www.intgovforum.org/content/igf-2021-outputs>

https://www.intgovforum.org/en/filedepot_download/223/20511

https://www.intgovforum.org/en/filedepot_download/223/20512

<https://www.intgovforum.org/en/igf-2021-reports>