

MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy

**Online Meeting 40
30 June 2022 at 14:00 UTC**

Summary Report

The 40th virtual meeting of the IGF MAG Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 30 June 2022 at 14:00 UTC. The meeting was moderated by Amrita Choudhury. The list of participants and the recording of the meeting is available upon request.

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

Agenda:

1. Plan of Activities for 2022
2. EuroDIG 2022 update
3. Update from the IGF Secretariat (Leadership Panel , etc.)
4. Update on behalf of the Office of the Envoy on Technology
5. AoB

Discussion:

1. Plan of Activities for 2022

Chris updated on the draft communication regarding the MAG's feedback on the Global Digital Compact; it has been sent to the MAG for their comment. He will send a reminder to the MAG, and there will be further discussion at the second Open Consultation/MAG Meeting (taking place next week).

No one has taken the pen on the other communication (which would document past and ongoing steps taken to evolve the IGF, in line with the Secretary-General's Roadmap); the MAG will try to form an ad hoc drafting group next week and move this forward.

2. EuroDIG 2022 update

Mark Carvell gave an update on how EuroDIG is following up on the Office of the Tech Envoy's survey on the Global Digital Compact. Following the approach of the Tech Envoy, EuroDIG is planning to use a public commenting platform to invite stakeholders to submit views towards a EuroDIG response. A deadline for comments will be set in early September, which will allow for a review, analysis and drafting phase (including a webinar) ahead preparing a final input by the deadline at the end of September. Mark noted that the seven issues/themes are not set in stone, and we hope to hear from

European stakeholders on whether these are the best (or complete) themes. The plan is to promote awareness through national IGFs in the European region, as well as ensuring that the voices of youth (YouthDIG in the EuroDIG context), government and other stakeholder groups are heard via this process.

Mark also noted that there was a lot of discussion of digital sovereignty in the EuroDIG agenda; there were also discussions of AI regulation, cybersecurity and standards, e-identification and delay-tolerant networks. He and Sandra confirmed that the EuroDIG Messages 2022 are currently being finalised.

Sandra Hoferichter also noted there have been recent discussions with the European Commission's High Level Meeting about EuroDIG, and she would be very keen to hear more from anyone who took part in the event.

Timea Suto asked about the modalities of EuroDIG comments on the Global Digital Compact survey - a blank sheet, or working from existing messaging? Sandra noted that these details have not yet been discussed, but it is expected that Mark will develop an initial text, based on EuroDIG outputs (messages from the conference, from the YouthDIG participants, consultations with EuroDIG session Focal Points).

Wolfgang noted that Trieste was a good example of "less is more", with only four themes, but high quality sessions. He also noted that there seemed to be a good balance between bottom-up event planning and more top-down planning to ensure quality control.

Chris noted that euroDIG had gone very well and supported the plans to develop input to the Global Digital Compact survey from the EuroDIG community. He also noted that in the chat, Jorje Cancio had noted that the Swiss IGF 2022 sent their "Messages" document directly, and that this may be a good approach, minimising mediation of the NRI messages. He also suggested that there are lessons from the EuroDIG experience for the MAG in relation to remote or hybrid participation, but these can be taken up by the MAG or its other Working Groups.

Jim Pendergast noted that the EU HLIIG is planning to be remote-only going forward, but there are concerns about this, given the value of face-to-face interactions. On the GDC, Jim noted that there is a lack of clarity on the modalities once GDC inputs are collected - Jim suggested that including suggestions on modalities in inputs would be useful.

Jorge Cancio noted re. the modalities on how comments received are translated to inter-governmental work - the President of the General Assembly will appoint coordinators from member states early next year to drive this process. Which countries

are chosen will be important, particularly depending on their position regarding the multistakeholder approach.

Timea agreed that it is important to understand the UN process here, and that the IGF itself may not be able to provide much comment on the substance ahead of the IGF event; however, the IGF could make a strong case for a multistakeholder approach to development of the GDC. Timea noted the UNESCO Connecting the Dots process and the WSIS+10 process as examples that may provide some lessons (both positive and in terms of things that can be managed better).

Mark believes that EuroDIG is an exemplar of the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance discussions, and that NRIs have a key role in these processes (though some NRIs may not be aware of this), and there is a need to ensure that NRIs are finding ways to work together to be active in global governance discussions.

Jason Munyan noted that the Office of the Tech Envoy is supportive of the multistakeholder approach, but a lot will depend on the President of the General Assembly, and facilitators have not yet been appointed for the GDC. In the meantime, the Office of the TE is making efforts to be as open and inclusive as possible, and plans to provide a synthesis document based on all inputs received by the deadline (as well as the inputs received from the IGF event at the end of the year).

3. Update from the IGF Secretariat (Leadership Panel , etc.)

There were no representatives from the IGF Secretariat on the call, as there was a conflict with a UN team meeting.

4. Update on behalf of the Office of the Envoy on Technology

Jason noted that there was a session at RightsCon on digital human rights, which has led to a new draft of the due diligence guidance (a recommendation from the Roadmap), which will be circulated.

On global digital cooperation, the Leadership Panel has been delayed a little, mainly because of some uncertainty about the member state representatives on that panel (changes in governments), and the need to recalibrate for balance based on those changes.

The Office has presented on the GDC in various venues, including a session at the ITU WTDC in Rwanda, as well as a follow-up session on digital development.

The newly appointed Tech Envoy will begin work soon; in the meantime the Office is still being led by the interim Tech Envoy.

5. AoB

Paul Mitchell noted the upcoming MAG meeting, and work has been ongoing in developing an agenda around the five themes identified. He also noted ongoing work on a review of the MAG Terms of Reference, to ensure that they are still aligned properly with the work going on in other UN processes. Paul noted that there has been a lot of interest from the broader community about the IGF going forward (including the Leadership Panel).

Amrita also noted some discussion in the chat about why some recent intergovernmental declarations did not mention the Global Digital Compact (though some more generic references to “existing processes” could be seen as inclusive of the GDC). Mark noted that, from his experience, the process for developing a G7 Declaration is very long, so it may not have been able to include more recent developments - we will see whether the upcoming presidencies of the G7 and G20 will follow up on these digital cooperation declarations.

Wolfgang asked about the Parliamentarian Track in the IGF and whether there was any news, but the Secretariat was not present to respond - it will be noted for future discussions.

The next meeting was scheduled for 14 July, but will be moved to 21 July.