

## **MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy**

**Online Meeting 47**  
**3 November 2022 at 14:00 UTC**

### **Summary Report**

The 47th virtual meeting of the IGF MAG Working Group (WG) on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 3 November 2022 at 14:00 UTC. The meeting was moderated by Titti Cassa. 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. *IGF involvement in the GDC*
  - a. *Tech Envoy Town Hall*
  - b. *Follow up activities*
2. *WSIS+20 action plan*
3. *Update from the IGF Secretariat (IGF 2022 LP, EGM follow up, etc.)*
4. *Update on behalf of the Office of the Envoy on Technology*
5. *AoB*

#### **Discussion:**

1. *IGF involvement in the GDC*

Jorge Cancio noted the process will be inter-governmental, driven by UN states, though the Office of the Tech Envoy will serve as a kind of secretariat to this. He noted that the Co-Facilitators have been appointed - Sweden and Rwanda - for the GDC process; this was somewhat earlier than expected. He further noted that there will also be a report from the Office of the Secretary-General in June, either on the preparations for the Summit or on the GDC itself; this will be in preparation for the Ministerial event in September 2023. It will be important to communicate effectively to the Co-Facilitators, both through other Member State delegations and directly. Finally, he noted that the ICT4D Resolution in the General Assembly has a paragraph on how this process will look, and there is not a lot of support for an “open, inclusive” process - again, this will take some engagement to change.

Chris noted the Tech Envoy's strong endorsement of multistakeholder approach, and the hope that he will be an ally in pushing that aspect. He also noted that a publication in June 2023 from the UNSG's office is an important milestone, and we should be endeavoring to engage on that now.

Christine Arida noted the Arab Group discussions recently; she also heard a strong support for a multistakeholder approach, but that this will, in the end, be driven by Member States. She agreed that lobbying to the Co-Facilitators is important. The consultation now is not only on the GDC content, but also on modalities and a vision for the future. We should be creative about what we provide as an IGF community.

Nigel Hickson noted some concern and sought clarification on the process between the consultation's end in March 2023 and the meeting of Ministers in September. The Tech Envoy explained a paper would go to the Ministers, which would give them options for the GDC, or an outline for content; it's not yet clear how stakeholders can be involved in the preparation of that paper.

Tulio Andrade noted the reference to "Enhanced Cooperation" in the ICT4D resolution (in UNGA). Nigel clarified that this may be of relevance in identifying the roles of different stakeholders in these processes.

Chris asked about the possibility of engaging the Swedish and Rwandan delegates at the IGF 2022 in Addis Ababa. Anriette Esterhuysen noted that it will likely not be the NYC delegates who will be there, but it will still be useful to engage the delegates who are there from those states. That was possible last time with the Germany/UAE delegations. She also suggested that we recognise that if we have priorities we want to see in the GDC (which we should distill), we should be looking to work through member states.

Tulio noted that some reports from the UN in New York reflect that most concerns coming from developing countries refer to the lack of representation of developing countries in multistakeholder processes (including the IGF). He encouraged the IGF community to ensure that participants from the Global South are able to take on a significant role in the IGF.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter noted the recent EU meeting in Prague, discussing the Declaration for the Future of the Internet. It is not clear whether the Declaration and the GDC are competing processes, or parallel. Amrita Chodhury noted that she was present at one of the workshops, and reported that it was understood that the principles in the Declaration would be endorsed by Member States.

Titti noted that at the EuroDIG event earlier in the year there was reference to perhaps merging or combining the Declaration for the Future of the Internet with the GDC. Jorge noted that the Declaration process has been controversial because it was not transparent or multistakeholder; indeed, some have referred to the Declaration as a driver of fragmentation.

Velimira Grau shared [a link](#) to the Prague event, and acknowledged that the European Commission recognises the frustration from some in the multistakeholder community about the development of the Declaration. She noted that the Commission's current aim is to more effectively involve the multistakeholder community in the implementation of the Declaration principles. She also offered to share the outcomes at a future meeting of the WG-Strategy; however, Tulio noted serious concerns about having such a formal presentation on the Declaration as part of the WG-Strategy call, as it could indicate support from the UN community for the Declaration. Amrita noted that the offer of an update was in response to questions raised in the WG-Strategy (regarding links that may exist to the GDC), and a better understanding for the WG-Strategy members would be of value. Velimira agreed. The Co-Chairs will work to develop an appropriate space for such discussions, based on the feedback and interest of working group participants.

#### *6. WSIS+20 action plan*

On the [IGF WSIS+20 Action Plan](#) document, Titti sought any discussion or input.

Chris noted that the document shaping up to be useful, and is structured around the objectives Mark Carvell initially laid out. The next steps for the objectives need to be drafted, and we need to look at what the urgent priorities should be.

Anriette suggested inviting the facilitators (the Rwandan and Swedish New York mission representatives) to participate in the IGF high level track, or in the closing session.

She also suggested organising bilateral meeting between the MAG and representatives from these states while in Ethiopia, or, if too soon for the IGF in Addis, then for the first MAG meeting and Open Consultation event next year. She noted the need for collective, collaborative work, rather than pre-cooked documents and principles provided for sign-on by other states.

Adam Peake suggested that the MAG could organise a session to help identify the gaps and try to provide suggestions on what can or should be done in terms of process and consultation.

Titti suggested that the WG-Strategy could also organise a session in Addis Ababa to start these discussions.

#### *7. Update from the IGF Secretariat (IGF 2022 LP, EGM follow up, etc.)*

Anja Gengo noted that in relation to the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) held earlier in 2022, there will be action points shared publicly after the IGF in Ethiopia.

She also noted that the MAG communication re. the GDC is uploaded and needs to be placed somewhere on the website. The Secretariat will liaise with Chris.

#### *8. Update on behalf of the Office of the Envoy on Technology*

Amrita suggested that the WG-Strategy Chairs could communicate with the ETO to ask them to re-engage with the WG's regular meetings, as the updates are valuable both for the WG members and for the MAG.

#### *9. AOB*

The next meeting will be on 17 November at 14:00 UTC.

On the issue of meeting recordings, Anja noted the solution being used for several groups is to post the recordings to Youtube, but only for those who have the direct link. There is a need to clarify whether such direct links can be shared to mailing lists that are publicly archived.

Anriette suggested that it would be useful to establish some connection with Leadership Panel members at the IGF and this WG-Strategy. It was suggested to invite, via the MAG Chair, the Leadership Panel to meet with WG Strategy.