MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy

Online Meeting 75
2 May 2024 at 13:00 UTC

Summary Report

The 75th virtual meeting of the IGF MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 2 May 2024 at 13:00 UTC. The meeting was moderated by Titti Cassa and a recording of the meeting is available upon request.

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

Agenda

1. Netmundial +10
2. GDC
3. Update from the IGF Secretariat
4. IGF strategic vision (including WSIS+20 review)
5. AoB

Discussion Points

Titti opened the session and introduced the agenda.

1. NETmundial +10

Titti noted that the NETmundial+10 has just concluded and there is a final output document, and invited anyone who had participated to share their perspectives. Jorge Cancio, a member of the NETmundial+10 HLEC, noted that he'd attended with a number of WG-Strategy contributors, and recommended everyone read the document, which is laid out in three sections: it reviews the importance and relevance of the 2014 principles (including digital issues under "Internet governance"); the second part are the Sao Paolo guidelines that can serve as an operationalisation help for the 2014 principles - they could help national and regional initiatives to develop implementation of multistakeholder collaboration. This includes normative principles and operational steps. There is hope stated in the document that these principles can also assist multilateral processes. The third section is messages from the NETmundial community to ongoing processes, including the IGF, the Global Digital Compact (GDC) - stressing the need to build on existing structures - and finally, messages for the WSIS+20 process. He noted some disappointment not to see more participants, especially from Africa and Asia (and particularly governments from those regions).

Giocomo Mazzone asked whether there will be the political will to follow up by pushing the document - he noted that he had heard there was a lack of enthusiasm from some governments for the text. Nigel Hickson echoed the interest in how governments (particularly those that didn't participate) will respond to the outcome document. He also noted some concern that the document was finalised without a revised draft being circulated to the meeting participants. Ana Neves commented on the document's legitimacy, and stressed that this was a bottom-up organisation - some governments were involved, others were not, though may still be supportive - but it was led by Brazil, so the hope is that Brazil will help to

leverage the documents with their like-minded countries. She also noted the presence and contribution of youth, and the supportive, productive atmosphere. She noted there were criticisms of multilateral processes, but there was still understanding of the importance to improve them.

Bruna noted that there had still been doubts from some civil society groups in the lead-up, and it's good to see that the document has landed well with these groups. There is pride on the part of the young people who were involved (which included a large Brazilian youth group that have taken part in the IGF). She noted that there is a question about follow-up - the HLEC has been considering whether to ask for an Open Forum at the IGF to connect the two events. It's important for the Brazilian government to share the document with other governments, missions, and diplomats.

Jorge agreed on the youth, the energy, and the atmosphere; responding to Nigel's concern about the process, he noted that this was intentional and the only way to do it, and noted that the HLEC incorporated all inputs from all sessions. On the follow-up, he agreed with some of the suggestions, but noted that the document doesn't have to be put in the hands of anyone else, but can be brought forward by the participants themselves to all kinds of fora. He also noted that the IGF is asked to act as caretaker for further developing the Sao Paolo guidelines, and suggested that they could help the IGF in developing recommendations.

Wout de Natris noted that he was a remote participant, and commended the organisation on treating remote participants equally. However, he noted that after having made some interventions, there was no follow-up from those drafting. He noted that the lack of dissent during the discussions was perhaps a weakness in the process, because those who disagree were not present (including the other countries in the BRICS group). He agreed that a session on the outcome at the IGF would make sense.

Bruna noted that the process operated according toe rough consensus, so the HLEC did not leave out or forget any inputs, even if some were not brought into the text. She believes that a good compromise was reached by the HLEC. She also noted that there were 15 different governments attending the event. She suggested continuing the conversation, and using the IGF.

Jordan Carter noted that CGI.br will be pulling together a fuller report of the proceedings that will better weave together all of the inputs made. This will stand as a resource of the event's proceedings. He also noted that the formulation of Internet governance and digital policy processes can be seeing as relating to the WSIS processes - there was a conscious effort to avoid introducing the term "digital governance".

Anriette Esterhuysen stressed that while it was a good process and outcome document, the build-up and planning was not so good, and there were very few governments from the Global South. This was an element in the original NETmundial that undermined its impact, and while there were governments that were very supportive, there were not many, and there were also not many Global South participants from other stakeholder groups. But she agreed that even if the process was suboptimal, it was worth doing, and there now needs to be a secondary engagement to have IGF, CSTD, ICANN and other organisations work with that outcome. She also noted that just having that experience of producing an output in a

short space of time is an important model for how these processes can work. But she warned against glossing over some of the weaknesses in legitimacy and inclusivity.

Nigel noted that the UK government will be supportive of the outcome document and advocate for it, but will do so in a sensitive way - something that we believe in, but acknowledging that it is not a global agreement written by all. But like outputs of a G7, G20, or OECD meeting, it is a result of a group that came together to try to produce something for the benefit of all.

2. Global Digital Compact
Chris Buckridge noted that there had been a GDC consultation last week, with interventions from both the MAG and the Leadership Panel - he noted that there could be better coordination, but in this case the two messages were aligned well. He also noted the state consultation happening later that day, which is not webcast.

Xiao Zhang noted that the Chinese technical community had a meeting with the Co-Facilitators and the Tech Envoy, and the Chinese community was very supportive of the multistakeholder model. She suggested that the IGF could develop a response to the Zero Draft to clarify that the IGF is not restricted to "Internet-related issues", but broader digital issues. Jorge noted that there are indications that this will be amended in the revised draft, and that the Zero Draft is not aligned with the WSIS conception of "Internet governance". He further noted that the text of all proposed amendments has been shared, and it is very extensive; however, he noted that for the sections on follow-up, there are many strong voices urging a different approach.

Bruna agreed that the state proposals are notable, and include some concerning elements, such as references to IP addresses and domain names. There is also concern about how transparently the negotiations will be conducted, and we should ask for this transparency.

3. Update from the IGF Secretariat
Anja Gengo noted that the call for proposals was extended to 5 May; at this stage there were around 250 proposals, but more are expected in final days.

She also noted that the Youth Track, working with the Youth Caucus, will have four capacity building workshops: one at EuroDIG (currently looking for stakeholders who will be present, including those from outside of Europe).

Eleonora is working with a small group of "communication ambassadors" to produce "Voices of the IGF", which will be short videos demonstrating the impact of the IGF - she encouraged all to consider participating.

The deadline for the village remains 30 May.

Anja confirmed that 26-28 June is the MAG meeting in Geneva, and there will be two IGF-related sessions at the upcoming WSIS Forum - the Secretariat will share the proposals to the working group. The first will be on how IGF can support GDC follow-up, while the second will focus more on WSIS+20.

Titti asked Anja to include in the next Open Consultations and MAG meeting a space in the agenda to discuss the results of Netmundial +10.

Anja also noted that the results of who will be the 2025 Host Country will be confirmed, possibly at the IGF in Riyadh.

4. IGF strategic vision
Titti noted that she will provide a revised draft of the work that she has developed, including further response to the NETmundial output. Anriette suggested looking at the ambitions for the IGF contained in the NETmundial output, and it may be useful to refer to these in the IGF strategy document. Bruna agreed that she would send the document to the full MAG, and that it will be important to have further discussions about this with the MAG. This can also happen at the WSIS Forum.

Regarding the interaction between NETmundial+10 and IGF, Jorge noted that the ITU had been ken to place the WSIS Forum in the NETmundial output, and that there was enthusiasm for the holistic system, including both the IGF and the WSIS Forum. Anriette agreed that there's a common view of using all existing mechanisms, and there may be aspects of the WSIS Action Lines that could fit well with the GDC. This seems to be gaining support, building on the proposal that Fiona Alexander made a few months ago. Anriette suggested we should work on new approaches on how to build cooperation in a concrete way (that might be able to come out of the WSIS+20 event and its Chair's Report).

Xiao suggested that we should ensure good interaction between different stakeholders and communities at this year's WSIS Forum.

5. AoB
The next call will be held on Thursday, 16 May, at 19:00 UTC.

List of participants

1. Adam Peake, former IGF MAG member,
2. Alishah Sharif, Independent Expert
3. Amrita Choudhury, Group's Co-Chair, CCAOI
4. Ana Christina Neves, Chair of the CSTD
5. Anriette Esterhuysen, former IGF MAG Chair
6. Anja Gengo, IGF Secretariat
7. Bruna Santos, Group's Co-Chair, IGF MAG member
8. Chris Buckridge, Group's Co-Chair, IGF MAG member
9. Concettina Cassa, Group's Co-Chair, Government of Italy
10. Fiona Alexander, former MAG member
11. Giacomo Mazzone, Independent Expert
12. Kenneth Merrill, NTIA
13. Jim Prendergast, Independent Expert
14. Jordan Carter, IGF MAG Member
15. Jorge Cancio, Government of Switzerland
16. Junko Kawauchi, IGF MAG Member

17. Justine Fair, IGF MAG member
18. Lito Barra, IGF MAG member
19. Markus Kummer, former MAG Chair
20. Neil Dundas, Independent Expert
21. Peter Koch, Independent Expert
22. Nigel Hickson, UK Government
23. Saba Tiku, MAG Member
24. Timea Suto (ICC Basis), former MAG member
25. Rudy Nolde, BMDV, German Government
26. Wim Degezelle, IGF Secretariat
27. Wout De Natris, Independent Expert
28. Xiao Zhang, MAG Member
29. Xiaobo Yang, Independent Expert