

MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy
Online Meeting
4 December 2025 at 13:00 UTC

Summary Report

The 106th virtual meeting of the IGF MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) was held on 4 December 2025 at 13:00 UTC. The meeting was moderated by Titti and a recording of the meeting is available upon request.

Titti opened the meeting by introducing the agenda.

Agenda

1. WSIS+20 – Rev2
2. IGF Improvements
3. Update from the IGF Secretariat
4. General Updates: GDC and AI Governance
5. Any other business (AOB)

Discussion

1. WSIS+20 – Rev2

Titti noted that Revision 2 of the WSIS+20 Outcome Document was published earlier in the day of the meeting. She noted that some people had already shared views on the list and elsewhere.

Flavio noted that the definition of Internet governance still seems quite narrow, a concern that many have noted from early in the process - particularly he noted that the sections on AI and data governance have no reference to the IGF, implying that these topics are not included under the umbrella of Internet governance. Chris agreed that the Rev 2 language feels like it is further isolating AI governance from WSIS. Jorge also agreed that the efforts to link Internet governance to these issues have not been successful so far; he also noted that as we move into the final stage, we are unlikely to achieve major changes in the text - we should all consider what precise and surgical changes could be adopted to make these linkages clearer.

Jorge also noted that the references to the IGF Secretariat (and specifically to UNDESA's role) might be more effectively worded. He also noted that the AI structures and the financing mechanisms still need further discussion.

Anriette also agreed on the concerns about AI and data governance; she wondered whether the WSIS architecture section might be able to precede the sections on AI and data governance, including some words to note that AI and data governance fall under the WSIS mandate. On the task force on financing mechanisms, she feels it is important to retain this, and a far better option than establishing a new fund; it also provides a possibility to look at some emerging best practices in the financing space - it might also fit in with the Swiss proposal for a "help desk".

Timea noted that it is important to have a frank discussion about financing; the concern she notes is the reporting to the UNGA, which could stymie efforts to have a true

multistakeholder discussion. She suggested that it might be more welcome if it could be tied into the WSIS Forum, the IGF, or some other element in the WSIS framework.

Jennifer suggested that the language on financing mechanisms has improved from Rev1, but there is concern that the current scope is very broad. Her general impression of the document is that there is balance retained, there has been some strengthening of language; the human rights section is stronger, including with the reintroduction of para. 54tre. She also noted the reinsertion of language on e-waste, which is very important for stakeholders in the Asia Pacific. Finally, she noted the ambiguity relating to the IGF Secretariat which could be clarified; she also noted that there could be stronger recognition of the multistakeholder sources of funding that have sustained the IGF.

Ana noted the challenge of having these negotiations taking place in New York. She agreed that the task force on financial mechanisms is moving in the right direction. She also agreed with Timea's concern on the reporting line for the task force.

Bertrand noted that para 101 discusses that the Sec-Gen making proposals in the 80th session seems difficult. He also noted that there is a fundamental linkage between the IGF's funding and its viable evolution and improvement - at the moment, these elements are not linked. Timea noted her assumption that the reporting from the Sec-Gen is intended to come in by July 2026 (which is a very short timeline).

Desiree agreed that it would be useful to get more clarity on the timeline for the Sec-Gen's input, but she also felt that the task force on financial mechanisms could be useful.

2. IGF Improvements

Titti introduced the work that Lito and Peace have been leading on improvements to IGF modalities. Lito explained the work that has gone into this through the MAG Working Group on Workshop Processes, via a [Google Doc](#). He reiterated the call for people to look at the document and provide feedback, comments, and suggestions, with a deadline of 5 December. After that, the co-chairs of the MAG Working Groups (Strategy and Workshop Processes) will coordinate on how to finalise an output of the work.

Jutta identified the linkage between IGF improvements as called for in the WSIS Outcome Document (para 101), and suggested that the group should consider this before finalising its output.

Chris agreed that this is a positive path forward, and stressed that while the mandate for the 2025 MAG is to look at improvements to MAG working modalities, it is not possible to separate this completely from other aspects of the IGF ecosystem (the NRIs, the intersessional work, etc.).

Titti noted that, beyond the document on IGF improvements, there is a need to develop a broader paper outlining a strategic framework to guide MAG's work over the next 3–5 years. This framework should include:

- the definition of long-term objectives (e.g., enhancing IGF impact, strengthening integration into UN processes, and increasing relevance for policymakers);

- a multi-year roadmap linking thematic priorities, intersessional work, and expected outcomes;
- mechanisms to assess the IGF's added value within the wider UN, WSIS+20 and GDC context.

Such a document would help position the IGF to address the new challenges expected to emerge from the final WSIS+20 review.

Bertrand noted that there had been some initial discussions about establishing a working group on IGF evolution and improvement following WSIS+20. If this does not come from the WSIS+20 process, he questioned whether the MAG itself (in 2026) might be able to launch such a consultation and working process, looking at all aspects of the IGF's components, mandate, and relationship to other processes. He encouraged all to consider this as a possible focus for the new year. Jutta agreed that this could be a very useful way forward, and noted that it aligns with the proposals that have come in via the stocktaking processes. Ana also noted that this idea has been raised in discussions around the WSIS+20 process, and suggested that the IMSB may be able to suggest this. Bertrand agreed that it would be good to have this included in the WSIS+20 Output Document, but that this is unlikely at this stage, and may need to happen via another channel (self-driven by the MAG or the Leadership Panel).

3. Update from the IGF Secretariat

Anja provided a quick update, noting that all the output reports from the intersessional work have been finalised, and a launch event was held earlier in the week. Outputs can be viewed on the IGF website. She also noted that an event with the IPU and UNDP took place in Malaysia - there will be more work building on the Parliamentary Track. She also noted that there are fireside chats to be held in New York during the WSIS+20 High-Level Event - these include a session led by the Leadership Panel on their work.

Chris asked whether there was any intelligence on the future plans for the Leadership Panel and its renewal. Anja noted that while this is being discussed, it is at the discretion of the Secretary-General, so at this point it is not clear.

Anja noted that there may still be possibilities for people to register for these side-events.

Jimson noted a side event that is being organised by Nigerian stakeholders, and shared the link for registration.

4. General Updates: GDC and AI Governance

n/a

5. Any other business (AOB)

There was discussion of holding the next meeting of the WG on 18 December, noting that this is the day after the WSIS+20 High-Level Event concludes, and that it may be a good opportunity for further discussion of the work on IGF improvements. The precise date and time will be shared to the list by the chairs.

List of participants

1. Ana Neves, IGF MAG Member
2. Anja Gengo, IGF Secretariat
3. Celine Bal, IGF Secretariat
4. Anriette Esterhuysen, former IGF MAG Chair
5. Chris Buckridge, Group's Co-Chair, IGF MAG member
6. Desiree Milhoshevich, IGF MAG Member
7. Titti Cassa, Group's Co-Chair, IGF MAG member, Government of Italy
8. Jennifer Chung, IGF MAG Member
9. Bertrand de La Chapelle, Director, Internet & Jurisdiction Policy Network
10. Esther Jaromi, Independent Expert
11. Ainsley Baille, Independent Expert
12. Eunice Alejandra Perez Coello, Independent Expert
13. Fiona Alexander, former IGF MAG member
14. Jorge Cancio, Government of Switzerland
15. Jim Prendergast, Independent Expert
16. Hossam Algamal, IGF MAG Member
17. Jutta Croll, former IGF MAG member
18. Lito Ibarra, IGF MAG Member
19. Paul Blaker, UK Government
20. Jorge Perez, IGF MAG Member
21. Jose Amado Spinosa, IGF MAG Member
22. Sofia Longwe, Independent Expert
23. Timea Suto, IGF MAG Member
24. Nabel Yasin, Independent Expert
25. Wout De Natris, Independent Expert
26. Washington Jiang, Independent Expert
27. Ellen Taylor, ISED Canada
28. Jimson Olufuye, IGF MAG Member