

**IGF 2017: National and Regional IGF Initiatives**  
**Public Call for Describing the additional IGF support to the NRIs**  
**- Summary of Received Inputs -**

## About

1. During the first IGF 2017 face to face meeting of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group in Geneva, the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point informed that the NRIs have submitted a joint submission to the IGF 2016 Taking Stock process that among other things, calls for the NRIs to organize a main session for the 2017 IGF as well as for the MAG to reconsider giving more space for the NRIs individual, substantive representation.
2. The MAG advised the NRIs to submit a concrete proposal on the possible models of their representation and integration in the IGF 2017 annual programme.
3. The IGF Secretariat launched a public call for the NRIs to submit their inputs to within a one-week long initial deadline, that later on request of some of the NRIs, was extended for another week. The Call as sent to the NRIs through the NRIs mailing list is attached to this summary Report as Annex A1.
4. The IGF Secretariat will share and discuss the content and format of this summary with the NRIs before submitting to the MAG for their further discussion. The NRIs discussion on this matter is scheduled to be during the NRIs Virtual Meeting IV on 4 April 2017, at 15:00 p.m. UTC.

## Number of received inputs and purpose of this summary

5. Until the given deadline, the IGF Secretariat received in total thirty-three (33) submission. Out of these, thirty (30) inputs were submitted by the NRIs coordinators, as per the IGF Secretariat's list of the NRIs coordinators. Other three (3) submissions came from the NRIs community of individual initiatives, including among them, one MAG member. All inputs, in their original text as received, are attached to this summary as Annex A2. Distinction is made among the submissions that came from the NRIs coordinators and the ones came from the wider NRIs community, as indicated in the table within the Annex A2.

6. The purpose of this summary report is providing formatted input to the NRIs to discuss how the final submission to the MAG should be formatted.

### Summary of received inputs

7. Summary of received inputs is done in line with the structure of the sent Public Call. Namely, the section A of the call asked the NRIs to describe the NRIs additional support, offering three broad options. Thus, the section below summarizes the section A, per each of three offered potential alternatives. The section B of the Call, asked for the integration of the NRIs into the IGF annual programme, and is summarized below the section A summary.

### Section A Summary

8. The section A asked for inputs on three broad possible alternatives, taking into account previously suggested ideas by some of the NRIs.

#### ➤ Section A, Option 1

9. The section A, option 1 called for inputs on the following: *“In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme.”*
10. Support for this option came from thirteen (13) initiatives. Three (3) individual submissions that were classified as Others did not support this option.
11. In terms of the provided content, the following key points were raised:
  - a) In line with informing that the submitted input does not represent a consensus based view of the members of their Organizing Team, one initiative gave a narrow preference to this option, with noting that this alternative does not provide clear explanation on how the NRIs representation in the MAG will improve linkages into the global IGF. It was suggested that this representative should be either appointed by the MAG Chair or selected by a committee or the entire MAG.
  - b) One initiative stated that it is important to keep strong connection to the MAG given the fact that the development of the annual meeting programme is MAG responsibility. It was underlined that this option allows space for having a more defined function of this representative, where a set of responsibilities will be taken by this dedicated member that will be mandated by the NRIs to

support their interests in the MAG. It was noted that this kind of practice proved to be effective during 2016 year.

c) In terms of this representative role description, some stated that it should be to coordinate the work of the NRIs regarding their best possible representation at the IGF annual meeting. Others stated that this person should act as a liaison between the NRIs and the MAG, and be knowledgeable of the NRIs work.

d) Some described that the role should include convening the NRIs quarterly meetings; offering assistance where needed; motivation of unrepresented regions to have their own initiatives organized; acting as a mediator between the NRIs and the IGF Secretariat in order to provide advices on financing the NRIs, to disseminate information on the IGF principles and to work closely with the IGF Secretariat's Focal Point to the NRIs.

e) The key responsibilities for this person, according to some views would be to represent the NRIs on the MAG and to report to the NRIs on the developments and outcomes of the MAG meetings.

f) Some described the role in a way that the representative would be chairing the NRIs (virtual) meetings and ensuring the corresponding inputs be conveyed to the MAG.

g) Considering the appointment of this person, some were of opinion that the MAG Chair should appoint one person, while others suggested that the whole MAG should decide on this. Some stated that the NRIs among themselves should decide on this.

h) As some understand that this position would require a significant amount of time, it was suggested that the MAG Chair to appoint one or two 'vice-coordinators'.

i) Some suggested to consider the regional diversity when appointing a MAG member.

j) It was suggested that this representative works closely with the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point.

k) Concerns were raised in light of how the representative would be chosen and how the NRIs would reach a consensus on this matter.

l) Others shared a concern that this option could dilute the NRIs voices. Given the set of responsibilities of the MAG members, it will be difficult for this representative to focus on assigned work.

## ➤ **Section A, Option 2**

12. The section A, option 2 called for the inputs on following alternative: *"The MAG members that are actively affiliated with the NRIs should be representing the interests of the NRIs on the MAG, (in regards to the annual programme) in addition to the interests of their particular stakeholder groups, while keeping in mind that*

*all MAG members act in their individual capacity with a commitment to the overall success of the IGF when contributing to the IGF annual programme and intersessional activities during the 2017 term.”*

13. Support for this option came from three (3) initiatives. One (1) individual submission, classified as Others supported this option as well.

14. In terms of the provided content, the following key points were raised:

- a) This option represents the spirit of multi-sectorial participation, as there are approximately 15 MAG 2017 members affiliated with the NRIs.
- b) It was noted that this option is the most practical, given the total number of the MAG members that are affiliated with the NRIs. It was suggested to make this information available.
- c) It was said that the MAG members should communicate with the NRIs on their specific issues.
- d) Some noted that it would be challenging for these representatives to balance the position of a stakeholder group they belong to and the NRIs position.
- e) Some stated that this option is not a good solution as not all NRIs are represented on the MAG. Also, it was said that this could influence the equality between the MAG members, as some will be given the additional authority with this role.

➤ **Section A, Option 3**

15. The section A, option 3 called for the inputs to the following: *“A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the annual IGF programme. As you know the MAG meetings are open to everyone, and the NRIs could explore this option as well.”*

16. Support for this option came from fourteen (14) initiatives. Two (2) individual submissions that were classified as Others supported this option as well.

17. In terms of the provided content, the following key points were raised by some of the initiatives:

- a) It was noted that the communication between the NRIs and the MAG will be more effective if it would have a speaker coming from the NRIs, and not an external person.

## IGF 2017 NRIs

- b) The appointed person will be acting as a liaison between the NRIs and the MAG, with the task to channel the communication related to the IGF overall programme and other relevant activities between the MAG and the NRIs.
- c) Individual communication with the NRIs should also be done by this person, vis-à-vis gathering needed inputs.
- d) This option goes in line with the need of the NRIs to create an autonomous position to represent their interests. In addition, this option prevents creating any collision or even the principle of multistakeholderism.
- e) As this position requires in depth knowledge about the NRIs, it was suggested that Ms. Marilyn Cade should support the NRIs in this role, as previously done.
- f) It was noted that the work done by the IGF Secretariat and the NRIs Substantive Coordinator was effective and some called for continuation.
- g) The driver of the overall process could be a past MAG member that understands both the MAG and the NRIs.
- h) It was suggested that the role of the appointed person be discussed by the NRIs on the dedicated virtual meetings. Possible work tasks of this representative could include the collaboration with the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point regarding the work related to the NRIs; speaking on behalf of the NRIs at relevant meetings (e.g. MAG meeting); improving the visibility of the NRIs and working on the NRIs representation at the IGF annual meeting.
- i) Appointed person must have in depth knowledge about the NRIs, individually and collectively.
- j) It was suggested that the IGF Secretariat's NRIs Focal Point should be taking the responsibility of representing the NRIs interest and liaising with the MAG members on regular basis to create synergies.
- k) Some were of opinion that this option raises concerns related to the accountability and transparency, in line with expressing that there is no good mechanism for the NRIs to choose this person.

**Section B Summary**

18. Within the section B, it was explained that the joint submission of the NRIs was read during the first IGF 2017 MAG face to face meeting, where it was noted that the NRIs showed interest to organize a main session for this year's IGF, as well as to host a Coordination session as during the IGF 2016 meeting. The submission also called for more representation of the NRIs within the IGF annual meeting's programme. In this regard, the NRIs have been asked if there will be an interest

## IGF 2017 NRIs

for some of them to partner with other individual NRIs and organize substantive sessions on a topic of their mutual interest.

19. Twenty-one (21) initiative expressed their interest to partner with other NRIs and organize a substantive session on a topic that is of mutual interest.
20. For some the so far practice was that the Government, that was given a slot for the Open Forum, offered a space within it for the national IGF of their country to organize a session.
21. Some noted that this could be opportunity to learn about the issues in other countries and regions, as well as to create synergies among the individual NRIs.
22. Some expressed concerns that collaboration with other NRIs on the organization of the joint session is challenging as it requires significant amount of time and coordination.
23. It was proposed that the length of these sessions could be between 60 and 90 minutes, depending on the topic. Some noted that the most optimal time would be 60 minutes as the 90 minutes sessions are too long for the audience.
24. Some noted that the posed question in the initial call was confusing, and that it suggests a fragmented process that may not attract the right audience.
25. In any case, these sessions should not be a substitute to the main session that brings visibility to the NRIs. Many reiterated the importance of having a main session.
26. One initiative proposed the topic on digital rights for joint organization by interested NRIs.

**Next Steps**

27. The IGF Secretariat will summarize the received inputs and distribute the summary report through the NRIs mailing list.
28. The summary report will be an input to the NRIs Virtual meeting IV, scheduled to be on 4 April at 15:00 p.m. UTC. The purpose of the meeting will be to define further actions on received inputs and the format of the final submission to the MAG.

29. For any questions related to the summary report, contact the IGF Secretariat, NRIs Focal Point at: [agengo@ungo.ch](mailto:agengo@ungo.ch).

## **Annex A1**

### **Call sent to the NRIs**

#### **A. Your inputs needed: defining the NRIs support**

Within the IGF Secretariat, the NRIs will continue to have the support from a dedicated Focal Point.

We would like to kindly ask for the inputs from each initiative, to define what kind of additional support is needed, especially in regards to the options that some of you previously have mentioned, as indicated below:

##### **Option 1**

**In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme.**

If this is the option you would find useful, please inform the IGF Secretariat and describe the role for this position.

##### **Option 2**

**The MAG members that are actively affiliated with the NRIs should be representing the interests of the NRIs on the MAG, (in regards to the annual programme) in addition to the interests of their particular stakeholder groups, while keeping in mind that all MAG members act in their individual capacity with a commitment to the overall success of the IGF when contributing to the IGF annual programme and intersessional activities during the 2017 term.**

Please note that there are approximately 15 MAG members\* that are directly affiliated with the NRIs, meaning that they have a seat with the Organizing Committees of their respective initiatives.

##### **Option 3**

**A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the annual IGF programme.**

As you know the MAG meetings are open to everyone, and the NRIs could explore this option as well.

Whichever option you endorse, kindly submit the description of the duties, as you see them.

#### **B. Your inputs needed: NRIs participation at the IGF annual meeting**

The NRIs joint submission to the IGF 2016 Taking Stock was read during the MAG meeting. As you know, the submission called for the following:



- 1. The NRIs to organize a substantive, interactive main sessions for this year's IGF.**
- 2. The NRIs coordination session to be organized.**
- 3. Integration of the NRIs in the overall IGF programme, in a way that a set of dedicated, thematic sessions be offered to the NRIs as an option.** The MAG asked for a concrete proposal to be submitted, in order to explore this option in particular. Therefore, in regards to this third option, and if there is interest within the NRIs, we would appreciate if you could submit answers to the following questions:

- a) Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting?**
- b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?**
- c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?**

**Annex A2**

**DESCRIBING THE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO THE NRIs: LIST OF RECEIVED INPUTS**

#	INITIATIVE	INPUTS TO SECTION A	INPUTS TO SECTION B	NOTES
<b>INPUTS RECEIVED FROM THE NRIs COORDINATORS</b>				
1.	<b>Poland IGF</b>	<p>Preferred option is number three (3), because the communication between MAG and NRIs will be most effective if an outside intermediary is not used, but rather an insider speaker for NRIs directly.</p> <p>The person appointed will mostly fulfill a liaising tasks channeling communication between MAG and NRIs. It will also entail some coordination among NRIs as individual initiatives need to receive information, be contacted and consulted and all their inputs have to be gathered, summed up and presented. It is preferable that the same person is also engaged in coordinating the NRIs preparation of IGF events before the Geneva meeting (or at least working closely with a person in charge of this task).</p>	<p>We are interested at the moment in organizing a session at the annual meeting in Geneva preferably with other NRI's as partners.</p> <p>We are in a process of finalizing a possible regional V4 IGF to take place in Warsaw this October. When we are sure of who will be engaging in this initiative we will put this question for their consideration. We expect to have some answers in mid-April at the latest. We also need to discuss this very issue in more depth with Polish stakeholders.</p>	
2.	<b>UK IGF</b>	<p>Option one (1) is narrowly the preferred option for the UK-IGF but this comes with comments and is not a consensus view.</p> <p>It is not clear to us how the NRIs representation in the MAG will improve the linkages into the global IGF. It makes sense to ask existing MAG members to reach out to the their local NRIs to help with outreach into the community.</p> <p>It has been suggested that some form of topic-based space for NRI's (and other members of the IG community) to</p>		<p>One additional suggestion from one of the UK-IGF organising committee after earlier responses were submitted:</p> <p>In relation to Option 2: has establishing a MAG sub-group for the NRI representatives who are MAG members been</p>

		<p>share best practise and their experiences would maybe serve this purpose better. Alternatively, some way of linking the workshops back to, and involving members of the NRI community perhaps would work. This would fit with the suggestion that Sandra from EuroDIG has made, although, we would support engagement with the global NRI community as well as a region-focussed event.</p> <p>Option one comments It is not clear what the terms of this representation would be or what level of support there would be. How would the representative be chosen and how would they reach consensus with the NRI community?</p> <p>This position largely depends on who the appointed person is and the amount of time that they have available to dedicate to this. The right person can do it if they are enthusiastic about it. It does not make sense to appoint yet another person to cover this who is not on the MAG. It is not clear how one person can represent all NRI's equally and fairly.</p> <p>Option two comments - Concerns that some NRIs are seen to be represented, and not others; - That some MAG members are encumbered with a conflicting mandate, being split between the stakeholder group they were asked to represent and the multi-stakeholder NRI they are now asked also to represent;</p>		<p>considered? If this were to be formally set up with a membership of at least 10 MAG members and with safeguards to ensure this sub-group is geographically diverse, they could elect on an annual basis a representative to lead on submitting to the MAG plenary their consensus-based NRI inputs on IGF planning. The annual selection process for MAG members would need to be adjusted to ensure an adequate turn-over of NRI representatives that would also be members of the sub-group. There are 90+ NRIs worldwide so this could be managed by invitations being sent by the MAG Chair to individual NRIs to join the sub-group - and the MAG - to ensure the required number of NRI representatives on the MAG is maintained over the three year cycle. In this way the MAG Chair would also be able to ensure there is sufficient geographical diversity so that Internet communities in developing</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That equality between MAG members is compromised, as some have the additional authority of speaking for an NRI as well as a stakeholder group, while others do not.</li> </ul> <p>Given the nature of the MAG, this is not as serious as it would be in a group with substantive decision-making authority but does complicate the model of the MAG so would need clear guidelines.</p> <p>The second suggests that any MAG member affiliated with an NRI simply represent the interests (only) of that NRI. How NRIs without a MAG member get represented is not clear.</p> <p>Option three comments</p> <p>This option has potential for the future but in order to be successful it would need a clear mandate for the role as being purely a liaison role and sufficient community support so that realistically a global liaison is both functional and productive. It would make sense for there to be outreach on both sides – i.e. for each NRI to appoint their own liaison in turn to work with the MAG liaison.</p> <p>The choice of person at MAG side could be either appointed by the MAG chair (option 1) or selected by a committee or the entire MAG. It would take time for the NRI's to establish an appointment process and not all may be able to commit to these discussions or process so option 3 seems a bit of a stretch currently.</p>		<p>countries and small island states would benefit from this important linkage and have a voice in the MAG deliberations. The sub-group would meet both virtually and physically at the same time as the MAG and Open Consultations. In addition I would expect that this MAG sub-group as a platform could prove to be a beneficial global networking mechanism for the NRIs.</p> <p>I suggest it may be worth exploring this if option 1 proves problematic in terms of defining an individual's status or role, but a structure for NRI representation nonetheless has wide support in the MAG.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Duties to make space for information sharing and discussion between NRIs, irrespective of policy topic; and to convey and promote on behalf of the NRI local interest in there being made space at the IGF for discussion of policy topics.</p> <p>liaison between MAG and local IGF/NRI MAG liaisons stimulate and co-ordinate local and global liaison to engage policy discussions, events, briefings, resources and research</p> <p>To assist liaison opportunities with other institutions and organisations to participate with and benefit from the entire IGF network.</p>		
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Japan IGF</b></p>	<p>We support Option 3 based on rationale below. It is described in order of preference.</p> <p>Option 3) It allows NRIs to send clear messages to the MAG with focus on NRI related issues in IGF settings (e.g., overall program, booth and any other general activities). The NRI appointed person can focus on coordination between the MAG and NRI related matters, and no need to be involved in additional general responsibilities as a MAG member.</p> <p>Option 1) Compared to option 3), it may dilute the voices of NRIs as the NRI represented MAG member will be one member out of 55 members. As a MAG member, there are additional responsibilities in considering the overall program, selection of the workshops, etc., and more difficult for NRI appointed</p>	<p>In regards to the NRIs Main Session, we support the idea of having substantive interactive session, rather than a session with one way inputs from NRIs on a broad theme. It may help to have some examples, such as listing a few key topics from IGF2016. This is of course not intended to impose the contents of IGF2016 to NRIs, but simply to serve as examples, as a starting point of considerations. It is NRIs' decision on the topics of the session and open to suggestions of themes from NRIs, not restricted to what was discussed in IGF2016.</p> <p>In regards to the substantive joint NRIs sessions, if there is a topic(s) relevant to Japan IGF, we are interested to co-</p>	

		<p>MAG member to focus coordination on NRI related issues.</p> <p>Option 2) I expect it to be challenging to balance the position of a stakeholder group and NRIs.</p>	<p>organise and coordinate with other NRIs. The length to be 90 minutes.</p>	
4.	<b>APrIGF</b>	Part A: Option 1	<p>Part B: Yes Yes 90 mins</p>	
5.	<b>Chad IGF</b>	We choose the option 3.	<p>We again agree with the 3 points :</p> <p>The NRIs to organize a substantive, interactive main sessions for this year's IGF.</p> <p>The NRIs coordination session to be organized.</p> <p>Integration of the NRIs in the overall IGF programme, in a way that a set of dedicated, thematic sessions be offered to the NRIs as an option. The MAG asked for a concrete proposal to be submitted, in order to explore this option in particular.</p> <p>Therefore, in regards to this third option, and if there is interest within the NRIs, we would appreciate if you could submit answers to the following questions:</p> <p>Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive</p>	

			<p>session during the IGF 2017 meeting? yes we approve it</p> <p>b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?</p> <p>We as IGF CHAD fully accept the idea to work closely with other NRI colleagues and members of stakeholders to organise the sessions;</p> <p>c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?</p> <p>we think that 90 minutes is normal to give the opportunity for everyone to speak and to share the idea ;</p> <p>Thanks</p>	
6.	<b>Mexico IGF</b>	In regards to the consultation run by the IGF Secretariat about the potential support offered to the NRIs, the Initiative Group on Internet Governance supports the first option: "In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme". In our opinion, this option offers the best	Also, we would like to state our preference for a joint session with the NRIs during the IGF 2017 meeting.	

		way to promote the NRIs work during the IGF 2017 preparatory process.		
7.	<b>Colombia IGF</b>	With respect to this consultation we commend option 2 that we consider represents the spirit of multi-sectorial participation since there are approximately 15 members in the MAG affiliated with NRIs. Is important to highlight that this recommendation was endorsed by the Colombian Ministry of ICTs. It was stated as well that MAG members who are actively affiliated with NRIs should represent the interests of NRIs in the MAG.	<p>We consider that since the previous year in the global FGI in Mexico we had options 1 and 2 for the first time, we see proposal 3 as new. Option 1 is a very busy session and there was not too much interaction with the public during the forum because each representative of the NRIs had only 3 minutes to talk and yet the time was short to facilitate participation with the public. While it was recognized the importance of publicizing the progress in the discussions of the different initiatives in the global forum through this global IGF space.</p> <p>Option 3 seems interesting to explore since it would mark an evolution in the process of NRI participation in the IGF and the participation of national initiatives like the Colombian IGF could directly contribute to the global IGF through this participation. Is important to highlight as well that this recommendation was endorsed by the Colombian Ministry of ICTs. We also recommend that option 2 be retained as well in order to maintain coordination activities for NRIs.</p> <p>This recommendations were shared</p>	



			through the Colombian IGF mailing list that currently has 168 subscribers.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Zimbabwe IGF</b>	Option 3 A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the 2017 annual IGF programme.		
<b>9.</b>	<b>German IGF</b>	The Steering Committee of the German IGF also supports option 3 for the same reasons stated by the Trinidad and Tobago IGF: the need to create an autonomous position to represent the interests of the NRIs thus avoiding any collision of interests or even the breach of the multistakeholder principle. The decision was taken unanimously.	With regards to the IGF 2017: The German Ministry of Foreign Affairs had organized an Open Forums last year and they kindly offered us the slot. We also had visit from other German speaking stakeholders from other countries (but not only). The Steering Committee evaluated the workshop as a very positive experience and expressed its willingness to have a similar 60 minutes session next year.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>IGF-USA</b>	The co-chairs would like to echo Trinidad and Tobago's IGF recommendation in support of Option 3. We agree that "it would be best that the NRIs self-organize their engagement at IGF 2017 in as autonomous a manner as is possible."	To organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017.	Secretariat to confirm with colleagues the input on section B.
<b>11.</b>	<b>Austria IGF</b>	On the first question: we would also prefer option 1 because it will also be the most efficient way.	On the second question: we currently have no plans to organize a session.	
<b>12.</b>	<b>EuroDIG</b>	It is most important to keep the strong connection to the MAG, because they are responsible to build the programme. In this respect only option 1 or 2 would be reasonable. My understanding is only MAG members which are appointed by UNDESA will be able to fully	EuroDIG would like to organise a substantive interactive session including all European NRIs preferably on day zero or day 1. We aim to discuss a topic which is of concern for most of the European	

		<p>participate equally in all MAG processes.</p> <p>With option 3 I also see challenges which go beyond the capacity of the NRI in respect to: Initiating a vote when it comes to agreeing on one person. We have no procedure for voting in place, I fear it will be rather time consuming to establish such a procedure and we might risk losing the positive momentum we have right now. Gaining travel for that person to attend MAG meetings</p> <p>Choosing between option 1 and 2 I would prefer option 1, because it will be a more defined function instead of asking multiple MAG members, where nobody really takes the responsibility. We should make sure this person then gets a clear mandate from the NRIs to support their interests in the MAG.</p> <p>This is actually the system which worked well in 2016, why should we change this?</p>	<p>countries and will start a related process at the EuroDIG meeting in June. We would be very much interested to learn what are the main (substantive) topics in other regions and encourage other regional initiatives to organise such a session too. We would need 60 or 90 min.</p>	
13.	<b>Trinidad and Tobago IGF</b>	<p>Support of Option 3. From where I sit, it would be best that the NRIs self-organize their engagement at IGF 2017 in as autonomous a manner as is possible.</p>	<p>Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting? <i>Tentatively - yes</i></p> <p>b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?</p> <p><i>YES. There may also be excellent</i></p>	

			<p><i>opportunities for synergies between other Caribbean National IGFs or even other Island IGFs</i></p> <p>c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?</p> <p><i>90 mins if all things can fall into place. However, I think the session should not take the form of a traditional Panel - rather it should take a Roundtable format so that discussions can be "talk with" as opposed to "talk to".</i></p>	
14.	<b>Sri Lanka IGF</b>	Option 2	Yes	
15.	<b>Netherlands IGF</b>	<p>About the additional support we think about option 2 but the last few years MAG member Marilyn Cade was like 'the mother' of the NRI's. She invested a lot of time in knowing, so if one MAG member should be appointed as affiliation it should be her and if that is the case, we, as NLIGF, could also vote for option 3 interaction with the audience.</p> <p>We give our full support to Marilyn Cade.</p>	<p>a) And about our participation at the IGF in Geneva, it is a yes to the question if we are interested to organize a substantive, interactive session. For the last 6 years NLIGF organises workshops, it is one of the important reasons of existence of our National IGF.</p> <p>b) Of course we can liaise with other NRI's or stakeholdergroups, if that is of your preferation. But our experience is that it takes a lot more time and effort in preparation. In earlier years, the MAG obliged submitters to merge their workshops with others. It is not a</p>	

			<p>guarantee that the workshop is getting better with the organisation from different parties. But as said, if it is a theme or subject or otherwise a benefit, we will go for it!</p> <p>c) About the time slot, of course it depends on the subject, the amount of people in the panel, but our experience is that 90 minutes is convenient - especially if you like some</p>	
<b>16.</b>	<b>Croatia IGF</b>	<p>We would prefer option 1 - "In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme."</p>	<p>In principle, we are in favour of organizing one session in cooperation with other NRIs. More concrete inputs on topics and format we will be able to suggest after this year's Croatian IGF.</p>	
<b>17.</b>	<b>Nigeria IGF</b>	<p>The "NRIs" has become a strong network that evolved organically, through the efforts of local and regional catalysts or champions. It is one of the best outcomes of the IGF, thus changing the view of some Critics of the Forum.</p> <p>Each NRI had commenced and existed without any MAG member promoting it, as the NRIs may not have any association with the MAG member appointed from its country or Region.</p> <p>The process of appointing MAG members on yearly basis has no linkage with the local initiatives as membership of Local Organising Committee of the NRI is not a criterion for such appointment.</p> <p>The Network now has a focal point at the Secretariat of the IGF which got the NRIs more organized and engaged as a community with all the virtual meetings and</p>	<p>NIGF and WAIGF will support The NRIs to organize a substantive, interactive main session for the 2017 IGF. The NRIs coordination session to be organized as well.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> option is confusing. Questions a-c are not very clear as the 3<sup>rd</sup> option is not a Main Session event rather fragmented programs that may not attract the right audience as Main Session would. However, any NRI that may wish to organize a forum or workshop focusing on its activities may be free to do so. Such workshop should not be substituted for the Substantive Main Session for the</p>	
<b>18.</b>	<b>West Africa IGF</b>			

		<p>intersessional work being carried out. Particularly, in 2016 when a Substantive Coordinator was appointed by the MAG Chair for the network, the combination of the Secretariat and the Coordinator helped the Network to achieve much. <i>(My personal opinion would be to do this again for 2017, retaining the duo, thus consolidating on the achievement of 2016)</i></p> <p>Based on the above, Nigeria would support option 3. Just like the BPF and DC, the driver of NRI network may not necessarily be a MAG member but should be a past MAG member that understands the history and workings of the NRIs.</p> <p>Internal consultation within the WAIGF also supports option 3 based on the above reasons.</p> <p>However, if a new criterion for evaluating applicants to the MAG includes coordination or affiliation with NRI, then, we shall support option 1.</p> <p>As for the Role of the appointed NRI coordinator, I will propose we hold a virtual meeting to discuss this. Below are some of the roles the Coordinator can play.</p> <p>Working with the Focal Point at the Secretariat in organizing the work of the Network at intersessional and IGF</p> <p>Speaking for and on behalf of the NRIs Network at forums which the NRIs may not be participating, eg at MAG Meeting and other UN related events.</p> <p>Ensuring the success of the Substantive Main Session and the Working Session at the annual IGF</p> <p>Mobilization of resources for the NRIs</p> <p>Creating visibility for the NRIs that leads to rapid growth of the network.</p>	<p>NRIs.</p>	
--	--	---	--------------	--

<b>19.</b>	<b>Armenia IGF</b>	<p>With A, we would go with option 1: In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme. The role of this MAG member can be coordinating the work of NRIs to be represented at best during the meeting at IGF. The details can be discussed with NRIs when we have the consultation meeting with the MAG Chair.</p>	<p>B. We fully support the points 1 and 2. Regarding the 3rd point, it's not so clear with the question a.          If this is about a session for example of our national IGF, then we are not interested to organize such a session. It is not a good idea to have lots of national IGFs sessions unlike the regional ones, this can be interesting by participants to see what is happening in certain region.          If this is about all NRIs to organize a substantive and interactive session over 1(or more) topics, then our initiative supports this idea and we are ready to co-operate with other colleagues from different NRIs and find out the topic(s) of discussion.          And for the time of the main session for all NRIs we suggest 2x90 minutes sessions.</p>	
<b>20.</b>	<b>African IGF</b>	<p>Option 1 would be most suitable with one adjustment. This option could help in deepening the definition around NRIs among the stakeholders with the hope that such appointment should serve as liaison between NRIs and MAG; such a person must be conversant with IGF, its development, future agenda; and the achievements / challenges of NRIs in propagating the IGF concept and values locally, nationally and regionally. Accordingly, the NRI representative would be an already existing MAG member and an active person within an NRI and the broader NRI community. This places a unique advantage as they would be familiar with the processes of the MAG and would know the best ways to engage the MAG &amp; the IGF secretariat for NRI goals and contributions. Having a</p>	<p>Yes, 90 minutes</p>	

		<p>dedicated person representing the NRIs will allow for easy accountability, transparency and sending of coordinated and cohesive messages from the NRIs to the MAG.</p> <p>It is suggested that the appointment of NRI Representative be done through a voting process by the NRIs and not an appointment by the MAG Chair. The MAG Chair should oversee/facilitate the voting process which will be supported by the IGF secretariat.</p> <p>Roles for this position: The NRI representative should convene at least quarterly meetings with NRIs to gather updates and planned initiatives from NRIs within the content This meeting will help the appointed NRI to represent NRIs efficiently, where the reporting and involvement in the MAG will be fruitful.</p> <p>They should offer assistance where needed for activities of NRIs – this assistance can come in the form of advising and directing new NRIs who seek guidance to relevant people/bodies</p> <p>They should facilitate a process within the NRI community to motivate for more initiatives to happen or take place in regions that NRIs are not currently taking place</p> <p>Act as mediator between NRIs and IGF Secretariat supporting and informing on the following: Financial assistance for NRIs (where NRIs can source information for funding opportunities) Dissemination of information regarding IGF principles to help ensure that NRIs align themselves with the broader principles of the IGF</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Work closely with IGF Secretariat’s Focal Point for the NRIs Engagement in ensuring that NRIs submit annual reports for initiatives done</p> <p>Responsibilities of the NRI representative: To represent all NRIs input in fairness and transparency to the MAG</p> <p>Reporting to NRIs developments and outcomes of MAG meetings that have a direct impact on NRIs objectives or functions</p> <p>Option 2</p> <p>One point which does not favour Option 2 is that someone could have a seat within an NRI or several NRIs, but may not have direct involvement in organizing the annual NRI events.</p> <p>Option 3</p> <p>According to one National IGF representative, “the NRIs need to designate their own representative and define his/her role for exercising the mandate. The NRI representative should be the spokesperson of NRIs and defender of our interests within the MAG. The post definition should include monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the various recommendations resulting from the NRI activity reports.”</p>		
<p><b>21.</b></p>	<p><b>Spain IGF</b></p>	<p>We agreed that we’d rather have a member at the MAG that would be representing the interests of the NRIs (option 1).</p>	<p>With regard to the IGF in Geneva, we would like to co-organize a session together with others NRIs, ideally about digital rights.</p>	



22.	Georgia IGF	<p>The first opinion is fully supported from our side and it is great idea but if it possible to use regional diversity (as recommendation) in the process of the appointment of MAG member affiliated with the NRIs.</p>	<p>In regards of the second and third opinions: we have regional, sub-regional and national IG initiatives. Representatives of this NRI is mostly related with regional challenges and representation may do issues little bit narrow.</p>	
23.	Ecuador IGF	<p>Option 1 In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme. If this is the option you would find useful, please inform the IGF Secretariat and describe the role for this position.</p> <p>THIS IS OUR SUGGESTED OPTION</p> <p>ROLE: To represent and inform the NRI about the IGF ANNUAL PROGRAMME and to interact with other NRIs and members of the program committee for this purpose</p>	<p>Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting?</p> <p>YES</p> <p>b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?</p> <p>YES</p> <p>c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?</p> <p>90 minutes</p>	
24.	Belarus IGF	<p>As a Secretary of the Steering Committee of the Belarus IGF I would like to express our opinion on the following</p>	<p>Section B: As soon as Belarusian IGF initiative has never participated in global</p>	

		<p>issues:</p> <p>Section A: We suppose that the possibility to represent NRIs more completely only has a person who is directly affiliated with the IGF organization. This person can not only express the opinion of others, but also be an active participant of all the NRIs issues discussions as he faced them personally. As far as there are only 15 MAG members that are directly affiliated with the NRIs (among all the IGF initiatives), we correspondingly choose Option 3.</p>	<p>IGF, we would like to gain experience and participate in the IGF 2017 not as an organizer of the session, but as its active participant if possible.</p>	
25.	Portugal IGF	<p>A. Your inputs needed: defining the NRIs support Option 3</p> <p>A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the annual IGF programme.</p> <p>As you know the MAG meetings are open to everyone, and the NRIs could explore this option as well.</p> <p>We see the person appointed by the NRIs with the role of representing the interests of NRIs in the preparation of the programme and liaise with MAG members regularly to identify synergies and high priority topics for the annual IGF. This person should be the same as the NRIs Focal Point</p>	<p>The Portuguese IGF team would like to be involved in a substantive/interactive session during IGF 2017 but we do not have enough resources to organize and coordinate such process.</p>	
26.	Arab IGF	<p>We wish first to express the high importance we associate with the support made available by a dedicated focal point for NRIs at the Secretariat. This is an important resource and it's continuity is of paramount importance.</p> <p>With regard to the options for MAG engagement, while we believe there could more than one way to achieve the representation of NRIs' interest within the MAG, we feel</p>	<p>Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting?</p> <p>Yes, we will be interested in such a session, while also taking into consideration the need to minimize redundancies in addressing the same topic, and the need to link discussions on the same topic with the main session, so</p>	

		<p>that at this stage option B might represent the most practical alternative for the cycle of 2017, especially given the high number of MAG members who are directly affiliated with one or more NRIs. It might be also useful to make available information on MAG members who are affiliated with NRIs and the initiatives they are associated with. This might enable NRI constituencies to better reach out to those members.</p>	<p>there is a comprehensive overview that would benefit participants and add value to the programme.</p> <p>b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?</p> <p>Yes. We would be happy to liaise with other NRIs.</p> <p>c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?</p> <p>Give the experience with IGF2016, a 60 min session would be most appropriate to attract wider participation while giving sufficient room to present the topic. 45 min will be very challenging in terms of allowing enough time to sufficiently tackle a topic, while 90 min is too long for many of IGF audience if we want to be attractive enough.</p>	
<b>27.</b>	<b>Benin IGF</b>	Option 3 supported.		
<b>28.</b>	<b>Central Asia IGF</b>	Regarding A question,3d option looks more promising. I think that you (the Focal Point) does a lot of work that is very well suited just for that position and if you represent NRIs at MAG meetings you will just continue the same work.	As for the B section, we are interested in organizing the session that would summarize and presents the main challenges in the region and probably we could cooperate with some other NRIs experiencing the same problems. Depending on number of	

			people and NRIs it may take from 60 to 90 mins, no more.	
29.	Finland IGF	<p>We prefer option 1. We believe that the MAG needs a focal point to liaise with the NRIs. This position would be one of chairing NRI calls and ensuring that the input from such calls and meetings would be conveyed to the MAG in virtual and f2f meetings. We do realize that this individual would have to allocate a serious amount of time for such activity and be preferably someone who is present at most IG related events both on global and regional levels. To ensure this, one or two MAG ‘vice-coordinators’ could be appointed. This option would require that we have sufficient resources to support NRI activities in the IGF secretariat that would be the focal point for the coordinator (why not even take the lead under the patronage of the selected MAG member). This approach proved to function well, especially with the remarkable work done by the IGF secretariat, while preparing the 2016 main session and we see no reason to change the way we operate.</p> <p>Option 2 is also something that could be worked on. This option just carries the risk that we do not have a clear lead and would require coordination among the MAG members. Even this option would require that the secretariat carries sufficient resources for NRI work.</p> <p>We do not support option 3. This option comes with concerns of transparency and accountability. We firmly believe that NRI work should be lead from within the MAG. Especially when it comes to choosing this individual, we are not convinced we have sufficient mechanisms for the NRIs to choose someone to represent them. Have the NRIs themselves displayed</p>	<p>The Finnish Internet Forum will undergo a change of coordinator/chair in the coming months. Because of this, we are unfortunately not able to participate in the preparations of this year’s NRI input to the IGF. Overall, while of the opinion that the NRI main session in Guadalajara served the purpose, we support organizing shorter, thematically more focused sessions with less panelists.</p>	

		<p>verified mechanisms to let someone represent themselves or vote on issues that carry a larger agenda than just national issues? While we support the NRIs to be standalone processes with minimal set of common rules or institutional linkages, we remain of the opinion that in the absence of clear mandates from the NRIs to their representatives on global level, the NRIs should not take part in formal voting or other similar decision making activities. Further, the MAG selection process already ensures certain commitment and qualities of the chosen individuals. We should rely on that and let them do the work instead of creating additional layers.</p>		
<p><b>30.</b></p>	<p><b>SEEDIG</b></p>	<p>The support from the dedicated focal point within the IGF Secretariat is hereby welcomed and strongly supported by us.</p> <p>As the operating model, we suggest the Option 1:</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> In consultations with the NRIs, the MAG Chair to appoint one MAG member affiliated with the NRIs, for 2017 term, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs in regards to the IGF annual programme. If this is the option you would find useful, please inform the IGF Secretariat and describe the role for this position.</p> <p>A clear role for the NRI's appointed representative needs to be determined. S/he would act as a sort of 'liaison', rather than '(substantive) coordinator'. We further suggest this MAG member to have a fixed term of 1 (one) year on this position (in this case for the IGF 2017), regardless of the term s/he serves in the MAG at that moment. The</p>	<p>a) Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting?</p> <p>After having our side event at the IGF 2016, which for the SEEDIG as a sub-regional IGF was meaningful and successful in various ways, such are the visibility and the outreach - having in mind that our region is less engaged at the IGF space - we are now interested in organising an interactive session in Geneva. The session would offer substantive and relevant discussions on the relevant topic, keeping in mind the emerging issues from the region to those in the global level. We would like to emphasise that having NRIs sessions at the global IGF meeting is not about having a working meeting, but a substantive sessions which would</p>	

		<p>description of the role for this position should be in relation to the IGF annual programme. The 'liaison' MAG representative should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- be in the continuous contact with the IGF Secretariat focal point, regarding the NRIs participation within the IGF programme</li> <li>- 'report back' to the MAG and the Chair on regular basis, and when needed even more frequently</li> <li>- be present at the NRIs virtual meetings (those organised by the IGF Secretariat and organised by the NRIs themselves - when they are held), and provide input to them, previously agreed by the MAG.</li> <li>- communicate any questions/answers and/or challenges there are on the side of the NRIs and/or the MAG (this in coordination with the IGF Focal point if needed or when possible)</li> </ul>	<p>contribute to the true bottom-up approach on IG challenges that exist on national, sub-regional and regional levels - to be discussed on the global level, for the discussion and exchanges of good practices to be brought back to national, sub-regional and regional levels.</p> <p>b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)?</p> <p>We stay fully open to any opportunity to cooperate with other National and/or Regional IGF initiatives and stakeholder groups, and to jointly develop and organise the session (the session format, programme, speakers, ways of interactive engagement, ways to enhance online participation - to name a few)</p> <p>c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)?</p> <p>We suggest to the MAG members, the Chair and the IGF Secretariat to consider having NRI's sessions within the</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>programme, rather than having them as 'side events'. Optimal timing for NRIs sessions from our experience would be 90 or 60 minutes.</p> <p>In addition, we would like to support for NRIs to have a Main session or a Plenary at the global IGF, again this year. We strongly think that it is important to keep bringing the NRI initiatives together, this time in a more substantive session, preferable a round table with a particular topic (or more then 1) that all the initiatives for e.g. had in common in their annual meetings in their programmes - following global trends and emerging issue(s).</p>	
<b>OTHER</b>				
<b>31.</b>	Shreedeep Rayamajhi	<p>I would support for Option 3 A person appointed by the NRIs, that is not a MAG member, that will be representing the interests of the NRIs during the MAG meetings, in regards to the 2017 annual IGF programme. As you know the MAG meetings are open to everyone, and the NRIs could explore this option as well. Benefits:</p> <p>1. By doing so there will be the option as being a MAG member there are various limitation as MAG is an intergovernmental process 2. With NRIs choosing their own leader it will gives a strong voice 3. Option 1 and 2 have more restriction in terms of their appointment and capacity</p> <p>With our elected member we would have the flexibility &amp; confidence to make our representation strong Duties: Fostering an environment for promoting the values of Internet Governance Forum (openness, transparency, accountability and multistakeholderism)</p>	<p>The pace should be built and further move with strong energy. I strongly believe that IGF's main motive is not just the intergovernmental process but to develop and grow the NRI network in every individual country with the values of openness, multistakeholderism, transparency and accountability. In the past IGF was very limited to just intergovernmental process, and developed nation only. Still today there seems to be lack of representation in the MAG from lower economies of Asia and Africa. Reality is the next billion is coming from Asia and there are very limited countries that have represented in MAG and Multistakeholder seems</p>	

		<p>Developing strategies for next generation leadership The person chosen will be responsible for voicing the NRI issues and problems Collaborate with NRI for better communication strategy among the network of regional and national IGF which is very low and less The major role of the candidate would also be promoting new IGF initiatives working closely with the IGF secretariat Attending all meetings and consultations related to IGF process and communicating 7. Prioritizing minority groups and issues</p>	<p>somewhere lost. NRI needs to bridge the gaps in between the international, national and regional networks creating a better value and interpretation of open standards and internet core values. 1. The NRIs to organize a substantive, interactive main sessions for this year's IGF. a) Would your initiative be interested to organize a substantive, interactive session during the IGF 2017 meeting? Currently I am affiliated to 1. APRIGF MSG 2. Nepal IGF MSG 3. Learn Internet Governance But I am not the point of contact, there are possibilities that I might be attending the IGF2017, I would love to update the progress happening or to connect the gaps in every possible way. You can count me in b) If yes, would you be interested to liaise with other NRIs and other stakeholder groups to co-organize these sessions, in order to offer a comprehensive overview of the agreed topic(s)? Yes c) How much time would you need for that session (45, 60 and 90 minutes slots or other)? 90 minutes</p>	
32.	Zeina Bou Harb	<p>Regarding the 1st question, and since the NRIs focal is closely involved with the NRI's activities, I would nominate the NRIs Focal Point to represent the interest of the NRI's. There will be support of the 15 MAG members mentioned. And I propose to keep the NRI's Coordination session.</p>		



<p>33.</p>	<p>Ali Hussaini</p>	<p>The MAG members that are actively affiliated with the NRIs should be representing the interests of the NRIs on the MAG, (in regards to the annual programme) in addition to the interests of their particular stakeholder groups, while keeping in mind that all MAG members act in their individual capacity with a commitment to the overall success of the IGF when contributing to the IGF annual programme and intersessional activities during the 2017 term. I support this option.</p> <p>The common member of MAS and NRIs will have better ability to understand the interest of NRIs. And he/she is expected to communicate the real issues of NRIs like funding for NRIs to attend IGF face to face meeting .</p>		
------------	---------------------	--	--	--