

## IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Virtual Meeting II 28 March 2017

### Summary Report

1. The second Virtual MAG Meeting of the 2017 IGF preparatory cycle took place on 28 March. Ms. Lynn St. Amour moderated the meeting as Chair of the MAG and Mr. Chengetai Masango represented the IGF Secretariat. On agreement by the MAG in the [previous virtual meeting](#), the agenda (**ANNEX I**) focused primarily on 2017 intersessional activities, in particular Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and their modalities, and MAG working groups.
2. The meeting began with a brief update on the IGF workshops proposal process, following the [call for proposals](#) publicized shortly after the first Virtual MAG Meeting, on 17 March. It was noted that all the work done by the MAG's dedicated working group had been finalized, together with the Secretariat, as scheduled. It was agreed that in order to keep track of any comments from proposers in the coming weeks or MAG members during the evaluation stage the working group would remain formally constituted. It was also suggested the group take stock of the process once completed at the MAG's [second face-to-face meeting in June](#), to discuss any lessons learned and make suggestions for improvement for next year. As highlighted by the MAG Chair, there have been significant improvements and innovations made, including the option for workshop proposers to connect with Geneva-based international organizations and to join an online discussion group with other proposers and workshop speakers ([IGF 2017 Speaker-Session Collaboration Space](#)).
3. On efforts to promote the call for proposals, the suggestion was made to do specific outreach to permanent missions in Geneva, as well as to encourage those missions to share the call with their capitals. The link with national missions and informing them of annual meeting preparations early on would be important given that the IGF will take place in Geneva. The Secretariat agreed and said it would make missions aware of the opportunity to propose both workshops and open forums, the call for which will be launched next week.
4. The MAG then reviewed a set of suggested modalities and guidelines for BPFs (**ANNEX II**), most of which were already in place but were revised or further developed by MAG member Juan Fernandez, together with the Chair and Secretariat. The aim of the document is to clarify how BPFs are established and the MAG's responsibilities in supporting them, as well as to set some basic guidelines for reporting on progress. One participant on the call observed that the document could risk being too formalistic or procedural, yet recognized the usefulness of documenting such procedures. It was also remarked that the modalities/guidelines are being considered at the same time as proposals for new and continuing BPFs. It was agreed that both processes should proceed in parallel and that the document will be open to further inputs from MAG members until the end of this week.

5. Short briefings were given by the relevant MAG members on each of the proposed BPFs to date. Participants heard proposals for work in 2017 on the following new BPF themes: Remote Participation; Combatting Corruption Online; Local Content; and Internet of Things (IoT). All received preliminary support from members, in particular Local Content. However, some suggestions were made to apply the proposed IoT BPF to other IGF channels, in light of the fact that a Dynamic Coalition (DC) on the issue already exists and the BPF could be seen as duplicative. This was supported by the MAG and the IoT BPF was subsequently withdrawn from consideration as a BPF. Updates were given on those BPFs which were proposed to continue: BPFs on Gender & Access, and BPF on Cybersecurity, the latter of which could contribute to a potential main session on Cybersecurity this year. Members expressed support for continuation of both.

6. In the context of the proposed IoT BPF, a discussion emerged on what the general substantive focus of BPFs should be. A couple of participants suggested that topics should have a certain level of maturity (IoT for instance could still be considered too new in the IGF context) and should be narrowly defined. It was also suggested that BPFs, as tools for distilling diverse views into outputs, seemed ideally suited for issues that have already been discussed by the IGF community in other ways, through the more informal DCs and workshops, for example. One MAG member mentioned there were early talks on forming a DC on Exponential Technologies, which, if established, could collaborate with the group interested in an IoT BPF to apply all these issues to possible workshops or a main session at the IGF this year. It was further recommended that the DC on IoT be reached out to for collaboration.

7. A draft set of modalities and guidelines on MAG Working Groups (**ANNEX III**) was shared with members. A good deal of initial support was expressed for the document, although one suggestion for amendment was to allow for non-MAG members to co-facilitate working groups. It was further mentioned that the role of the Secretariat in working groups would need to be carefully reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and should be noted in the WG charter. Updates were given on the groups that have been proposed so far, namely on 'Communications and Outreach' and 'New Session Formats' (continuing from last year), and on 'IGF Improvements' and 'Funding' (new topics). The proposed group on IGF Improvements received particular support. [The draft charter is open for comment](#). The Chair informed that a more detailed discussion on the possible group on Funding would be taken to the MAG list. The WG on Workshop Evaluation agreed to update their charter and resubmit for the 2017 MAG process. MAG members should review and give inputs on the WG modalities/guidelines document by April 5<sup>th</sup> in order to review and finalize these at the next virtual meeting.

8. It was agreed a future MAG call would be dedicated primarily or entirely to DCs. Avri Doria, the MAG member who has liaised with the DCs community, offered to brief the other members, particularly new members, on what DCs are, how they function and share the relevant guidelines in place.

9. The Chair mentioned consolidated documents outlining all the proposals for BPFs and Working Groups (and how and when to respond) and any other

relevant intersessional work would be shared as soon as possible. The next virtual meeting is scheduled to take place on **Tuesday, 11 April**.

## **Annex I**

### **2017 MAG Virtual Meeting II - 28 March 2017, 15:00 UTC - Draft Agenda** ***(approx. 60 minutes)***

1. Adoption of Agenda (5 minutes)
2. Follow-up from MAG Virtual Meeting I (50 minutes)
  - a. *Discussion on 2017 intersessional activities, including modalities (BPFs, DCs, possible work on CENB)*
  - b. *MAG Working Groups*
  - c. *Other issues - programming outreach, publicizing the call for WS proposals, bringing in new proposers*
2. AOB

## **Annex II**



### **IGF Best Practice Forum's (BPFs): About BPFs, Formation and Working Modalities and Guidelines**

*Draft as of 27 March 2017*

#### **Introduction: About BPFs**

The Report of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum<sup>1</sup> made, among others, the following recommendation:

*11. While maintaining the IGF as a non-binding, non-decision-making and non-duplicative forum, it is important to improve the quality and format of IGF outcomes to enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy. For this purpose, it is necessary that IGF outcomes clearly reflect the full diversity of opinions on key policy issues of the multi-stakeholder IGF community.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. A /67/65- E /2012/48, [http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65corr1\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65corr1_en.pdf)

*In addition, **more tangible and visible IGF outcomes** combined with enhanced communication tools and strategy would also improve outreach.*

This recommendation was reaffirmed by the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 2015 on the overall review of the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society<sup>2</sup>:

*63. We acknowledge the role of the Internet Governance Forum as a multi-stakeholder platform for discussion of Internet governance issues. We support the recommendations in the report of the Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, 10 which the General Assembly took note of in its resolution 68/198 of 20 December 2013, and we call for their accelerated implementation. We extend for another 10 years the existing mandate of the Internet Governance Forum as set out in paragraphs 72 to 78 of the Tunis Agenda. We recognize that during that period, the Forum should continue to show progress on working modalities and the participation of relevant stakeholders from developing countries. We call upon the Commission, within its regular reporting, to give due consideration to fulfilment of the recommendations in the report of its Working Group.*

In 2014, the IGF developed an intersessional programme consisting of best practice forums (BPFs) and other initiatives intended to complement other IGF community activities. This intersessional program was designed in accordance with the recommendations of the 2012 [report](#) of the CSTD Working Group on IGF Improvements that called for the development of more tangible outputs to ‘enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy’.

Since 2014 the United Nations including the IGF Secretariat and the MAG have received significant feedback and suggestions on how the BPF work could be improved moving forward, some of which is included herewith in **ANNEX I**.

### **Formation of BPFs**

- Periodically, the multistakeholder advisory group (MAG) of the IGF may decide to introduce a new topic/themes/issues for a BPF. Generally, the topics/themes/issues<sup>3</sup> are proposed/nominated by MAG members (together with stakeholders from the broader community) and then discussed/reviewed by the full MAG and broader community at a MAG face-to-face meeting and online.
- MAG members or others from the IGF community who wish to propose a topic for a new BPF should submit formal proposals to the MAG for review no less than 3 weeks<sup>4</sup> before a face-to-face or virtual MAG Meeting where the formation of new BPFs may be discussed. Ideally, BPFs intended for the coming year would be submitted 3 weeks ahead of the first physical MAG meeting each year.

---

<sup>2</sup> Doc. A /RES/70/125, <http://www.un.org/Docs/asp/ws.asp?m=A/RES/70/125>

<sup>3</sup> As of March 2017 IGF BPFs have been carried out on the following topics: Developing meaningful multistakeholder participation mechanisms; Regulation and mitigation of unwanted communications (e.g. "spam"); Establishing and supporting Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) for Internet security; Creating an enabling environment for the development of local content; Online child protection; IXPs; IPv6; Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence Against Women; Access and Gender; Cybersecurity

<sup>4</sup> Timeframe/deadline may be subject to adjustment from year to year.

- BPFs wishing to continue their work from the previous year should also submit annual work reports from the prior year and proposals for continuing work to the MAG for review in the same timeframe.
- Themes or issues can be of any nature - technical or non-technical - and are generally chosen if they are perceived to be topical and important to the future of the Internet and related public policy challenges. Topics may be covered/worked on for multiple year(s) if there is a consensus desire to continue the work by the community of participants of a respective BPF.
- The formation and continuation of BPFs is a MAG responsibility and should be undertaken in consultation with the IGF Secretariat as this work may not be resource-neutral.
- Once constituted, BPFs should give periodic updates to the MAG and Secretariat and if it is determined by the MAG that sufficient progress has not been made on the work, BPFs may be subject to dissolution.

### **MAG Responsibilities:**

- MAG members are expected to be co-facilitators of BPFs, actively participating in periodic meetings of the BPF and steering the work, etc. (*more in modalities and guidelines below*).
- Determine whether a liaison is appropriate between the MAG and the BPFs

### **Working Modalities and Guidelines**

- BPFs have the freedom to define their own methodologies; tailored to each theme's specific needs and requirements. While BPF outcomes have already been useful in informing policy debates, they are also viewed as iterative materials that are not only flexible but also 'living' in the sense that they can be updated at any time to accommodate the pace of technological change faced by Internet policymakers.
- The [IGF Code of Conduct](#) should be followed by all stakeholders involved in IGF BPFs.
- Each BPF should discuss and decide on their respective working modalities in an open and transparent way through mailing lists and during virtual meetings. Decisions on working modalities should have the support of the participants of the BPF and should also be made in an inclusive and transparent manner.
- MAG facilitators should act as stewards of the groups, assist in scheduling and chairing the working virtual meetings, guiding work being carried out on the mailing lists and carrying out outreach to encourage participation from all stakeholders in the work.
- The IGF Secretariat should primarily be acting as a neutral rapporteur, including responsibility for drafting meeting summaries/meeting minutes and any outputs and providing other logistical support as needed to the work of the groups.
- The format/length of BPF outputs will be dependent on the working methods of the respective groups.

- BPFs may be given space at IGF annual meetings to present their outputs and discuss the work, and possible ways forward for it, with the broader global community.
- In the lead-up to and at the annual IGF meeting and post-annual meeting - MAG facilitators/coordinators (and all MAG members) are encouraged to carry out outreach activities to help disseminate IGF outputs and messages to other relevant fora and future meetings.
- A [BPF Participant's guide](#) has been developed over the years to help orient newcomers to BPF work.

### **Submission Process/Template For Proposed New BPFs**

*(2-3 Pages)*

Proposed Theme/Issue for the BPF:

Objectives/Goals of the BPF:

Expected Output(s):

Outreach and Dissemination Plan/Strategy:

Timeframe for the work (1-year or multi-year forecast):

Names of Co-Facilitator(s) (2-3 MAG members + non-MAG members if appropriate):

## **ANNEX I**

### **Community feedback on IGF BPFs:**

#### **From the contributions received from the IGF community Taking Stock of IGF 2015 and Looking Forward to IGF 2016<sup>5</sup>:**

*26. Leaders of the Best Practice Forums and other stakeholders involved in the day-to-day BPF work recommended that each BPF have the ability to decide on its own methods and approach as this was deemed to be very valuable and contributed to the success of the BPFs. Should the BPF work continued, it was suggested that ideally, the choice of topics, coordinators and consultants should be made as early as possible. This longer period would make it easier to reach out to more stakeholders and parties that are usually not involved in IGF processes. It was also suggested that at the start of the BPF's term, an agreement be reached on the terminology used for key actors, timelines and procedures, use of BPF space on the*

---

<sup>5</sup> Synthesis Paper of the Open Consultations and MAG Meeting, 4-6 April 2016, Geneva, Switzerland, <https://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/igf-meeting/igf-2016/takingstock/708-igf-synthesis-paper-taking-stock-2015-2016>

*IGF website and that all BPFs be advised to adhere thereto for the sake of consistency.*

*27. It was suggested that coordinators and/or consultants involved in IGF BPFs invest more in outreach and engage with broader communities, including at conferences and meetings relevant to the BPF topic, in order to present on the BPF process and its desired outcomes, as well as to learn from community members, have one-on-one meetings with them, ask for help, involvement, input, etc. It was also suggested that the BPFs discuss and prepare a strategy to promote and disseminate the outputs of the BPFs post-publication. Various channels could be used for such promotion, including the IGF mailing lists, cooperation with N/RIs and using the IGF's social media accounts.*

**From the IGF community consultation regarding the working retreat on “Advancing the Ten-Year Mandate of the IGF”<sup>6</sup>:**

*170. It was suggested that some form of liaison could be set up between the BPFs working groups and the MAG. It is also suggested that BPFs work groups could submit their annual work reports for review by the MAG supported by the Secretariat.*

*171. Some suggested that BPFs could better reflect the multi-year thematic focus areas of the IGF (should there be one). This could be a more effective way in determining resource implications and end objectives. It was also recommended to continue the practice of having a neutral third party to support the logistics and writing components of the BPF work.*

*172. Guidelines for facilitators of BPFs could be developed to ensure consistency and inclusion of all members of the community.*

**From the 1st 2017 IGF Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting<sup>7</sup>:**

*19. There was then a good discussion about the current status of IGF Best Practice Forum(s). There was agreement amongst the community and the MAG that further work should be done to be sure that the outputs of the IGF BPFs are widely disseminated and that those who might find such outputs beneficial be made aware of both the outputs and ongoing work of the BPFs. For example, while it was agreed that the IGF BPFs on IXPs and IPv6 would not continue in 2017, there was a strong push to make sure that the useful work carried out by these BPFs over the past two years were better promoted.*

---

<sup>6</sup> See <https://www.intgovforum.org/review/igf-retreat-proceedings-ideas-and-suggestions/>

<sup>7</sup> Synthesis Paper of the 1st 2017 IGF Open Consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Meeting, 1-3 March 2017, Geneva, Switzerland, [https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot\\_download/4146/544](https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/4146/544)

## Annex III

### **Internet Governance Forum (IGF) Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Working Groups (WG): About WGs, Formation and Working Modalities and Guidelines**

#### **Background:**

Since the inception of the first IGF MAG in 2006, the MAG has occasionally decided to form issue-specific Working Groups (WGs) to advance work on specific issues related to the MAG's primary responsibilities as described in the [MAG terms of reference](#).

#### **Formation of MAG Working Groups:**

Generally, the MAG should strive to fulfil their mandate with the concurrent participation of all MAG members, taking advantage of face-to-face meetings, online meetings and email communications. If an individual MAG member, or a group of MAG members, feels there is a specific item of work that would be better addressed by a smaller group of MAG members in a working group format then the individual or group of MAG members should propose the formation of a working group to the full MAG and MAG Chair for consideration. A written proposal should be presented which states clear objectives and a timetable (if applicable) for the work. If a consensus of the MAG feels the working group should be formed, then the MAG Chair can approve such a Working Group.

#### **MAG Working Group Guidelines/Modalities**

- Working groups should be inclusive of all views and have balanced participation from all stakeholder groups.
- Working groups must seek and receive feedback from the full MAG when defining goals and objectives of the group and prior to making recommendations.
- Working groups should be fully transparent and mailing lists/face-to-face and virtual meetings should be open to all MAG members.
- Proceedings from any Working Group activity/meeting should be publically available on the IGF website.
- The [IGF Code of Conduct](#) should be followed at all times.
- Working groups have the freedom to define their own working methodologies and can include non-MAG members in the work if appropriate.
- Decisions on these working modalities should be made by consensus of the Working Group.
- There should be two MAG co-facilitators from different stakeholder groups appointed by the MAG Chair.
- MAG facilitators should act as stewards of the groups, assist in scheduling and chairing the working virtual meetings, guiding work being carried out on the mailing lists and carrying out outreach as appropriate to encourage participation.
- The IGF Secretariat should be a part of these Working Groups, with their role defined by each Working Group and the IGF Secretariat.



- MAG Working Groups are assumed to have a lifetime of one (1) IGF cycle, and must be approved anew each year.
- Once constituted, Working Groups should give periodic updates to the MAG and Secretariat and if it is determined by the MAG that sufficient progress has not been made, a Working Group may be subject to dissolution.

### **Submission Process/Template For Proposed New Working Groups**

*(2-3 Pages)*

Purpose of the WG:

Objectives/Goals of the WG:

Expected Output(s):

Implementation Plan (if appropriate)

Timeframe for the work:

## List of Participants

<b>Chair</b>	
Ms. St. Amour, Lynn	Internet Matters
<b>IGF 2017 Host Country Representatives</b>	
Mr. Rollier, Nicolas	Office of Federal Communications, Government of Switzerland
<b>MAG Members</b>	
Ms. Abdulla, Rasha	Associate Professor at the American University in Cairo
Ms. Aquino Ribeiro, Renata	Researcher and teacher, E. I. Consulting,
Ms. Bou Harb, Zeina	OGERO Telecom, Ministry of Telecommunications of Lebanon
Mr. Donkor, Wisdom	Information Technology Manager, Technical Lead for Ghana Open Data Initiative, National Information Technology Agency
Ms. Doria, Avri	Independent Researcher, DBA Technicalities
Ms. Erramuspe, Alejandra	Communications Manager and Head of Internet Governance, Agencia de Gobierno Electrónico y Sociedad de la Información y el Conocimiento (AGESIC)
Mr. Estrada, Miguel Ignacio	CEO, 1977 SRL
Mr. Fernández González, Juan Alfonso	Advisor, Ministry of Communications, Cuba
Ms. Franz, Liesyl	Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues at the Department of State, United States
Ms. Gatto, Raquel	Regional Policy Advisor, ISOC
Mr. Ilishebo, Michael	Officer, Zambia Police Service
Ms. Kaspar, Lea	Programme Lead, Global Partners Digital
Mr. Ji, Haojun	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations Office at Geneva
Ms. Lazanski, Dominique	Public Policy Director, GSM Association
Mr. Lo, Mamadou	Head of Communication and Information Department, Credit Agricole Bank (Senegal)
Ms. Malczewska, Joanna	Chief Policy Expert, Information Society, Department Ministry of Digital Affairs of Poland
Mr. Marković, Slobodan	Advisor for ICT Policy and Internet Community Relations, Serbian National Internet Domain Registry
Ms. Miller, Cheryl	Director of International Public Policy

	and Regulatory Affairs, Verizon
Mr. Moisander, Juuso	Commercial Secretary, Information Society and ICT, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Ms. Nguyen, Carolyn	Director, Technology Policy, Microsoft Corporation
Mr. Olugbile, Segun	CEO, Continental Project Affairs Associates
Mr. Onyango, Douglas	Chief Technology Officer at Delta IT Solutions
Ms. Paque, Virginia	Director Internet Governance Programmes, DiploFoundation
Mr. Pérez Galindo, Rafael	Head of Unit, Directorate for Information Society Services, Ministry of Industry, Energy and Tourism, Spain
Mr. Rhijn van, Arnold	Senior Policy Advisor/Project Manager, Telecommunications Market Directorate, Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Netherlands
Ms. Tamanikaiwaimaro, Salanieta	President, South Pacific Computer Society
Ms. Thomas-Raynaud, Elizabeth	Senior Policy Executive, Digital Economy and Project Director at International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)
Mr. Wagner, Flávio	Board Member, Brazilian Internet Steering Committee (CGI.br)
Mr. Wanawit, Akhuputra	Deputy Executive Director, Electronic Transactions Development Agency, Ministry of Information and Communication Technology, Thailand
Ms. Watkins, Laura	Policy Executive at Nominet
<b>Former IGF Host Country Representatives</b>	
Ms. Arida, Christine	Director of Telecom Services and Planning Division, National Telecom Regulatory Authority, Egypt
Ms. Martinez, Yolanda	Head of Digital Government Unit, Ministry of Public Administration, Mexico
Mr. Moedjiono, Sardjoeni	National ICT Council Executive Team Member, Indonesia
Mr. Rosas, Israel	Internet Policy Analyst at the National Digital Strategy Coordination, Government of Mexico
<b>Other Participants</b>	
Ms. Chalmers, Susan	Internet Policy Specialist, NTIA, U.S. Department of Commerce
Mr. Degezelle, Wim	Consultant
Mr. Faye, Makane	African IGF Secretariat

Mr. Kummer, Markus	IGFSA Executive Chairman, ICANN Board Member
Ms. Nava, Gabriela	Government of Mexico
Mr. Nelson, Mike	Public Policy, CloudFlare, and Adjunct Professor, Internet Studies, Georgetown University
Mr. Sastre, Andrés	Director Regional, ASIET
Mr. Sastre, Lorenzo	Regulatory Adviser, ASIET
Ms. Suto, Timea	ICC-BASIS
<b>IGF Secretariat</b>	
Chengetai Masango	Programme and Technology Manager
Luis Bobo	Associate Information Systems Officer
Eleonora Mazzucchi	Programme Management Assistant
Anja Gengo	Consultant
Brian Gutterman	Associate Programme Officer