Strengthening cooperation within the context of the IGF: A roadmap for 2018

A report by Wout de Natris

De Natris Consult

Haarlem, 10-02-2018

Introduction

In 2017 the MAG was presented a proposal for a Best Practice Forum on Enhanced cooperation within the context of the IGF, following one of the recommendations of a fact finding workshop at the Mexico IGF in. The MAG asked for more information in order to discuss the topic more in-depth in 2018. This report provides the MAG with more information on options the IGF has and the decisions to be made to facilitate change.

It focuses around two main questions: 1) Do you see the IGF capable of discussing complex, multistakeholder Internet governance challenges and issues, aiming to formulate consensus based advice, best practices, agreements or intentions to work on a proposed solution within or outside of the IGF? and; 2) If so, what conditions and prerequisites need to be created for the IGF to have a chance at success?

The research was carried out through a questionnaire. This culminated in a session on Day 0 where internationally operating (multistakeholder) organisations actively participated in a thought sharing session on strengthened cooperation within the context of the IGF. The IGF was actively and successfully used to pick peoples' brains in a way that allowed them to work together, discuss and develop ideas on how to adapt the IGF to accommodate working on complex challenges. One on one discussions with IGF participants delivered the last pieces of information.

All this leads to recommendations that are put before the MAG to discuss and decide on. No one wants the IGF, exclusively, to continue as it does now. No one wants to lose what it currently is either. All stakeholders see the potential of the IGF, because all stakeholders are there or could be. To what extend and in how far individuals are of an opinion whether the IGF is capable of change is an entirely different matter. Not all see the IGF as capable and even willing, to fulfil what is presented here to the MAG. "Perhaps this is what it is", their message is. This report has another focus though and shows how participants view change.

Almost all agreed that if the IGF is to strive for meaningful and supported tangible outcomes the MAG needs to prioritise and focus. From there selection criteria, alternative ways to become aware of priorities within stakeholder communities and alternative session formats come into focus. The MAG is invited to lead and provide the much called for prioritisation. This report seems to have become an option to choose between freedom and structure, where many call for structure; if the IGF is to go this way. The current freedom will never lead to tangible outcomes of any consequence.

Comments and suggestions are presented anonymously. It is not important who shared what, but that all participants felt at liberty to do so.

The research, session and report were made possible through the generous support of AMS-IX, DINL, ecp/NLIGF, GFCE, RIPE NCC, SIDN and SURFnet. The government of the Netherlands was actively supportive in order for this work to take place. The fact that representatives of global organisations chose to participate in writing and/or the Geneva session attests to the interest in the topic.

Management summary: A roadmap for 2018 and beyond
The question that started this study: Is the IGF capable of providing answers or solutions to complex Internet challenges and issues?, is one that at this point in time cannot be answered. It has not been tried. It is presaged by two other questions: Does the IGF want to go this way?; and if so, what are sensible ways forward? The participants were near unanimous in their answer. If the IGF is to strive for producing tangible outcomes that are of meaning of and have consequences for stakeholders, it can only have a chance at success when the MAG leads by making (the right) choices.

Recommendations were formulated that the MAG should consider before coming to a decision on this topic. They are presented below. In short, for many stakeholders to seriously commit to intersessional work as proposed here, there is a strong need for: prioritization; focus on a specific, concise topic; time restraint; no duplication and pre-defined desired outcomes. In other words, nearly the opposite of how the IGF's current intersessional work is organised. An important question to answer is one that came up regularly: Where can the IGF be of added value?

The lack of focus within the IGF is said to be the main cause of non-participation of important stakeholders in intersessional work. A second point of concern is the, at a minimum perceived, tendency of the IGF to lean too much towards civil society. Stakeholders have turned away from the IGF, as it became of less interest for them to attend.

The recommendations come down to the need for more and better cooperation between stakeholder communities. Several ideas were voiced on how to create interest from all stakeholders. Cooperation and coordination become more important, if not the core of the MAG's and Secretariat's work. To achieve this, there is a need for more and better information, creating an overview of the playing field. How can the MAG obtain this information?

1. Priorities are set within respective stakeholder communities
All stakeholder groups can prioritise topics per IGF cycle.

2. Multistakeholder Internet (governance) communities
Each stakeholder community works on complex Internet issues that (may) impact other stakeholders. The IGF connects these issues for multistakeholder debate, advise, input, support, implementation, etc. Another option is to, also, invite the active exchange of information aimed at cooperation and the sharing of knowledge.

3. The regular IGF process of workshop proposals

4. Urgent matters
Topics that come up often, including the workshop process, could be brought together, connected. Volunteers/workshop proposers are invited to work together on finding solutions, best practices, ways forward, policy suggestions, presentations, etc.

5. Best Practice Fora
Become more focused through an early selection of concise topics allowing for a tangible outcome.

6. NRIs
Use the NRIs to their full potential.

7. Connecting the dots
This input places the MAG in a unique, global position: a total overview of the Internet governance playing field. Participants advised the MAG to actively search for topics that are of importance to several stakeholder communities and identify where communing these stakeholders would benefit the progress of the topic. It is here where they perceive the most added value.

To achieve this, the role of the MAG, in part, changes. The members become a conduit for information both ways, for timely support, for calls for input, etc., to and from their constituencies.

It is recommended to set up liaison functions between the MAG and other multistakeholder organisations, so important work reaches the MAG sooner and allows for input, support, etc. to create innovative sessions and working (group) formats to allow community driven, intersessional work, in any desired format.

To achieve this, a few years will have passed. It is however recommended to pilot some suggested formats in 2018, working, if successful, towards a permanent change. In the meantime it is recommended that a MAG working group looks into a more permanent change while learning from the pilots at the same time. To look into alternative selection processes, selection criteria, routes of communication, etc..

Although this study also shows not everyone is convinced the IGF can ever play this role, it does show two things. First, all participants were positively inclined to discuss it. Second, they stress that the IGF is the only global forum where all stakeholders (could) meet.

The MAG has asked for more input on the topic of (a BPF on) strengthened cooperation. This report provides it and more. If one thing was made clear, all agree the IGF has a unique position in the Internet world. Nearly all stakeholders are present. This fact makes this platform, where all topics can be discussed and worked on with meaningful input from and outcome for all concerned, within grasp. It is up to the MAG to decide on what the IGF actually can be from 2018 onwards. It is however important to note that the present form has already seen the top of its success. Does the MAG see a new peak to climb?

A need for change is felt by many

The IGF has brought an opportunity for people to meet and discuss Internet governance topics on an equal footing. In that it is unique. All agree on this. The true power of the IGF, as with most conferences, is most likely all that goes on in the hallways. By far most participants see the potential of the IGF and wish it to grow towards using that potential. We found that for most involved it is far easier to formulate what the IGF should or cannot do, then what it should. This makes the input provided here extra valuable, as people looked at the topic from a positive angle and were triggered by others present to formulate their own thoughts on change.

Several participants pointed to actual successes, (in)tangible outcomes of the IGF. E.g. the improved interaction between CSIRTs and other stakeholders because of the BPF on CSIRTs in 2014 and 2015; The ease stakeholders were able to contact each other in the IANA transition, was, most likely, due to previous interaction at the IGF; The ease with which the 'Connecting the next billion' intersessional program was put together, leading to influential outcomes; Most participants pointed to the creation of the NRIs as the most prized outcome of the IGF.

Undoubtedly there are more successes to point to. Yet, somehow they never seem to be mentioned. This is a point where the IGF could market and promote itself better, just like it can promote its unique position better, as the, only, global conference where all the different stakeholder communities meet and discuss.

The IGF has a mandate for 8 more years. At the end of those eight years there must be something to point to, some sort of result, is what is said by many. The how is very far and wide apart. "The IGF needs more focus and less tracks. Otherwise smaller countries can never host one", reads one comment. Others focus on intended outcomes and/or on inclusiveness. The panel format was criticised regularly. "Civil society has become too dominant", is an often and broadly heard comment as well. This leads to disinterest in and disconnection from the IGF from others. If not this, what then?

Focus and prioritisation

It is often said industry and government are less involved in the IGF, because it's hard for them to speak their minds openly due to secrecy around to be developed policy and perhaps for financial reasons; often coming from other stakeholders. By asking the question directly, this showed:

1) It is hard for these stakeholders to spread out over all the different topics. Often it is one person who is responsible for the IGF, while added to this restraint, the IGF is only one among other tasks;
2) Without a focus on some sort of concrete outcome they tend to move away, due to a lack of time, interest and priority;
3) There is a strongly felt need for relevance;
4) Time is of essence.

This provides a totally different view on these stakeholder communities and opens options to cater to the needs of these communities that can ensure their inclusion and commitment. If focus and prioritization is of the essence and many have indicated it is, it is of importance to allow for conditions early on in the IGF cycle that create them. Conditions that allow the MAG to receive this important information early on in the IGF cycle and allow it to make decisions. Several ways were suggested how to get there.

A. Stakeholder communities

The different stakeholder communities can prioritize within themselves and bring in one or two central themes. These topics are recognized as relevant immediately, without competition to other communities, commitment is given and time reserved for work on it.

B. NRIs
One way of prioritising that kept coming up was through the NRIs. The MAG is advised to use the NRIs more to become on the one hand less western centric in its prioritising and on the other learn about urgent issues from a more local level. Only this way the IGF is able to cater to the differences in cultures, socio-political and economic boundaries.

C. The IGF cycle
It was pointed out that at the end of an IGF cycle so many topics have been touched upon, only to be left behind at the end of the cycle, as if nothing happened. A plea was made to make an inventory of the outcomes of the previous IGF cycle with the aim to identify where further attention or in-depth work is called for. As several new to the IGF noted: "there seems to no focus in general, let alone on outcomes".

D. International multistakeholder Internet organisations
Other Internet governance bodies work on parts of this governance in their respective silos. What are their priorities for the next year, does this work affect other stakeholders and what input could they (all) benefit from?

E. The current system of open mike sessions
This is an excellent form of sensing what the general mood for topics is. This could be added to with a formal reporting function on outcomes/recommendations of sessions.

This inventory allows for choices. Within stakeholder communities and for the MAG. From it certain "workstreams" can be identified by the MAG.

Once stakeholder communities have decided on their respective topics or themes they become one stream in the IGF cycle from which calls for input are started.

Current work at other global multistakeholder Internet organisations that affects other stakeholders, could benefit from a multistakeholder discussion. Either for input, support, implementation or understanding. The relevance of and support for this work and as a consequence for the IGF itself will grow when results return to the respective communities. Not one participant disagreed on the fact the IGF is the best place to do so -if it makes the right choices- because: "We are all already there". The topics coming from these communities form a second stream.

The continuation of topics from the previous cycle that need more in-depth attention or work become the third stream. The fourth stream is the call for workshops and Open Forum proposals; of which much less will probably be needed. The fifth stream is intersessional work like it is currently undertaken.

All this input creates an overview that brings the MAG itself to a next level: it is able to oversee the total playing field. An overview individuals within their respective silos most likely cannot acquire. From this overview the MAG is able to connect the dots. The MAG is invited to look for topics that "go over the top". Topics that are worked on in very different communities in an isolated fashion that could profit from the wider view of outsiders working elsewhere on the same topic. In the same vein the MAG could "fill the gaps" between organisations. This approach asks the MAG to consider answering this question: Where can the IGF be of added value? This view looks at the IGF as a place where different stakeholders discuss topics and take away the outcome to implement them within their respective communities. This becomes a sixth stream of work within the IGF.

An important prerequisite is to make these organisations see and understand the added value the IGF offers them. Here is where promoting the scale and options the IGF offers and liaising may make a difference in the future. Below we offer more insight into how several participants envision this role of the IGF and the importance of cooperation in general.

Fact remains, the more input the IGF calls for, the more ideas will come forward. It may in the end be necessary for the MAG, from its acquired position of overview of the playing field, to be the arbiter if decisions on priorities are not sufficiently made by the respective communities. "Having heard all, in 20xx we opt for ….", is an option worth considering.

Pre-conditions for cooperation or not?
Last year the MAG was presented a proposal for a Best Practice Forum on Enhanced Cooperation to look into the conditions needed for the IGF to facilitate such cooperation. There is an answer to that question: No one sees the need for formalisation of cooperation up front. Why and what does the IGF need?

All participants agree that in order to work together trust comes first and trust comes from people meeting each other, learning to understand where they come from. People meet at the IGF so trust is taken care of. Participants pointed out "people find each other around content". So if there is a problem, identify it, make it proportional by asking the right questions. One participant formulated it as follows:
1) What's the problem we're trying to solve?;
2) Can we annunciate specific goals that would solve it?;
3) If we reached them, that would imply success.
Yet this is not enough:
4) Is anybody else trying to solve these same problems?;
5) Are they doing it better than we could do it?;
6) Should we just affiliate with them as individuals or organizations rather than try to start something new?;
7) If there is nobody doing it, would there be significant value, however determined, socially, economically, technically, etc., in achieving these goals?;
8) Can we do it (with the resources that we have)?;
9) Will those resources commit? ;
10) If all those conditions are met, well, then maybe it's possible that we can do it.

So there is a pre-condition for intersessional work, the need for a clearly defined choice, purpose and time frame. As someone formulated it: "Intersessional work has to be practical, procedural and technical in order to have a chance at success and have the right personnel on board".

Of course rules must be applied, new rules the MAG needs to look into before proposed work, sessions, panels, etc. are to take place. This was not a part of this research, but can be a part of the proposed working group on change. Condition like e.g. well-described multistakeholder participation, a presentation at the IGF on outcomes, a clear project description, etc. The following piece of advice is noteworthy, if the IGF is to work on tangible outputs: "The formulation of end goals allows for measuring the level of success reached".

It seems the outcome of the BPF on strengthened cooperation is provided by this report.

Session formats
If tangible outcomes can be achieved through focus and prioritization, what sort of approach facilitates (ongoing) discussions concerning complex Internet challenges? Several ideas were shared. First let's look at how the present is viewed. There were many comments on the current session

formats. The focus of the IGF lies in organising main sessions by the MAG and workshops that are selected through a sort of beauty contest. They who write the best sounding proposal and fill in the conditions correctly stand the best chance of being selected. This process and outcome is found to be wanting. For a few and different reasons.

The current process is, at a minimum, perceived by several participants to create a misbalance between stakeholder communities and their respective priorities. There are people who feel that, what in their eyes should be, the most important criteria for selection are not prioritised enough: relevance, current, stakeholder diversity, solution driven and innovative approaches to sessions, instead of politically correct criteria that could easily be amended with a nudge in the right direction. Representatives from the technical community commented that currently little of interest remains.

This is one angle. The other and more important question is, if the IGF is to work more towards tangible outcomes, what kind of sessions have a chance to produce such outcomes? There is general agreement that this is not a panel where people state their views and leave again for the next, often likeminded panel, without a debate. Let alone an outcome. A point that was in fact underscored during the German Open Forum on Strengthened Cooperation at the Geneva IGF. Nor by a panel where stakeholder diversity is (totally) absent. So what can be alternatives? Some suggestions.

A. Free form multistakeholder cooperation
As soon as a decision has been reached within the respective stakeholder communities on what their topics of choice are, they get to choose what form or forms they need, to reach their desired conclusion. Whether through intersessional work, a working group, a working session at the IGF, a panel, etc. or all of them. They decide.

B. An alternative panel discussion
If a panel is the desired format and the topic qualifies for a tangible outcome, there are options for the MAG to ensure an outcome beyond experts presenting:
- Secure stakeholder diversity so that opposite views come forward, but ideally common ground is found as a basis to work on further after the IGF;
- Ask for a desired outcome up front and;
- How do the organisers intend to work toward such an outcome?;
- Presentation at and publishing of recommendations on the outcomes after the IGF;
- MAG mentoring before and monitoring during and after the IGF to ensure the above.

An outcome of a panel becomes key and is influenced by asking a set of questions upfront. E.g., what stakeholders do you need in your session?; what solution are you seeking?; what questions need answers and who do you need for that?; how does this work ideally continue?, what approach do you envision for the session?, etc. This allows the selection process to look beyond the quality of written introductions and the who is or is not on a panel. Relevance, urgency, potential best practices or recommendations for ways forward become measurable as well. The session format can be advised upon by the MAG, not leaving it solely to the organiser who may not have the overview.

C. Combining panel proposals
An urgent topic (also) comes from the number of proposals. The MAG recognises this urgency. It could provide circumstances allowing organisers to work with other stakeholders and reach some sort of conclusion that could be presented on at the IGF as an outcome. Give them a (virtual) room, experts on process development, moderator and an expert rapporteur to do the work. Topics like bitcoin, artificial intelligence, women's Internet rights and cyber security all could have profited from the expert minds present in Geneva under different, actively created circumstances.

D. BPFs
Best Practice Fora remain a strong format in which best practices, advise or agreements are formulated between different stakeholders. However, conditions need to be created that allow active participation from all stakeholders.

E. Fact-finding sessions
To learn quickly from different actors, fact finding sessions or working sessions have proven successful. They address one specific topic. Participants are well-prepared on the content and desired outcome. Assisted by a moderator, they use the allotted time to work towards a tangible outcome. E.g. best practices, recommendations, ways forward, actions to be undertaken within communities, etc.

F. Input requesting and informative sessions
Another idea is to actively invite other multistakeholder platforms to initiate sessions around their current topics aimed at outreach and interactions. E.g. IETF, M3AAWG, WTO, WIPO, CoE, ICANN, GFCE, etc. Topics that touch directly upon the interests of other stakeholders. These sessions generate understanding of the work and give input to that work, so the initiating platform can take in considerations of impact on other stakeholders and work from there and vice versa.

G. Flexibility
There is a need for flexibility within the IGF programme. During intersessional work ideas or complex challenges come forward that need and deserve a broader input than can be discerned from virtual participation. Topics that need in-depth multistakeholder input. Currently the IGF does not allow for spontaneous sessions that develop over the months. If intersessional work is recognised as the way to deliver tangible outcomes and are valued as such, it is of importance to allow for them to grow to their potential. This could involve extra-curricular sessions driving input and (future) commitment to the work and output.

H. Specials
Working groups could be created around a single challenge needing multistakeholder "over the top" participation. This could be any topic the MAG decides upon.

Considering other ways to select topics and alter some of the criteria for selection allows for alternate routes towards choices in sessions, topics and session formats. To better understand what the IGF could be capable of, try and answer the following questions for yourself. What is the benefit in organising five or more panels on the same topic without an outcome? What could be achieved if all involved are invited to work together, within a multistakeholder session, at the start of the IGF, to come up with a set of recommendations, best practices, a desired way forward within or beyond the IGF? Would work in one silo be more impactful if IGF cooperation and cross-pollination were allowed for, the outcomes presented at the closing day and published by the IGF and within different stakeholder communities?

All these proposals take an intensive preparation, expert moderation and reporting during the IGF. If this could be allowed for, many stakeholders may actually commit to the process and the outcomes. There are digital platforms that can assist in the online preparations of virtual meetings and the finalisation at the IGF itself and expert bureaus in organising and moderating such sessions. When of importance the work will go beyond the IGF-representatives and allow for experts to join the work.

As one participant wrote: "By working together to achieve a shared vision, more informed and inclusive methods, policies, and responses can be developed". Future sessions could be organised in such a way that this process is facilitated.

Of course, it's impossible to change all this in one IGF cycle. Hence we propose to start a working group on preparing the change towards new ways of working in this IGF cycle. This working group can advise on the way forward for 2019.

In 2018 a few pilots in strengthened cooperation can be organised. After the topics are selected, including focus, time frame and necessary stakeholders, within this pilot participants start working together towards a pre-formulated, desired outcome.

Potential topics for 2018
Participants were asked to share their thoughts on the most important topics for 2018. If anything more abstract is to be said about the topics, it is that people tend to look at the IGF for the most grave topics. E.g. concerns around Internet Protocols; cyber security fixes; artificial intelligence; robotics; (Duties of Care concerning the) Internet of things; etc..

Some pointed to the many existing standards and best practices concerning cyber security and cyber hygiene. The IGF could become a broker in best practices for the world at large. How can other organisations and countries learn from each other? E.g. How the hosting industry in The Netherlands has minimised the impact of d-dos attacks without any government involvement or how Finland has minimised the effect of botnet infections through disinfection legislation on ISPs? Can a focus on creating awareness around existing, non-implemented, standards, protocols and best practices fasten implementation and heighten security?

Cooperation between platforms
For the IGF to become more relevant, cooperation will be the decisive way forward. Hence this extra attention to this topic. There are many platforms in the world where Internet governance is discussed in one form or another, others where best practices are formed, standards and protocols of the Internet are developed, etc. Although most of these organisations participate in the IGF, it is currently not common practice to look into how (the work of) these organisations can be strengthened by the IGF or how they can use it as a vehicle to deliver or receive input.

Repeatedly it was remarked that "people in my organisation are not aware of the IGF", followed by "We are doing our thing and work on it together". "The unknown" argument was challenged by participants in three ways. First, some participants showed that interaction with and through the IGF gives context to undertaken work within respective organisations, makes this work wider known and can create more support for and understanding of this work. The BPF on CSIRTs provided such an example. Secondly, interaction creates the opportunity to actively reach out, share knowledge and receive input to the tasks at hand from other, but relevant, stakeholders. Thirdly, it appears normal to have formal liaison functions between more technical Internet organisations, but not with the IGF. So how could this be altered for the better?

The Council of Europe gave an example of how it uses the IGF in its work on the proliferation of the Budapest Convention and its work in cyber security measures. It doesn't want the IGF to replace its work, but works with and through it. The Internet & Jurisdiction Policy Network works this way to. This interaction leads to better informed participants, but also better informed decisions and outcomes. And it works both ways.

This ties in to the repeatedly made comment for the IGF to connect to existing processes and only to invent a new wheel when one is missing. By doing so the IGF could facilitate interaction between, exchange input to existing processes and thus create synergies should they currently be missing.

The Global Forum on Cyber Expertise (GFCE) is an example of successful multistakeholder cooperation in the field of cyber. Launched in 2015 during the Global Conference on Cyber Space, the GFCE is a global platform for countries, international organizations and private companies to exchange best practices and expertise on cyber capacity building. The IGF has a platform to share its expertise and best practices and to work on implementation, e.g. presenting the IGF BPF during the GFCE Annual Meeting. In return, the GFCE could bring in expertise and best practices from the GFCE community during the annual IGF. The GFCE offered explicitly to cooperate with the IGF (BPFs) by working together on the implementation of developed best practices. A cooperation between the GFCE and IGF would provide opportunities to continue the development and implementation of the IGF BPFs throughout the year using the GFCE's multistakeholder outreach. A step further could be the development of an IGF/GFCE initiative to implement best practices on different topics, within the GFCE structure a similar approach was followed on the topic of CIIP with the GFCE-Meridian community. In conclusion, the IGF has much to offer, and the GFCE is looking forward to find more concrete ways to realize a close cooperation on best practices and possible implementation in the near future.

Another example is the work of the Internet Engineering Task Force. Asked what it's priority for 2018 was, the answer was "increasing the security of the Internet Protocols, and those will have implications for a lot of these topics that have been discussed". Judging the reactions in the room the representative answered "there may be a need to "market" those and discuss the implications more broadly". It seems a pilot for 2018 presented itself.

The MAG is advised to invite liaisons from relevant organisations. By establishing information exchange and cooperation, outcomes can be sped up tremendously, e.g. because organisations find common causes and communalities between them and align their priorities and outcomes. This would allow for the IGF to connect the dots and produce (in)tangible outcomes of significance. The relevance of and support for the IGF will grow accordingly when results return to the respective communities.

Prioritisation between stakeholdergroups
Several participants said that what is most important to them, was insufficiently or not at all present at the IGF. Others, especially from governments, were quite satisfied with the topics addressed.

This report recommends stakeholder communities to state their own priorities and the MAG to accept them as equal. Then there is no disparity between them and no need to prioritize between stakeholders.

MAG Commitment
Some pointed out that support from the MAG for chosen priorities can be bettered. Once the MAG has committed itself to specific intersessional work, it is of great importance that it(s members) assist(s) the volunteers, usually non-MAG members, in outreach, participation and receiving the relevant input to and proliferation of outcomes. Many pointed to the need for participation and input in order to be able to make a difference. It is here that sceptics voiced doubts whether the IGF could ever have impact or can change towards influential tangible outcomes. From a perceived strong urge not to change, to a lack of MAG commitment to the agreed upon work, were all mentioned as reasons. There was agreement between participants that once a choice has been made, all need to stand by and support it, actively.

The role of the MAG in intersessional work
Comments were made whether the MAG would have the will to drive the proposed changes as well whether it would ever be able to reach the necessary consensus in order to be able to achieve these changes. Hence the suggestion was presented not to put these task in the hands of the MAG and

create a different group of persons whose only role is to guide and assist the processes of intersessional work. E.g. the Secretariat or a new committee. The MAG keeps its role and responsibilities where the IGF conference is concerned.

This however lies outside of the scope of the report. This body of work focused on tools and processes that allow the MAG to decide on and to facilitate the intersessional and working group process. It does not mean the aforementioned option could not be considered and discussed.

Global south and governance
An important side outcome is the following. The word governance in Internet Governance Forum is seen by several governments in the Global South as a topic belonging exclusively to them. In these countries the word governance prevents multistakeholderism from happening. Some people suggested to change the name to underscore the new approaches. E.g. Global Internet Forum or World Internet Forum. Perhaps a contest could be called for?

Recommendations
If the MAG decides that it is of interest and importance for the IGF to work more towards tangible outcomes, there are many prerequisites that need consideration. There is one main recommendation provided. Three follow from it.

Recommendation 1: To have a chance at full participation, thus influence and success where intersessional work and tangible outcomes are concerned, prioritisation and focus, including a time frame have to be provided at the start.

Recommendation 2: If focus on tangible outputs through multistakeholder cooperation becomes a standard, it is critical to determine and facilitate the session and work formats that offer the circumstances that can lead to success

Recommendation 3: For the IGF to become more influential it is necessary for the MAG to connect the dots and search for "over the top" topics in close cooperation with other, more specialised stakeholder communities, e.g. through a liaison system

Recommendation 4: Once decided, the MAG needs to actively stand by and fully commit to the work following its choices by assisting the volunteers at work in all necessary ways