**Internet Governance Forum Multistakeholder Advisory Group
Working Group on IGF Strategy and Strengthening, 2020
Response to the paper on "Options for the Future of Digital
Cooperation"
Version of 29 September 2020**

Table of Contents

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The co-chairs[1] of the Internet Governance Forum Multistakeholder Advisory Group (IGF MAG) Working Group on Internet Governance Forum Strengthening and Strategy (WG-Strategy) expresses their gratitude to the members of the Working Group who contributed time and information to the development of this document.

---

[1] Concettina Casa, MAG member and Head of Internet Governance at the Agency for Digital Italy and Anriette Esterhuysen, IGF MAG chair and Senior Adviser, Internet Governance, Association for Progressive Communications.

2. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a response from the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) Multistakeholder Advisory Group (IGF MAG) Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy to the "Options for the Future of Digital Cooperation" document issued on September 3 2020, by the co-champions of Recommendations 5A/B of the United Nations Secretary General's High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation (HLPDC). The structure of this document consists of 10 sections (sections 3 to 12) highlighting the main ideas and concrete actions suggested by the Working Group for the future of global digital cooperation. For more information, access the charter of the Working Group, and the results of its deliberations, on the IGF website.

3. A NEW DIGITAL COOPERATION ARCHITECTURE: EVOLUTION OF THE IGF

The Working Group welcomes and supports the central and fundamental role the Options Paper assigns to the IGF model as well as efforts to strengthen it. Taking the IGF as the institutional framework for improving global digital cooperation provides important continuity for past work and for strengthening a known, open and accessible platform for sharing information on all aspects of digital cooperation.

The IGF MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy considers several elements included in the Options Paper as fundamental to the way forward and the evolution of the IGF + model:

- Raising the profile of the IGF;
- Strengthening its inclusiveness across all geographies and stakeholder groups;
- Devising and implementing a professional and targeted communications and outreach strategy;
- No duplication of existing structures or creation of new structures, but rather building on existing structures of the IGF such as the Dynamic Coalitions (DCs) and Best Practice Forums (BPFs);
- Establishing a professional and dedicated fundraising structure.

The Working Group has taken note of the intent expressed in the Options Paper on including elements from the other two digital cooperation mechanisms discussed in the HLPDC report. In this respect, it recommends a sequenced and gradual way forward, to first build on the strengths of the IGF to achieve the discussed IGF+ model, then

consider what – if any – further elements should be added to this structure.

It also suggests that recommendations to improve the IGF proposed by previous MAG Working Groups (IGF Improvements and Multi-year Strategy) be implemented as they constitute an informed foundation for the evolution of the IGF.

4. INCLUSIVITY

The Working Group considers inclusivity one of the biggest challenges and most important goals of improved digital cooperation. Inclusivity could be improved by strengthening remote participation, broadening participation of stakeholders from different sectors and through improved capacity building.

Leveraging digital technologies to improve and increase inclusivity
The Working Group recommends that the IGF+ leverages digital technologies to strengthen and encourage remote participation so that it gives equal weight to those able to participate in person. IGF+ should enable digital participation and be designed from a digital-native perspective as this would increase remote participation of individuals, organizations, countries, etc. The current project to transform the IGF's website should aim to increase inclusive participation in the entire IGF process, not just in the annual event.

It was noted that improving inclusion is about more than participation and cannot be achieved without understanding exclusion. Therefore, research on participation in the IGF is a key element to improve it[2]. Further, the IGF needs to ensure that its decision-making processes and agenda-setting are built on inclusive processes.

Capacity-building
In order to ensure that both remote and in-person participation have equal weight, capacity building is of crucial importance, not only in the technical abilities to use digital tools, but also in soft skills needed to participate in online meetings and multi-stakeholder consultations. Capacity-building to support inclusive engagement with the IGF should become a central pillar for the IGF+. See also the Working Group's comments on collaboration and coordination with regard to capacity building in section 10 below.

---

2 A study of participation in the IGF is being conducted by Research ICT Africa will be published in October 2020. It will provide a detailed analysis of participation in the IGF since its inception.

The Working Group suggests further discussion on capacity-building is needed. The initial outputs of a task commissioned by the IGF Secretariat to develop a "IGF-based capacity building framework" in 2019 could be taken as starting point for further discussion. The needs assessment of capacity building needs among IGF stakeholders which formed the basis of this draft framework might also be valuable.

Voluntary financial contributions from participants to support inclusion
WG members suggested exploring solutions that would enable more participation from under-represented groups. Different views and perspectives were shared. Some WG members were in favour of introducing an option for participants in the IGF to contribute a fee of some kind. Others thought that it would be better to find other ways of reducing the cost of the event. The WG recommends that further discussions are needed to develop more evidence-based solutions (e.g. looking at other UN/Global conferences that are successful in finding solutions to balance participation and cost) and suggest a broad dialogue with the community directly impacted by this decision. It was also suggested to invite a voluntary contribution, linked to registration, or in other outreach to proposed participants, to the existing IGF Support Association.

5. STRENGTHENING COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

The Working Group considers improved cooperation and coordination between existing fora and overcoming the silos between technical knowledge, civil society and policymakers to be of fundamental importance. It welcomed the Cooperation Accelerator as a set of functions to be distributed over (or shared among) different elements of the IGF (MAG, Best Practice Fora (BPFs), Dynamic Coalitions (DCs), and National and Regional IGF initiatives (NRIs) to enhance cooperation and coordination between the various stakeholders and organizations and to make communication channels as direct and as short as possible.

It suggests that rather than trying to design a robust mechanism in an abstract manner, it would be better to start small, taking one or two specific ideas to start with, and scale up.

Associating the IGF Secretariat with the Office of the UNSG
The Working Group supports stronger links between the IGF Secretariat and the Office of the UNSG as this would facilitate closer links between the Tech Envoy and the IGF and would enable the Tech Envoy to represent the IGF's work to the Secretary-

General's Office and vice-versa to reflect UN priorities back to the MAG. This will ensure higher visibility for the IGF and better coordination with various other UN processes and projects.

It was noted that coordination and cooperation needs both 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' elements. Better information sharing is essential but there is also a need for institutional commitment to working cooperatively. Therefore, more consistent and formal linkages of the IGF with decision-making institutions who are the ones that should be listening to and influenced by multistakeholder debate and discussion are needed.

The Working Group considers of extreme importance the impact a Multistakeholder High-level Body (MHLB) would have on the IGF+ as well as how a new body would interact with the Tech Envoy and the MAG.

Role of NRIs

The WG expressed strong support for strengthening the role of initiatives on a regional and national level as well as meaningful youth engagement, including National Internet Governance Fora, Regional Internet Governance Fora (NRIs) and Youth IGFs. Global discussions need to be informed by local and regional inputs establishing a formal way of feeding input of NRIs into the annual IGF. It could be built from the ongoing efforts from the IGF Secretariat to identify, support, connect and address challenges from NRIs.

Roles of BPFs and DCs in strengthening cooperation

Regarding the DCs and BPFs as existing cooperation structures, it has been suggested to think of these as more closely connected to the policy-making processes.

Additional Recommendations suggested by the Working Group:

a)   It is suggested that the "permanent liaison officers" should be part of the IGF Secretariat, or to be drawn from the MAG or from the proposed MHLB.

b)   It is suggested that the BPFs should be a starting point for the Cooperation Accelerator[3].

c)   It is suggested that the Cooperation Accelerator and Policy Incubator of the

---

3 In this respect we refer to the comparison between BPFs and the proposed Cooperation Accelerator included in the submission by the 2019 BPF coordinators and facilitators to the consultation on Recommendation 5 A/B:
https://www.global-cooperation.digital/GCD/Redaktion/EN/Downloads/igf2019-bpf-coordinators-and-facilitators.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=2

IGF+ model are integrated into one element. The WG suggests further discussions to clarify how these bodies would work and why diverse actors with different interests would support their activities.

d)   It is suggested that the work of the Cooperation Accelerator is supported also by liaison officers at the IGF+ and other fora.

e)   It is suggested to further develop the potential of the NRIs to strengthen cooperation and coordination.

6. MORE ACTIONABLE AND CONCRETE OUTCOMES

The Working Group recognized that the IGF's key value derives from being a "safe place" for stakeholders to test new ideas and unveil potential solutions. In addition to the reflections shared here, Working Group members are also developing a discussion paper on IGF outcomes which will be available at the end of September 2020.

The WG's view is that the IGF should: "Keep the status quo. The IGF should remain a discussion body which allows for openness and creativity without the pressure to negotiate formal decisions" and not become a treaty-making forum". At the same time WG members felt strongly that there were several opportunities for improvements on the outcomes and in how effectively outcomes and recommendations are transmitted to the appropriate decision-making bodies. The IGF+ could become the vehicle for follow-up on outcomes and recommendations as a natural way to follow progress on previously identified issues.

It was suggested to have more focused and specific themes for discussion, streamlining and 'curating' sessions so that they are easier to navigate and to improve communications. Another option could be to feature the BPF and DC meetings immediately ahead of the IGF annual meeting with a 'report-out' during the IGF itself. This might also serve to bring more awareness to their work.

The WG supports the recommendation that the "IGF proposes non-binding policy recommendations, so that stakeholders who believe this is important, including governments and companies, have a greater incentive to participate."

It was suggested as an additional solution to have outputs in the form of multiple "Options for Action" that could allow different groups to advance different solutions that would be presented side-by-side.

It was also noted that in the past, various policy recommendations under development in bodies or processes outside the IGF have been "discussed/reviewed" within IGF structures. It was suggested to use and strengthen the valuable role that the IGF plays in this regard.

7. FORGING LINKS BETWEEN DISCUSSION AND DECISION-MAKING BODIES

The Working group agrees on the need to create links between discussion bodies, such as the IGF (including NRIs), and entities which make decisions about internet governance issues.

It was suggested that the IGF establish a network of institutions so that it can interact with decision-making institutions/bodies as a network and get their input into IGF themes and agendas. The IGF can then also interact with these institutions through the network on communicating and leveraging IGF outcomes.

Further it was suggested to reflect on the "Unique value that the IGF can provide". By identifying what the IGF could uniquely contribute, its value can be better explained to decision-making bodies. For example, if the IGF was to in some way contribute new knowledge (e.g., research findings, policy observations, economic data...) that would both represent clear IGF outcomes and provide the basis of direct outreach to these other bodies via non-duplicative hooks that could be leveraged.

It was highlighted that a "Multistakeholder High-level Body" (MHLB) or IGF+ leadership could contribute by forging links with decision-making bodies. This High-Level Body or IGF+ leadership could also play a role in conveying messages directly to relevant decision-making bodies.

Policy Incubator
The WG supports the proposal in the Options Paper saying: "Rather than establish a new structure, further develop the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora which already organize intersessional work and produce recommendations and best practice proposals. They should be given a clear mandate, working procedures and principles and receive more resources and administrative support by the IGF Secretariat. The work of the Dynamic Coalitions and Best Practice Fora has to be complemented by other initiatives to link discussion and decision-making bodies."

The WG further suggests that BPFs and DCs should as a rule include experts from external organizations and, especially, representatives from decision-making bodies. They would discuss recommendations that could inform the adoption of norms and policies by decision-making bodies and organizations from various stakeholder groups. This way, these structures would also help strengthen cooperation and coordination with other fora of the digital cooperation ecosystem. On this aspect, it was noted that BPFs and DCs currently hold different operating mandates and terms of reference. More clarity on how their envisioned new role will ensure their transparency, inclusivity and accountability across the board is needed. The [BPF on BPRs report](#)[4] gives several suggestions on how BPFs could enhance their contribution to the IGF.

8. STRONGER LEADERSHIP

A broad-based discussion took place among Working Group members on this subject and on the sentence included in the Options Paper that refers to "a high-level leadership group as part of the IGF, similar to an executive committee and in addition to the MAG (which would continue to focus on organizational tasks)" which corresponds to the MHLB (Multistakeholder High Level Body) mentioned in the SG's Roadmap for Digital Cooperation.

Some members of the Working Group thought that an additional layer focused on strategic issues could provide benefits, and it would be helpful for the people forming this layer to have a fairly high profile and be able to speak directly to peers at the decision-making bodies which we want to be made more aware of IGF work. Other members of the Working Group expressed concerns, however, that appointing a set of high-profile individuals to a new body could eclipse the IGF, create distance from the IGF community and cause confusion and competition with the MAG.

The Working Group drafted a specific document titled: *Possible implementations of a MHLB* (Roadmap – par.93 a) that includes three approaches (Approaches A, B and C) on how to address the implementation of the MHLB.
- Approach A foresees the MHLB as a separate and complementary body to the MAG;
- Approach B foresees the MHLB as an internal body of the MAG (Executive Committee);

---

4 This "Best Practice Forum on Best Practice Forums" was approved by the IGF MAG in 2020 and tasked with gathering lessons learned from BPFs since their inception and making recommendations on how to enhance their effectiveness.

- Approach C foresees the IGF Leadership Group that includes both the MHLB and the MAG.

This document is available in Annex 1. The WG has not reached a consensus on the option to be recommended. The diverse views within the group highlight the crucial need for the discussions in setting the MHLB to be taken into account carefully and widely.

9. PLACING DIGITAL COOPERATION ISSUES AT THE TOP OF THE POLITICAL AGENDA

The Working Group supports and welcomes governments' participation in the IGF as the right way to place digital cooperation issues higher on the political agenda. An adequate governmental involvement would improve the quality of the IGF's outcomes.

It welcomes the efforts to the appointment of the Tech Envoy. Grounded in the principles of multistakeholder dialogue and transparency, this role will have the unique opportunity to facilitate dialogue and should be open and responsive to all stakeholders seeking involvement in digital cooperation initiatives.

10. PROVIDING TRANSPARENCY AND GUIDANCE IN A COMPLEX SYSTEM

The Working Group suggests better coordination and more synergy between the new structure proposed in paras 83-84 of the Roadmap and the existing capacity-building initiatives working at national and regional level. It highlighted the need to discuss how to link the IGF+ capacity-building functions to this new body in order to avoid duplication of the current activities managed by the IGF and the NRIs and also for a better awareness of ongoing activities. The Working Group strongly suggests that in case of having a new digital capacity-building entity created by ITU and UNDP, the IGF + should be a key member of it and ways should be found for the IGF to feed into this, e.g. through access to an updated and organised archive of past IGF meetings and outcomes, and by steering requests received via the IGF to this new ITU-UNDP "joint facility for capacity development". This could be an opportunity to share the best practices linked to the IGF (e.g. DC on IG schools), would prevent duplication, reduce the amount of functions and create a clear linkage between the UN agencies for digital

capacity-building and the IGF. As additional comment on capacity building it was noted that it should not be merely referred to digital skills but also to the capacity building in a multi-stakeholder dimension.

11. GREATER VISIBILITY OF A GLOBAL DIGITAL COOPERATION ARCHITECTURE

The Working Group fully supports the need to enhance the visibility of a global digital cooperation structure, including through creating a strong corporate identity. Greater visibility will have positive effects on governmental involvement and the willingness of other bodies to cooperate.

12. ADEQUATE FUNDING AND FAIR DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES

The Working Group fully supports the "Establishment of a dedicated and professional fundraising structure within the IGF Secretariat" and considers this a vital development to enable the raising of sufficient funds to support the envisaged functions on an IGF+. It recommends to take care when operationalizing this to ensure that the Trust Fund becomes an effective, user-friendly and transparent mechanism for raising and managing funds.

Several concerns were shared regarding the proposal that "Ad-hoc contributions could support specialized projects and tracks". It was noted that introducing a "pay-for-play" element seems to be in opposition to the concern mentioned in the same section related to "the risk of undue influence" of donors. The Working Group thinks that it is preferable to fund the institution of the IGF and let the MAG / community determine which IGF activities should be supported.

It was also pointed out that "Introducing a membership fee with exemptions for marginalized groups, small civil society organizations as well as small and developing countries" could potentially reduce participation if a barrier is raised to entry, particularly as the Options Paper envisages certain stakeholder groups being targeted for donations plus "membership fees" plus "participants fees". The focus should instead be on using a professional fundraiser whose sole role is to raise funds.

ANNEX 1. Some ideas on how to operationalize the MHLB outlined in para. 93 (a) of the UNSG Roadmap for Digital Cooperation

Developed by member of the MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy, September 28, 2020

Paragraph 93 of The Roadmap for Digital Cooperation: "*(a) Creating a strategic and empowered multi-stakeholder high-level body, building on the experience of the existing multi-stakeholder advisory group, which would address urgent issues, coordinate follow-up action on Forum discussions and relay proposed policy approaches and recommendations from the Forum to the appropriate normative and decision-making forums;*"

Approach "A": operationalize 93(a) through a new body within the IGF, separate and complementary to the MAG

Purpose of the MHLB:

The Multistakeholder High-Level Body (MHLB) will be part of the IGF architecture. The MHLB's main function would be to build bridges at a high level between what is discussed and prepared by the IGF and the fora and institutions where decisions are taken, by contributing to improved awareness among high-level decision-makers of the discussions and proposals emerging from the IGF. It would also be a place for the UNSG and/or the Tech Envoy to discuss at a high level pressing issues, which then may be dealt with in detail by the IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG), the Best Practice Forums (BPFs) etc. These functions require high-level people in the MHLB, who are able to both as a group and as individuals effectively liaise between IGF discussions and decision-making fora. They will be normally supported by their own organizations, with "Sherpas", advisers etc., while the IGF Secretariat will organize the logistics of the meetings. Probably, some senior people sitting in the MHLB will have a bigger incentive to consider funding the IGF Secretariat, without making this a requirement at all.

The MAG, according to its ToR, would continue to be the program-developing committee of the IGF, i.e. on the annual program and on intersessional work. This function requires, as today, an "expert-level" profile. This would be maintained, with the advantage of the MHLB providing strategic advice on the program, on intersessional work, and with the MHLB performing, as said above, a liaison role with other organizations etc. at a high level.

The MHLB would, hence, be composed of senior-level persons nominated by IGF stakeholders following a process informed by the MAG's experience and practice (see below), and contribute to filling some gaps identified both by the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation (HLP)'s Report and the UNSG Roadmap by performing the functions identified in §93 (a) of the Roadmap.

It shall not act as gatekeeper or as top-down control mechanism of or within the IGF. The MHLB would be bound and perform its functions within the mandate of the IGF as laid down in §72 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society. It would not take decisions on behalf of the IGF, but mainly act as a carrier that transports the insights and messages from the IGF so that they reach the eyes and ears of decision-makers at the highest levels (and vice versa). This would support the work of current and future IGF policy networks.

Key functions/activities of the MHLB:

Per 93 (a) of the Roadmap (see above):

- Address and raise awareness on urgent issues
- Contribute to coordinating follow-up to IGF discussions
- Relay proposed policy approaches and recommendations from the Forum (i.e. prepared by policy networks, such as BPFs), to the appropriate normative and decision-making fora.

Activities in connection with the IGF ecosystem:

- Advise UNSG and Tech Envoy on strategic issues, based on IGF discussions
- Deliver strategic inputs, including from other digital cooperation fora, to MAG on annual program and intersessional activities, contributing also to the pluriannual working plan of the IGF
- Offer strategic input on intersessional work of IGF, e.g. by suggesting new policy networks to the IGF community
- Offer strategic feedback on draft policy approaches and recommendations from the Forum (i.e. prepared by policy networks, such as BPFs, etc.)
- Offer feedback and support with regard to the evolution of the IGF/IGF+
- Advocate for the IGF/IGF+ and bring the discussions and messages of the IGF/IGF+ to the attention of other relevant fora and decision-making bodies to help build stronger connections, encourage information sharing and the

meaningful participation of these organizations in the IGF/IGF+ discussions.

- Collect inputs on IGF outputs from other fora and channel them back through strategic inputs into the IGF ecosystem
- Contribute with strategic inputs to fundraising efforts and corporate identity strategy of the IGF

Composition of the MHLB:

Per 93 (a) the MHLB has to be multistakeholder and build on the experience of the existing MAG. Hence, it is logical to apply the same or a very similar nomination and selection procedure like the one used for the MAG, following transparent and clear nomination and designation procedures and criteria (including on geographical, gender and stakeholder balance):

- Composition is informed by MAG practice and experience: about 25 people[5] from all stakeholder groups; bottom-up nominations by stakeholder groups and UNSG designation; rotation by thirds; terms would be limited;
- The formal/honorary chair of the MHLB could be the UNSG, with a rotational day-to-day co-chair drawn from any member of the MHLB.
- The chair of MAG should be an ex-officio member of the MHLB, and possibly a vice-chair of it; The chair of the MHLB would as well be a member of the MAG, possibly also as its vice-chair. Both Chairs would liaise with each other and ensure smooth cooperation.
- The UN Tech Envoy should be a member or at least attend MHLB meetings as a liaison. A vice-chair role could also be possible for the Tech Envoy.

Profile of members:

The functions of the MHLB require a high-level composition made up of people who are established leaders in their sectors and institutions, and who are able to take action and commit their organizations and institutions as much as possible:

- The members should be high-level, namely at senior Minister level for

---

5 Several members of the Working Group felt that 25 members would make this body too large. One proposed that 16 would be sufficient, with four individuals from each of the four primary stakeholder groups: government, civil society, technical community and business. Others pointed out that if it was any smaller it would be virtually impossible to make it sufficiently inclusive in terms of sector, stakeholder group and geographic regions. Some also comments made earlier to the effect that the criteria of "head of organisation" and even "senior executive" might exclude prominent individuals from the academia and civil society.

Governments or head of organization level in civil society, private sector, academia and technical community organizations, and/or prominent individuals, senior officials or executives from the respective stakeholder groups

- All members should be committed to the WSIS outcomes and the IGF mandate
- They should act individually as multipliers of the IGF in their respective organizations/communities, linking the IGF up with the decision-making fora and institutions

MHLB secretariat function would be performed by:

- The IGF Secretariat, whose resources would need to be strengthened

Modalities of work:

- Minimum one f2f meeting at the annual IGF, where personal participation of MHLB members would be expected
- Normally 3 more meetings virtually per year
- Work intersessionally, e.g. meet representatives of decision-making fora, attend other internet governance events, present IGF outcomes
- May meet at the request of UNSG/MHLB Chair to address emergencies

Approach "B": operationalize 93(a) through an in-depth reform of the MAG – A High Level Body – "MAG Plus" Approach

Purpose of the High Level Body

The functions of the High Level Body will be performed by "MAG+", which will be empowered to provide strategic leadership and more senior representation for the IGF+.

The MAG+ will include a "leadership team" (or "executive committee") which would drive forward the implementation of IGF+ and the steps set out in Para 93 of the Roadmap. It would be composed by senior-level persons nominated by IGF stakeholders following a process informed by the MAG's experience and practice (see below). The "leadership team" will be led by the chair of the MAG+. It will act on behalf of the MAG+ as a whole and it will be accountable to the IGF+ community as a whole. Its members will act as senior advocates for the IGF+ and for the discussions and proposals emerging from IGF+. It shall not act as gatekeeper or as top-down control mechanism of or within the IGF.

A key role for the "leadership team" would be to help to ensure linkages between the discussions held at the IGF and existing decision-making bodies, by contributing to improved awareness among high-level decision-makers of the discussions and proposals emerging from the IGF.

The whole MAG+ would be bound and perform its functions within the mandate of the IGF as laid down in §72 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society. It would not take, develop or provide critical commentary on policy decisions on behalf of the IGF. The "leadership team" will act as a carrier that transports the insights and messages from the IGF so that they reach the eyes and ears of decision-makers at the highest levels. This would support the work of current and future IGF policy networks.

Key functions/activities of the MAG+:

Para 93 (a) of the Roadmap says the high level body should:

- Address and raise awareness on urgent issues

- Contribute to coordinating follow-up to IGF discussions

- Relay proposed policy approaches and recommendations from the Forum (i.e. prepared by policy networks, such as BPFs) to appropriate normative and decision-making fora.

Following discussions in the Recommendation 5 Roundtable and elsewhere, we would suggest developing these key functions and activities as part of a MAG+.

The MAG+ "leadership team" will:
- Lead the work of the MAG+ to ensure that IGF+ is able to address issues effectively
- Lead the work of the MAG+ to ensure inclusive participation at the IGF+ and ensure that IGF+ is well-focused and easy for all stakeholders to navigate
- Lead the "programme committee" functions of the MAG+
- Advise UNSG and Tech Envoy on strategic issues, based on IGF discussions
- Deliver strategic inputs on annual program and intersessional activities
- Be accountable and responsive to the wider MAG+ and the wider IGF+ community
- Help advocate for the role of the IGF+ and for the discussions and proposals emerging from it.
- Help ensure linkages between the discussions held at the IGF+ and existing decision-making bodies, supporting the IGF community to build stronger links as appropriate.
- Offer feedback and support with regard to the evolution of the IGF/IGF plus.
- The Terms of Reference of the MAG should be amended and developed to reflect these roles and to ensure that the MAG+ is able to support an effective IGF+.

Composition of the MAG+:

Per 93 (a) the MAG+ has to be multistakeholder and build on the experience of the existing MAG.
- The "leadership team" should have a very similar nomination and selection procedure like the one used for the MAG. It would comprise of 5 or 6 people.
- Composition of the rest of the MAG+ should continue to be based on MAG practice and experience: about 40-50 people from all stakeholder groups; bottom-up nominations by stakeholder groups and UNSG designation; rotation by thirds; terms would be limited.

Profile of the "leadership team":

The functions of the "leadership team" require a high-level composition made up of people who are established leaders in their sectors and institutions, and who are able to generate support and commitment from their sectors as much as possible:
- The members should be high-level, namely at senior official/ambassador level for

Governments or head of organization level in civil society, private sector, academia and technical community

- All members should be committed to the WSIS outcomes and the IGF mandate
- Their work to represent the IGF+ should be based on consensus and collective responsibility

MAG+ secretariat function would be performed by:

- IGF Secretariat. The "leadership team" should not have an independent secretariat function.

Modalities of work:

- Minimum one meeting of the leadership team alongside meetings of the MAG+
- May meet at the request of UNSG/MAG+ Chair to address emergencies

Approach "C": Operationalise 93(a) through a two-tiered multistakeholder IGF leadership structure including the MHLB and the MAG

This approach draws on elements of options A and B to operationalising the MHLB. It involves **establishing a single IGF multistakeholder leadership structure** that consists of two tiers: the proposed MHLB and the current MAG. It could be referred to as the "**IGF Leadership Group**" or as the "**IGF Multistakeholder Leadership Council**" or simply the **"IGF Council"**.

1. Rationale for a single two-tiered IGF leadership structure

The IGF has evolved into more than just an annual event. It includes a multi-year intersessional work programme (Best Practice Forums and Dynamic Coalitions) and an extensive network of National, Regional and Youth IGF initiatives (NRIs). Many institutions select the IGF as a launchpad for network-building, research and publications and convening events on Day 0. The Roadmap for Digital Cooperation's IGF+ involves an even more complex IGF ecosystem and a "strategic and empowered multi-stakeholder high-level body" to "address urgent issues, coordinate follow-up action on Forum discussions and relay proposed policy approaches and recommendations from the Forum to the appropriate normative and decision-making forums" (from paragraph 93 of the Roadmap).

This evolved IGF needs leadership and support at both strategic and programmatic levels and it needs enhanced capacity to interact effectively with policy-making institutions and processes. Currently the IGF MAG plays primarily – but not exclusively - a programme planning role to assist the Secretary-General in convening the annual IGF meeting by preparing the programme and schedule. The MAG's current terms of reference does not explicitly include responsibility for the longer term strategic development of the IGF but the MAG has actively sought improvements strategic and operational. By complementing the MAG with the addition of the proposed MHLB, the resulting IGF Leadership Group will be able to supplement and extend these efforts.

2. Building a two-tiered IGF multistakeholder leadership structure

This structure (which can be referred to, for example, as the "**IGF leadership group**" or the "**IGF multistakeholder leadership council" or the "IGF council")** can consist of adding the **proposed MHLB** and the current **MAG** into a single two tiered body. These two bodies will work together as a group, but each will also have distinct

roles and responsibilities. The MHLB will be empowered to provide strategic leadership and more senior representation for the IGF+ while the MAG will continue to focus on the annual IGF process and intersessional activities.

2.1 Purpose of the IGF Leadership Group/Council

The IGF Leadership Group/Council will provide strategic leadership as the IGF+ evolves, and be bound by the mandate of the IGF as laid down in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society. The IGF leadership group would not take decisions on behalf of the IGF. It will be responsible for interacting with the broader IGF community and ensuring that the IGF retains its 'bottom-up' character.

Members of the Leadership Group will work collaboratively, but its two tiers or "subgroups" will have different areas of focus: the MAG will lead the work of organising the IGF's annual work programme and the global forum and the MHLB will act as a carrier that transports the insights and messages from the IGF so that they reach the eyes and ears of decision-makers at the highest levels and facilitate the input of these decision-makers into the IGF's agenda-setting process. The MHLB would extend outreach efforts and help leverage the work of current and future IGF policy networks.

The IGF leadership group should consist of about 50 people (+-20 MHLB members and +- 30 MAG members) from all stakeholder groups constituted through a nomination process and appointed by the UNSG with rotation by thirds and with limited terms. Transparent and clear nomination and designation procedures and criteria (including on geographical, gender and stakeholder balance) should be used. The existing processes used for MAG appointments should be built upon as they respect stakeholder community processes. Nomination processes for the MHLB and the MAG may run concurrently or at different times although in the longer term a concurrent nomination process would be simpler. More about the profile of MHLB members below.

2.2 IGF Leadership Group/Council chairing and coordination

The MHLB and the MAG will each have its own chairperson. The MHLB chairing role could be played by the proposed Tech Envoy. The IGF Leadership Group as a whole can be chaired by the MHLB chair with the MAG chair acting as vice-chair. The chair of the IGF Leadership Group and the chair of the MAG would liaise with each other and ensure smooth cooperation.

A further option would be for both the MHLB and the MAG to each have vice chairs.

There could, for example, be four vice-chairs (one from each stakeholder group), but a single vice-chair is also an option. If needed, an **IGF Leadership Group management committee** could be formed, consisting of the chair and vice-chairs of both the MHLB and the MAG. This management committee can oversee strategic financial and administrative management of the IGF.

Some members of the Working Group felt that having multiple vice-chairs and a management committee could potentially create a division between the "leadership structures" and the members, and the community that nominated them. Some also pointed out that vice-chairs for stakeholder groups could encourage "stakeholder group" positioning. Others felt it could be a useful mechanism for aggregating and channelling views from stakeholder groups when needed.

The **IGF Leadership Group's secretariat function** would be performed by the IGF Secretariat, whose resources would need to be strengthened.

2.3 Work modalities of the IGF Leadership Group

The full IGF Leadership Group will meet face to face three times a year, ideally face to face at the IGF. The MHLB and the MAG will meet separately more frequently (see below). MHLB meetings will be shorter and more focused than MAG meetings.

3. The MHLB tier of the IGF leadership structure

3.1 Purpose of MHLB

The MHLB's main function would be to build bridges – in both directions - at a high level between what is discussed and prepared by the IGF and the fora and institutions where decisions are taken, by contributing to improved collaboration among high-level decision-makers of the discussions and proposals emerging from the IGF. An additional role should be to advocate for increased collaboration between institutions. It would also be a place for the UNSG and/or the Tech Envoy to raise at a high level pressing issues, which then may be dealt with in detail by the IGF-Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG), the Best Practice Forums (BPFs) etc. These functions require high-level people in the MHLB, who are able to both as a group and as individuals effectively liaise between IGF discussions and decision-making fora.

Key functions/activities of the MHLB:

NOTE: This text is very similar to that included in Option A and in the "options paper"

but there are some differences. Points that have been added or adapted are indicated with **

Per 93 (a) of the Roadmap:
- Address and raise awareness on urgent issues – both directions **
- Contribute to coordinating follow-up to IGF discussions
- Relay proposed policy approaches and recommendations from the Forum (i.e. prepared by policy networks, such as BPFs), to the appropriate normative and decision-making fora.
- Identify existing programmes with relevance to IGF activities **

Further activities in connection with the IGF ecosystem:
- Advise UNSG and Tech Envoy on strategic issues, based on IGF discussions
- Deliver strategic inputs, including from other digital cooperation fora, to MAG on annual program and intersessional activities, contributing also to the pluriannual working plan of the IGF
- Offer strategic feedback on approaches to developing draft policy and recommendations from the Forum (i.e. prepared by policy networks, such as BPFs, etc.) **
- Offer strategic input on intersessional work of IGF, e.g. by suggesting new policy networks to the IGF community
- Offer feedback and support with regard to the evolution of the IGF/IGF+
- Advocate for the IGF/IGF+ and bring the discussions and messages of the IGF/IGF+ to the attention of other relevant fora and decision-making bodies to help build stronger connections, encourage information sharing and the meaningful participation of these organization in the IGF/IGF+ discussions.
- Collect inputs on IGF outputs from other fora and channel them back through strategic inputs into the IGF ecosystem
- Contribute with strategic inputs to fundraising efforts and corporate identity strategy of the IGF.

3.2 Profile of MHLB members

The functions of the MHLB require a high-level composition made up of people who are established leaders in their sectors and institutions and communities, and who are able to take action and commit their organizations and institutions and communities, e.g. to support the IGF, as much as possible:
- The members should be high-level, namely at senior ministerial level for

governments or head of organization level for civil society, private sector, academia and technical community organizations, and/or prominent individuals, senior officials or executives from the respective stakeholder groups[6].

- All members should be committed to the WSIS outcomes and the IGF mandate.
- They should act individually as multipliers of the IGF in their respective organizations, linking the IGF up with the decision-making fora and institutions.

3.3 Modalities of work

- Minimum one f2f meeting at the annual IGF with the full IGF Leadership Group/Council, where personal participation of MHLB members would be expected.
- Normally 3 more meetings virtually per year, including a joint session with the MAG.
- Work intersessionally, e.g. meet representatives of decision-making fora, attend other internet governance events, present IGF outcomes.
- May meet at the request of the UNSG/MHLB Chair to address emergencies.

4. The IGF MAG

MAG members will be members of the IGF Leadership Group/Council. The MAG would continue to be the programme-developing committee of the IGF, i.e. of the annual forum programme and intersessional work. This function requires, as today, an "expert-level" profile. This would be maintained, with the advantage of the MHLB providing strategic advice on the program, on intersessional work, and with the MHLB performing, as said above, a liaison role with other organizations etc. at a high level.

The MAG ToR should be updated to reflect this approach and revised as needed from time to time.

---

6 Some Working Group members commented that the criteria of "head of organisation" and even senior executives might exclude prominent individuals from the academia and civil society.