

Strategic Multiyear Work Programme Discussion Paper for 2019 Activities

The 2018 MAG WG on Strategic Multiyear Work Programme was active in three (3) main areas of focus, as outlined below:

- 1) [Draft IGF Programme Framework Chart](#): - outlines the planning cycle for the annual IGF. The purpose is to serve as a reference document for the work of the wider community by illustrating the agenda and programme-setting process from a "bird's eye" point of view, capturing the main points and junctures of the current process. The aim is to develop a common baseline for the IGF annual programme development and agenda setting process, as well as assess potential gaps and desired improvements.

The Chart also aims to assess how IGF outputs are reached, collected, and shared so that they are valuable inputs and building blocks for a subsequent IGF cycle.

A public questionnaire was shared with the IGF community for comment to assess whether the Programme Framework Chart accurately represents the current process and for community members to share ideas to improve the efficiency, scalability, and transparency of the current process.

STATUS:

In Progress

- 2) [Moving from reports to outputs/recommendations](#):
 - a. Two pilots¹ were proposed to facilitate intersessional and multiyear work that would focus on more concrete outputs and possible modalities for different types of recommendations² as some WG members stress are indicated in the Tunis Agenda - 1 - [Methodologies for the Development of Written IGF Outputs](#), and 2 - [Strengthened cooperation within the context of the IGF 2019](#), while respecting the Tunis Agenda. The aim of the proposed pilots was to determine if/how to use these experiences in future IGF cooperation processes. The pilots were proposed as alternative sessions leading to or for the Berlin IGF 2019.

STATUS:

The pilot "Methodologies for the Development of Written IGF Outputs" above remains an open discussion and will be discussed with the full MAG as part of our strategic evaluation of needed improvements for the IGF.

¹ [Methodologies for the Development of Written IGF Outputs and Strengthening Cooperation within the Context of the IGF](#)

² [Tunis Agenda](#) – para 72 g. Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.

The second pilot above: “Strengthened Cooperation” is being advanced through support from the community and the results of that project will be reviewed leading up to and during IGF 2019.

- 3) Improve current outputs: Various efforts were undertaken to improve the outputs that currently exist, making them more useful and more visible. Many of these efforts were based on suggestions made by the MAG and the community, and were supported by the IGF Secretariat, DESA, and a few WG members. These were covered in separate efforts as part of operationalizing them through the IGF Secretariat.

STATUS:

Future efforts here will be part of the on-going strategic evaluation of needed improvements for the IGF, while relying significantly on the Secretariat for support.

LOOKING AHEAD:

The Working Group recognized the importance of engaging broadly across the full MAG, the IGF community, BPFs, DCs, CENB, and NRIs, in the development of a multi-year strategic work programme. These engagements are of primary importance given the global interconnected nature of international Internet public policy issues, and in full recognition of the work and expertise that exists across the IGF ecosystem. At the same time, it was recognized that progress on these issues requires the collaboration of additional International Organizations, governmental, non-governmental, private sector, civil society, and non-governmental entities. The WG recognizes the importance of bringing in additional collaborators in virtually all areas, and has suggestions on how to advance this.

The WG stresses that the IGF, as a multistakeholder effort, is an important forum for discussion on many international Internet public policy issues. For example, the IGF could collaborate with or act as a convener providing a platform for engaging on global solutions through open discussions on international Internet public policy issues. The combined knowledge and insight across collaborators would help broaden perspectives, bring clarity and enable additional and accelerated progress through possible partnerships on these important, complex and intertwined issues.

It is important for the IGF to bring in new collaborators, as well as work more substantively with the organizations already engaged in the IGF. A key goal of all these efforts must also be to increase the participation of disadvantaged and marginalized groups in our work.

Additional goals:

- i) Increased participation from senior policy makers
- ii) Increased participation from senior private sector actors
- iii) More balanced stakeholder participation
- iv) Increase collaboration between the NRIs and the global IGF
- v) Support NRI efforts to increase collaboration among NRIs
- vi) Increase collaboration among DCs, and between the DCs and the global IGF
- vii) Work to raise the overall stature of the IGF

Of Special Note:

Throughout this process, there has been a recurring issue with respect to how far to go with producing more tangible outputs. Some members believe there is support in the Tunis Agenda for “recommendations”, perhaps achieved through various ‘deliberative democratic methodologies that do not require text negotiations or voting, while still delivering outputs’.

It should be noted that all members of the WG fully support the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS+10 Outcome Document. No members supported the idea of voting or steps for the IGF to become a forum for negotiations, as the implementation of such ideas are beyond the scope of the MAG, and within the hands of the United Nations General Assembly. Specifically, several members (from different stakeholder groups) expressed the hope that the MAG will support the idea of new modalities of outputs / recommendations, perhaps via a small number of pilots.

Proposed Strategic Multi-year Work Programme - 2019 IGF cycle (from the WG-MWP 2018 Status Report)

1. The IGF Secretariat should provide an assessment to the MAG, ahead of its first meeting of topics discussed during IGF 2018 (in workshops, main sessions, open forums, inter-sessionals etc.), including input from the IGF taking stock exercise and the call for ‘**IGF topics of interest**’ (as piloted in 2018). **DONE**
2. This assessment should inform the MAG’s decisions on the **main intersessional work for IGF** (including any major policy initiatives (past efforts here were Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) programme (CENB)) and/or a number of BPFs. It should also inform the programme preparations of the IGF through, inter alia, the selection of IGF sub-themes and potential multi-year topics, which in turn should influence the topics on which a call is made for workshops. **DONE**
3. An overall **plan for the advancement of intersessional work and/or multiyear topics** should be developed, which as for all IGF work, should provide measures of success, standards of accountability and balance, including a focus on ensuring broad collaboration, and input from the IGF community with a specific outreach plan for other important collaborators. **IN PROGRESS**
4. The MAG should decide whether a **new intersessional major policy programme should be undertaken** (given the “retirement of the “Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) programme) or if we should progress a multi-year topic/focus. Members suggested a review of how such major policy initiatives can be improved. **TO BE DISCUSSED**
5. It was suggested a process could be piloted to collect ‘**IGF Findings” or “IGF session Recommendations”** reflecting the output of the multistakeholder discussions held during IGF sessions. This has been successfully piloted in a number of NRI meetings and is planned for the NRI sessions held during IGF 2018. Whether there was strong agreement, strong divergence, or something in between, a reflection of what the “session participants” think would be helpful. Care would need to be taken to highlight the provenance of these outputs in order that they be

accurately positioned (an analogy might be, today's BPF outputs). **TO BE DISCUSSED**

6. The IGF produces a lot of **output**, such as: Key Messages, Chair's Summary, main session and workshop summaries, BPF and major policy programme (CENB) output documents, collaborative partnerships, etc. At the same time the multistakeholder dialogues themselves are valuable outputs; policymakers can gather many insights from the exchange of information and experiences with Internet policy issues that takes place during the IGF. Capturing them appropriately (and more helpfully) and promoting them successfully could make them a valued resource for many. **TO BE DISCUSSED**

7. Late in the year, some members of the WG proposed the MAG explore the possibility of using a **professionally facilitated process** in 2019 to explore strategic issues and discussed an offer from a company called Synmind to provide an online/offline facilitated process for the IGF community. There was no consensus on proceeding, due to lack of time, concerns re funding, and recognizing this was a decision for the full MAG. **TO BE DISCUSSED**

CLOSING:

Any pilots or piloted improvements will be thoroughly assessed and there will be learnings along the way. But if we believe the IGF and its multistakeholder processes are central to better informed policies (whether those of policy makers or private sector actors) then the IGF needs to figure out ways to provide more and more tangible outputs. Much of the criticism the IGF receives has to do with the quality and nature of its outputs.

All efforts would follow community expectations of openness, inclusivity and engagement, and would engage with the IGF Community to further develop activities, outputs, recommendations as appropriate.

This paper is offered to kickstart a discussion. It is based on the work of the WG-Multi-year Strategic Work Programme.

<end>