

1. What are the most important **achievements** arising from WSIS that should be highlighted in the Zero Draft? *

In terms of internet governance, the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is the most important - actually the only - institutional innovation of the last 20 years. Since its inception in 2006, it has organically developed its structure and modes of operation: flexibility and self-organization are part of the IGF's strong DNA. The recent annual events in Kyoto, Riyadh, and Oslo have demonstrated ongoing interest from the community, as well as the IGF's capacity to rapidly put on its schedule emerging issues such as AI, illustrating its agenda-setting potential and issue-framing capacities. Para. 60 of the elements paper highlights that the IGF's "importance as the primary multi-stakeholder platform for discussion of Internet governance issues has been recognized". But more importantly, as several other contributions to the WSIS+20 process emphasised, the IGF is already much more than just an annual event. In particular, the spontaneous emergence of more than 175 national and regional IGFs (NRIs), as well as the various Dynamic Coalitions, Best Practices Forums and Policy Networks is a testimonial of the global bottom-up dynamics the IGF has generated. This should be more reflected in the zero draft, to recognize the ecosystem that has emerged.

2. What are the most important **challenges** to the achievement of WSIS outcomes to date and in the future that need to be addressed in the Zero Draft? *

Limiting this contribution to a focus on the IGF, its main challenge is its lack of sustainable funding. This significantly hampers the capacity of the Secretariat to help the IGF wholly fulfill its mandate. Yet, better funding will only be available when and if stakeholders have a clearer roadmap of what the IGF will become. This requires, beyond a mere reconduction, to initiate a structured and in-depth review of its mandate, operational structure, and insertion in the larger ecosystem of organizations dealing with digital issues. Such a review can only take place after December 2025, but the WSIS+20 review outcome document should include a call for such a review, to make the IGF the 21st institution we all need.

3. What are the most important **priorities** for action to achieve the WSIS vision of a 'people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society' in the future, taking into account emerging trends? *

Two key aspects are essential in order to address any policy issue related to the information society:
- a flexible and agile agenda-setting process, able to surface emerging trends early on, to avoid the delays often plaguing multilateral processes where agreement of all governments is required before putting any issue on the agenda;
- a comprehensive issue-framing effort on each issue, involving all relevant stakeholders, to identify the different facets of the problem, as a prerequisite for discussing possible solutions.
Because of its open, bottom-up and multistakeholder nature, the IGF, through its various processes and the network of national and regional IGFs, is uniquely placed to fulfill this agenda-setting and issue-framing function, pending sufficient resources and operational evolutions (see proposed review process above).

4. What **additional themes/issues**, if any, should be included in the Elements Paper? *

No particular additional theme.

5. Do you wish to comment on **particular themes/issues/paragraphs** in the Elements Paper? *

Paragraph 62 of the Elements Paper only mentions "proposals for the renewal of the mandate" of the IGF. However necessary, mere reconduction of the IGF is not sufficient. The IGF is not currently reaching its full potential. The zero draft should expand this to cover not only the renewal of the mandate but also "reviewing and updating, as appropriate, the IGF's mandate, operational structure, and interfacing with other processes".
In determining the modalities for conducting such a review after the December 2025 UNGA Resolution, some inspiration can be found in the mechanisms adopted during the WSIS itself, with the creation of the multistakeholder Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG).

6. What suggestions do you have to support the development of the **WSIS framework** (WSIS Action Lines, IGF, WSIS Forum, UNGIS etc.)? *

The IGF has the potential to be the bridge connecting multilateral governance processes with the rest of the multi-stakeholder internet governance community, and to foster better coordination in the complex ecosystem of organizations and processes dealing with digital issues. This goes beyond the strict WSIS framework (WSIS Forum, UNGIS, and CSTD), or the follow up to the Global Digital Compact, but should also include numerous other international organizations, such as OECD, Council of Europe and various regional groupings.

The IGF, in its agenda-setting and issue-framing functions, could:

- Provide input into and contribute substantively to such processes;
- Offer a space for them to regularly provide updates on their work; and
- Make the network of NRIs available for broad global consultations.

7. Do you have any **other** comments? *

The future of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is an important part of the WSIS+20 review process.

But after 20 years, the key question should now be its organizational evolution, more than just how long its mandate should be extended or whether it should be rebranded.

The time has come for a constitutional moment for the IGF.

A dedicated review process should take place in 2026 around three core questions:

- The review and updating of the IGF mandate
- A chartering of its organizational evolution
- How it interfaces with other process.

A more detailed development of the above contribution can be found here: <https://circleid.com/posts/a-constitutional-moment-for-the-igf>

8. Who is **submitting** this input? *

Kindly provide the name of the person submitting this input, as well as the associated country, organization, stakeholder type, and relevant contact information

Bertrand de LA CHAPELLE, Executive Director, Internet & Jurisdiction Policy Network, France, NGO

9. Please provide your **e-mail** address: *

Please enter an email