Name: Raul Echeberria
Organisation: Consultant
Country and Region: Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)
Date of Submission: 10/01/2020
Stakeholder Group: Civil Society

Input to the Call for inputs for 2020 and taking stock of 2019

1. Taking Stock of the 2019 programming, outputs, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the event itself: What worked well? What worked not so well?

1.1 Preparatory process (timeline, call for workshop proposals, workshop selection, MAG meetings etc.)

The preparation of IGF2019 continued improving in relation to the previous IGFs.
The timeline was appropriate. The selection of workshops could still improve. It should be even more clear to the proponents, what the MAG is looking for.

The requirement that potential speakers should be previously registered in the systems was restrictive, specially when we talk about senior speakers.
The policy questions were very helpful, that's something that should be done again and if the questions are even more specific, much better

1.2 Community intersessional activities (Best Practice Forums, Dynamic Coalitions) and National, Regional and Youth IGFs - please comment on process, content, and in particular on how these intersessional activities were included in the programme content of the Berlin IGF.

x

1.3 IGF 2019 overall program structure and flow (in particular the three thematic tracks: digital inclusion; data governance; and security, safety, stability and resilience)

The 3 thematic tracks were a significant progress. Congratulations to the IGF MAG, Chair and the secretariat for that. Another progress was to reduce the number of workshops.

1.4 IGF 2019 programme content: Please comment on the content of workshops, main sessions, high level sessions, open forums, BPF, DC and NRIs sessions, as well as on the speakers and quality of discussions.

In general the level of the discussion and the contents of the sessions were very good.
The high level session on day 0 doesn't add much value to the event. This shoudl be changed.

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

The participation of youth is consolidated. The parliamentarians program was a very good addition. Of course the fact that the IGF is being organized in Europe 4 years in a row, is a restriction for people from other regions.

1.6 IGF 2019 village

x

1.7 IGF 2019 communications, outreach and outputs (add relevant link here)

x

1.8 IGF 2019 logistics (venue, catering, security, registration etc.)

The facilities were excellent and it made the work of everybody much easier. The services provided by the host were awesome.

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

2. **What are your suggestions for improvements for 2020?**

2.1 Preparatory process (timeline, call for workshop proposals, workshop selection, MAG and OC meetings etc.)

I suggest to make the workshop proposals process more simple, and, as said before, the MAG should be more clear about what they are looking for. The insiders have still advantage over the rest of people. It looks like some people always get their workshops approved and this is because they learned how to navigate they systems and how to elaborate a proposal.

The policy questions that guide the preparation of workshops proposals could be still more specific.

I propose that there are 2 kind of workshops. Some workshops exploring new areas and looking to the future on emerging issues and others that are expected to feed concretely the discussion of the main sessions on the selected priority topics.

2.2 Community intersessional activities (BPFs, Dynamic Coalitions) and National, Regional and Youth IGFs and how they can best connect with the global IGF.

x

2.3 Overall programme structure and flow (introductory and concluding sessions, main and other sessions, schedule structure etc.)

I strongly suggest to introduce some changes in 2020 and I recommend the MAG to take decisions on the structure of the meeting as soon as possible. January meeting would be ideal.

1) the workshops should not compete with the main sessions. Day one could be entirely dedicated to workshops and so to move on the second day to a "general discussion mode"

2) While it was a very good progress to reduce the number of workshops in 2019, the number of WS in 2020 should be still smaller.

3) Days 2 and 3 should be dedicated to the general discussion on the most relevant topics in sessions with reduced number of panelists.
Time should be left free to organize bilateral meetings so the bilateral don't compete either very much with the main sessions.

4) The discussion on the main sessions should be based on documents elaborated by the secretariat and the MAG in advance of the meeting. Those documents should be prepared from

contributions of the community on the topics chosen as the priorities. The workshops should feed the discussion of the main sessions.
The conclusions of these sessions could be prepared in the same way it is done at the Eurodig Meetings, with people trained to take notes and draft the conclusions during the discussion. The notes are read at the end of the session and so the chair of the session ask for objections or important amendments.

5) The High level meeting on day zero doesn't add much value. This should be cancelled and instead, a high level meeting should be organized on the last day.
This session could be conducted in a Netmundial style. The participants could so discuss the outcomes of the workshops and main sessions. The conclusions of this session would be one important outcome of the IGF.

2.4 <u>Do you think there should be thematic tracks as there were in 2019? Please indicate if you believe the three 2019 thematic tracks should be retained (digital inclusion; data governance; and security, safety, stability and resilience). If not, what should take their place or what theme should be added?</u>

Yes, the thematic tracks have been a significant improvement of IGF. The themes chosen could be even more focused. That would contribute very much to the objective to produce valuable outcomes.

2.5 <u>Programme content (workshops, main sessions, high level sessions, open forums, speakers)</u>

x

2.6 IGF 2020 <u>Participants</u>

x

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

Some minor and very practical suggestions:
Sometimes, to submit either comments or workshops proposals and in many other cases of participation in the IGF ecosystem, people has to identify themselves as members of one stakeholder group and to indicate their organizational affiliation. This is very restrictive. Some

people don't belong exlusively to one stakeholders group and they don't have necessarily an organizational affiliation. I propose that a new category is included: "individual", and that organizational affiliation is considered just as an optional field.
In several forms also there are are mandatory fields that should not be mandatory. Those simple changes can easy the participation of the community.