

Name: Shreedeeep Rayamajhi
Organisation: RayZnews
Country and Region: Asia-Pacific Group
Date of Submission: 20/12/2019

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.)

I felt the selection process were good but more developing nation needs to be focused and highlighted. A lot of the times in the name of minority groups are given more focus and stakeholder so qualified session and leaders needs to be given opportunity in the name of right people at right place

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.

N/A

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)

N/A

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.

N/A

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

More people from lower economies need to participate and contribute

1.6 IGF 2019 village

well managed

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

well managed

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

well managed

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

well managed

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.)

well managed

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

well managed

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

well managed

2.4 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?

well managed

2.5 Programme content (workshops, main sessions, high level sessions, open forums, speakers)

well managed

2.6 IGF 2020 Participants

well managed

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

The travel fellowship selection process needs to be more transparent and accountable as in few cases people from national IGF were given the responsibility of pre-scanning which resulted in promoting people from a certain community or circle only. This problem needs to be tackled in the more accountable way.