This is a joint submission made on behalf of the conveners of the Dynamic Coalitions and other interested IGF participants named below.

Taking Stock of the 10th IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?

We appreciate the establishment of a main session for the Dynamic Coalitions at the 2015 IGF in João Pessoa, which was a significant and timely step towards creating a more formal link between these self-organising thematicgroups, and the Internet Governance Forum as a larger process or institution.

This was important because it is through the Dynamic Coalitions, most of which conduct intersessional work throughout the year, that policy options and ideas are most effectively generated. The new main session provided a good opportunity for the Dynamic Coalitions to present and raise awareness about the importance of their work to the larger body of IGF participants, thereby creating the opportunity for broader feedback on the Dynamic Coalitions efforts, and for its potential transmission into IGF output documents.

On the other hand, because the Dynamic Coalition main session was organised for the first time ever this year, some improvements can be foreseen. In particular, it was found that little of the expected substantive feedback on Dynamic Coalition work was actually received from floor participants at the second half of the split main session, and that indeed a lot of the feedback that was received related to the process itself.

This indicates that some improvements to the methodology may be helpful for next year, that would encourage more visibility of Dynamic Coalition outputs as well as more feedback from other participants. In 2015, one of the techniques that we employed during the session was the trial use of [Idea Rating Sheets](http://www.idearatingsheets.org/). Although the concept enjoyed widespread support during the main session, the lack of resources for publicising and executing the trial, coupled with the limited time between the two main sessions, hampered its success. Particularly, it seems important to note that it has been very challenging to stimulate engagement from participants, due to the sole possibility to express their feedback after the closing of day 3 (*i.e*. when the first half of the session ended) and before the opening of day 4 (*i.e.* when the second half of the session started).

Nonetheless, we consider that the trial was a valid proof of concept and that with further support from the IGF MAG in 2016, as well as a longer lead time and broader outreach to participants, a similar deliberative method of consultation and feedback should be employed again in 2016 with still greater success.

Suggestions for improvements for the 11th IGF meeting in 2016?

Following the Dynamic Coalitions main session, and based upon a suggestion made during that session, a poll was established to gather ideas for improvements in the process if it were to be repeated in the following year. Despite a limited response rate to this poll, the following were the ideas that received support:

* Making the paper Idea Rating Sheets available throughout the IGF week in an accessible place. For example, the sheets could be made available in the IGF Village when the IGF opens, for completion during the week.
* Making the online Idea Rating Sheets available for a longer period in the run-up to the IGF and inviting all registered IGF participants to complete them, even before the IGF opens, and after it is completed with a specific closing date.
* Translating the sheets into the UN and host country languages, so that not only those fluent in English can participate in the exercise.
* ensure that all documentation are accessible for persons with disabilities both online and offline documents to enable participation from all
* More publicity about the exercise, so that participants know what to expect, and are able to take the time to brief themselves on the Dynamic Coalitions' work prior to their arrival at the IGF.
* Expert facilitation of the main session.
* More strategic schedule aimed at maximising participants' feedback
* Allowing secret ballot in order to facilitate freedom of expression. In this regard,  participants' names should not be displayed although names may be required to access the online Idea Rating Sheets.
* Ensure that youth representatives at the IGF have the opportunity to input.
* To have the DC presentations and discussion of their respective outputs integrated so that audience feedback could be directly related to the topic presented (i.e. DC Main Session takes place during one day). This facilitates substantive discussion that can be considered and integrated into the DC going forward.
* If a DC Main Session is split into two parts again the presentations and discussions could be spread evenly between the two sessions to provide fair and equal coverage for those DCs taking part, in such a way that an individual DC is able to both present and receive feedback at the same session. This ensures that the same audience is responding to the DC output on hand.

To these suggestions, we would add that it is important that if we again split the main session into two halves, the first of which is for presentations from the Dynamic Coalitions and the second being for feedback, we would also advocate for a more strategic schedule, allowing either a much longer gap between those half sessions, for instance scheduling the first half on day 1 and the second one on day 3, or a much shorter gap, for instance scheduling the two halves during the same day and simply separating them with a coffee break or lunch break. Having the first half session at the end of day 3 and the second at the start of day 4 was not effective.

It is also worth noting that the Idea Rating Sheets methodology should probably be adapted to be more precisely attuned to the IGF's needs, perhaps with a different name. The inventor of Idea Rating Sheets, ‎Stakeholder Engagement Consultant Jason Diceman, has indicated his possible interest in collaborating with the Dynamic Coalitions on this. Given its importance towards the fulfilment of the IGF's mandate, it would be helpful if some resources could be made available by the IGF Secretariat and/or host country towards the expenses associated with this exercise. More generally, the effectiveness of the outreach efforts of the Dynamic Coalitions' conveners would benefit from a more central consideration of the role of Dynamic Coalitions in the programming of the IGF, and the allocation of specific IGF resources to the coordination of their work.
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