



Representing the ecosystem of Internet -Bharat Model

15 Jan, 2019

## **CCAOI comments to the IGF Community Public Consultation: Taking stock of the 2018 work programme and 13th IGF and suggestions for 2019 and 14th IGF**

### **Submitted by:**

Name: Amrita Choudhury  
Stakeholder group: Civil Society  
Region: Asia Pacific  
Organization: [CCAOI](http://www.ccaoi.in)

Whether submitting in your individual capacity: No submitting comments on behalf of CCAOI

At the outset, we thank the IGF Secretariat and the MAG for giving us the opportunity to comment on IGF 2018. Please find below our submission to the questions asked. We look forward to for favorable consideration of the suggestions in the interest improving the 2019 IGF programme.

### **A) Taking Stock of 2018 programming, outputs, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the 13th annual IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?**

#### **CCAOI Response:**

As the venue of the 13<sup>th</sup> annual IGF was decided quite late, many of the processes seemed hurried.

The elimination of Day 0 event, was quite disappointing, since many groups organize side events, meetings on this day, which cannot fit into the official IGF programme. The reduced three days 2018 IGF could not accommodate many of these discussions which have become an integral part of the annual IGF.

The selection of the final sessions and topics for the IGF needs a more nuanced approach to balance all the topics without the content being discussed in the sessions being repetitive, as some of the sessions have been this year.

The content, speakers, etc. for the main and intersessional sessions should be planned well in advance and not left to the last moment. Late preparations, last moment updation of sessions, reflect badly on the session.

With the website being down for a considerable time on the first day, many people were unable to view the program schedule and in many sessions the remote panelists were unable to participate and speak.

The names of the speakers, moderators including their affiliations need to be displayed and shared clearly, for remote participants to understand who the speakers are. Many times the last moment change of speakers do not reflect on the website, causing confusion.

It was also noted that in some sessions, there were no remote moderators to respond to the queries of remote participants. As remote participation allows many people to participate in the IGF process who otherwise would not be able to attend, we urge the IGF secretariat to look into the issue seriously.

**B) What suggestions for improvements could be made for 2019? (Please focus on programming, the outputs preparatory processes, community intersessional activities and improvements for the 14th annual meeting and beyond.)**

**CCAOI Response:**

1. Make sure the topics of the workshop are clearly mentioned, so that the community can submit relevant proposals.
2. While selecting sessions, the discussion points of the session should be evaluated so that repetitive sessions can be removed easily.
3. The main and intersessional sessions should be planned well in advance, in consultation with the community.
4. Make the selection process of sessions more transparent.
5. Ensure the website is accessible to all. In case of issue, provide alternatives in real time basis.
6. Ensure remote moderators are present and active in all sessions and respond to remote participants.
7. During the session clearly provide the names and affiliations of speakers and moderators, especially for remote participants

**C) How could the IGF respond to the recommendations made by the UN Secretary-General during his speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony?**

**CCAOI Response :** No Comments

**D) How could the IGF respond to President Macron's "call for action" made during his speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony?**

**CCAOI Response:**

We believe the community needs to further deliberate whether it is appropriate to respond to one state heads call of action, since IGF follows a multistakeholder process

where all stakeholders, including governments have an equal and collective voice, with no preference given to any single community.

**E) What other organizations/disciplines should the IGF be collaborating with and how/to what purpose?**

**CCAOI Response:**

The objective of the IGF has always been to be a forum encouraging diverse stakeholders participate and share knowledge, discuss policy issues, and ideas. It is a platform where the global community can get together to talk and discuss on issues of importance without the pressure of having to make decisions. Being an open platform individuals, representatives of nation states, business and organizations are free to join the discussions.

We are of the opinion that this unique feature of the IGF should be retained and continued and IGF sticks to its existing mission.

**F) The Secretary-General set up a High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation (HLPDC) to “*identify good examples and propose modalities for working cooperatively across sectors, disciplines and borders to address challenges in the digital age*”**

**1. How can the IGF contribute to the work of the HLPDC to help foster these aims?**

**CCAOI Response:**

The best practices forums final document of IGF 2018, namely the [BPF on Cybersecurity](#); [BPF on Gender & Access](#); [BPF on Internet of Things, Big Data & Artificial Intelligence](#); [BPF on Local Content](#); [CENB IV](#) can contribute as reference documents to the work of the HLPDC

**2. Do you have any specific inputs for the HLPDC in relation to the IGF?**

**CCAOI Response:** None