

**Ms. June Parris (*in personal capacity*)**  
**Research Associate at Halaqah Media**  
**Barbados, Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)**

**Date of Submission: 27/12/2019**

## **Taking Stock of IGF 2019 and Inputs for IGF 2020**

### **Feedback:**

Berlin IGF was the best that I attended, it was well done and well attended. It was inclusive as youth was funded, and I saw wheelchair attendees and a blind attendee, youth volunteers were also assisting those with disabilities.

Most of the MAG did a good job, but in submitting main sessions some of those who helped they were left out in the final documents and reporting. There was only one main session that all those involved were mentioned. To me this is exclusion and favouritism. Those in The global south were hardly mentioned. Ideas were shared but not acknowledged.

Workshop submissions were favoured. I believe also that most that were submitted were copied and pasted. The process of scoring did not exclude subjectivity, and some were scored on those who know the people who submitted. I personally received an email asking me to favour a submission. We need to find a better way to score that is not too difficult, the remarks section was completed, therefore some really good workshops were excluded. The problem is MAG has to be in agreement and sometimes good ideas are thrown out.

I received complaints that everyone was saying the same thing, this makes me suspicious that some were copied and pasted. Therefore repetitive. Although having 3 themes only was a good idea, it limited ideas in a way as well.

There were too many main sessions, we need to condense this and only have 5 main sessions, one a day in the morning only. That way we won't overlap, like I did. Introductory and closing sessions was also a new and though full idea, but they must not overlap with the main sessions. Day 0 should be the first and the last day in the afternoon before the closing session.

The opening session was well done, with the MAG sitting at the front and seats reserved. However Parliamentarians need to be more involved with both opening and closing sessions and introductory and closing sessions. MAG should have had access to those who were funded in some way to facilitate speakers and moderators, perhaps then youth would have had more involvement.

The Youth complained the 6 were not involved, a youth representative needs to be invited to meetings, the website is complicated and a lot of people cannot understand how it works. In order to sign up as resource persons and things such as donors. Although I believe Youth are not really resourceful, and do not do groundwork. Perhaps some nuts and bolts sessions should be introduced, the secretariat can do this and invite the public to attend online.

As the introduction to the IGF did not come off, some ground work was lost. Introductory sessions could not really fill the role of the ABC of the IGF. Internet governance needs to be explained in depth, hopefully in Poland.

I find no fault with booths, they were well laid out, but can we number them for next year, with limited time between sessions, one cannot search. A big fat NUMBER 1-50 would make it clearer.

Security, meals and entertainment were well done, I give a #10.

Prior to the start of the IGF communication was faulty. I shared information to my W/G when I found out anything, but some information was kept close to the chest and not shared. Creating some level of anxiety and frustration. It all worked out in the end.

Work groups need to share the work in the future, there should be some way of monitoring this by the secretariat.

Staffing at the secretariat needs to increase at the beginning of the year and interns trained up to take on certain roles.