

Representing the ecosystem of Internet -Bharat Model

## IGF Community Public Consultation: Call for Inputs Taking stock of the 2016 work program and 11th IGF, & suggestions for 2017 and 12th IGF

Submitted by: Amrita Choudhury
Director, CCAOI, India
amritachoudhury@ccaoi.in
www.ccaoi.in

At the outset, I thank the IGF Secretariat for providing the opportunity to share inputs and suggestions on IGF Meetings.

Sharing below my personal observations of IGF Mexico 2016 as a remote participant

## The Good

- The quality of the discussions and the range of sessions were good.
- Geneva Internet Platform did an excellent work in providing regular updates and alerts on the sessions and discussion highlights.

## The Bad

- The quality of remote participation needs improvement.
- The attendees of IGF 2016 were predominantly from Europe and America., with very less presence from Asia and Africa.

## **Suggestion for improvement**

- Improvement in the quality of remote participation.
- Allocating substantial time for the remote participants for sharing their views during the discussion. This also calls for better moderation of remote participants.
- Adopting a transparent MAG selection process and clearly stating the role of MAG members.
- To encourage participation from developing nations, there should be more fellowship awarded to support deserving candidates, who have potential to contribute not only in the global IGF process but also build capacity within their countries. Selection of candidates should ensure diversity in representation at IGF meetings.
- The process to submit workshop proposals should be simplified.