Name: Fotjon Kosta
Organisation: Albania IGF
Country and Region: Eastern European Group
Date of Submission: 10/01/2020
Stakeholder Group: Civil Society

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.)

Preparatory process was ok i believe that was enough time but people and organizations sometimes needs more time as they have not so much time due to other work responsibilities and contributions

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.

in our opinion were good organized but needs it the national , regional and youth IGFs to provide more efforts in intersession activities as also as in workshop/sessions proposals

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)

the overall programme structure and flow was very well structured and organized.

Albania IGF it was part of cyber security session and we believe that this session was with the high interesting .

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.

I do not have a lot of comments on this question due to, i did not participate in person in this year IGF and i have follow just a few sessions online. And also we have not any feedback from participant of Albania in this year IGF.

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

IGF 2019 had a very big number of participants world wide.
Some participant from South Eastern Europe mentions that National IGFs (at least coordinators) from Western Balkans Countries Missing from the event due to financial and other issues.
Maybe it will need in the next IGF 2020 to cover expenses for at least one representative from WB , in order just this region to be represented.

1.6 IGF 2019 village

n/a

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

great as always

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

n/a

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

2. What are your suggestions for improvements for 2020?

2.1 <u>Preparatory process (timeline, call for workshop proposals, workshop selection, MAG and OC meetings etc.)</u>

> the session time line maybe could be longer as in cybersecurity session that is very wide and inclusive needs more time to cove discussions and hot topics from country to country and region to region

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

> maybe we need to create a methodology for better connection National , regional and youth IGFs with each other.

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

> well structure and flow no comments

2.4 <u>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?</u>

> we can propose:
>
> digital transformation
> Digital Skills
> Digital Economy
> Trust and Security

2.5 <u>Programme content (workshops, main sessions, high level sessions, open forums, speakers)</u>

workshops organizers from 2-3 NRIs/Org/Proposals
Main session 4 as are the thematic tracks
high level sessions 1-3 (UN members, Ministerial Level, and International Organization Level)

2.6 IGF 2020 <u>Participants</u>

To make the appropriate efforts financially to be in person least all National, regional and Youth IGFs coordinators/representatives. NRIs should be all in person in Annual IGF as this is the most important event for them and whole community as NRIs coordinators/representatives participate in the Annual IGF in order to provide the voice of its community and need to be represented and after all the experiences and information gain there spread it to the national community.

and for example if will not be possible to support all them they have to support at least one from regions as e.i South Eastern Europe or Western Balkans regions in order at least the region to be represented.

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020