

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

Submission by **Arsene Tungali**,

On behalf of the [Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus](#) - IGC

This is a collaborative work with contributions from the individual members whose names are as follow:

- Arsene Tungali, DRC
- Yolanda Mlonzi, South Africa
- Carlos Vera, LAC
- Chennai Chair, South Africa
- Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Brazil
- Mahamat Adam Seid, Chad

All IGF stakeholders were invited to submit inputs to the IGF Secretariat related to the following questions:

A) Taking Stock of 2016 programming, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the 11th annual IGF:

1.

What worked well?

- Transportation from hotels to the venue and vice versa
- Internet connection was really good at any area at the venue
- Mexico was great with Uber working very well allowing people to easily move from one place to another
- The main session room, (almost) everyone had a place to sit during the opening session
- Mexico was a very affordable country in terms of getting around and buying local foods
- The IGF volunteers were really helpful in all respects, especially the lost and found desk as well as showing directions to different meeting rooms
- Most volunteers were bilingual. This helped a lot.
- The crowd control and security checks: Getting into the venue on the first day was easy and the service was quick and efficient. Compared to Brazil, this was fast and delegates were not left under the heat of the morning sun.
- There were alternative eating options close to the venue
- Areas that one could have side meetings were very useful
- Remote participation was a topic that gathered a lot of attention, having workshops on it and increasingly interested parties online participating

- Programme of the IGF is increasingly becoming more flexible with innovative formats sessions like unconference and lightning talks. Apparently community is also interested in MAG process selection so maybe this should also follow this integration of the community in choosing who will do IGF programme.
- Workshop selection process has a working group now. This is an interesting point also for community involvement.
- Interaction between IGF and other spaces like WTO and CSTD increased and became more transparent through exchange of debates.
- Capacity building initiatives in IGF were major players like IG Academy, Diplo and SIGs ever more present.
- BPF Gender entered its 2nd year and took requests for a 3rd year already in the closing ceremony, proving intersessional can have more than year long consistency
- Gender Report Card helped gender diversity on panels and got adopted by NRIs like the APrIGF

What worked not so well?

- Even though there were bus shuttles to the venue, the lack of flexibility on shuttle times was a constraint. The previous Global IGF in Brazil was much more flexible and accommodating regarding shuttle times
- Buying of meal vouchers: This could have been communicated well in advance on the IGF website (or did I miss it?)
- The workshop rooms were a bit too small
- Workshop room set up sometimes hindered having a more interactive session when one had proposed a fishbowl format and they would be in a room better for a panel
- The rooms were spread out and one could miss a session coming from one to another one. Compared to Brazil, it was more complicated.
- Changes in programme and rooms and lack of updated info on rooms and other locations make difficult to find the right places. Some on line, real time info on screens would be very useful
- The NCUC booth does not work as a meeting point or to get some people more involved. Every people that knows better NCUC were always busy.
- There are no more participation of some governments.

B) Suggestions for improvements in 2017? (programming, preparatory processes, community intersessional activities and improvements for 12th annual meeting)

- Real time info on screens and real time notifications through an app for smartphones for participants
- Planned informative sessions on NCUC with schedules
- Better planning for meetings so speakers are diverse
- Translation on rooms and not only on main locations
- Allocation of rooms according to session types
- Better communication on logistics of IGF
- Better facilitation on remote participation

- Better implication for all multistakeholder in meeting,

As IGC Co-coordinator, I would like to thank those members who took their time to formulate their thoughts using this form.