

## IGF Consultations: IGF 2017 Taking Stock

February 2018

We would like to compliment the Switzerland and the IGF Secretariat for their work and efficiency in organizing IGF 2017. Below is some feedback on IGF 2017. We plan to present additional suggestions at the next MAG meeting in March 2018 in order to improve the IGF.

### A) Taking Stock of 2017 programming, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the 12th annual IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?

#### > What worked well

##### Substantive discussions

- Successful work of BPFs and CENB III: following the WSIS+10 review process and the recommendations from the CSTD for the improvement of the IGF, important work has been done to generate tangible outputs through the Best Practice Forum process and the policy options for Connecting the Next Billion. The continuity of both formats delivering tangible outcomes each year has proven to be a successful way to demonstrate the value of the inclusive, bottom up and multistakeholder approach of the IGF. The MAG decision to focus the work of the BPFs on only 3 themes the CENB track on only 3 SDGs was critical to create concise and yet useful results.

##### Schedule, Logistics & Operations

- The open High Level panel on Day 1, in replacement of the former closed High Level Day 0, organized by the Swiss hosts was an improvement. This format allows more interaction with the community and yet brings the key messages from government and key players.
- The size of the workshop rooms was good as it allowed to accommodate a large audience.
- The availability of a central coffee/food area throughout the day was appreciated to accommodate different schedules; as well as being key for attendants to find each other for side meetings.

#### > What could be improved

##### Schedule & Content

- The agenda covered too many topics which gave an impression of lack of focus. Many workshops overlapped in terms of content.



- Some sessions seemed to not have been prepared: lack of clarity of the objectives, lack of opportunities to speak from the audience.
- **Logistics & Operations**
- There was very limited participation of high-level governmental officials and industry representatives.
- The IGF Village was poorly equipped and badly distributed which did not allow more interactions.
- The bilateral rooms were difficult to find and the numbering system was not useful to identify the correct location.
- Having a different venue for Day 0 generated delays. Participants had to register and pick up the badges at UN and then move to the CICC.

## B) Suggestions to improve the IGF

### **Session formats & agenda shaping**

- We invite MAG members as they develop the program to be selective and reduce the number of workshops and sessions. The agenda also needs to be more focused.
- We also encourage to continue the intersessional activities: BPFs and CENB, with a focus on the link between ICTs and SDGs.
- More creative formats for discussion should be explored.
- Include a tech portion in Day 0 for hands-on training such as IXPs, CNs, IPv6, using Raspberry Pi's, etc.