

Name: Federica Tortorella

Organisation: ISOC DO|

Country and Region: Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)

Date of Submission: 29/12/2019

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.)

I think all the process has been quite good.

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 my case I didn't attended those kind of sessions

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)

Definitely a great diversity in content. I found very interesting the different sessions and the way they were focused on the subjects.

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 have no complains about that

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

A huge variety, but I think we need more people from academy and keep involving government

1.6 IGF 2019 village

Very good.

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

Very good.

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

Definitely the best IGF I've been

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

Please pay attention to the quality of translation. In my case, my speech was in Spanish but when I heard the recorded video, unfortunately it lost its meaning and context.

2. What are your suggestions for improvements for 2020?

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

I think we could be less flexible with deadlines.

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

I have no complains about how it is working.

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

I have no complains nor suggestions.

2.4 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?

I think we should keep those tracks in order to see how different countries and organizations are using the inputs they received in the igf sessions. Something like "ok, you were at the igf last year. this year which projects are you developing, what are you doing based on what you learn or explained in the session you attended?"

2.5 Programme content (workshops, main sessions, high level sessions, open forums, speakers)

I think we should improve the selection of some sessions. Check the content of the speeches of the different speakers.

2.6 IGF 2020 Participants

more government and academy staff, please.

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

Please improve the quality of the translations.