

**Name: Muriel ALAPINI**  
**Organisation: FGI BENIN**  
**Country and Region: African Group**  
**Stakeholder Group: Civil Society**  
**Date of Submission: 07/01/2020**

## **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.)

As I did not take part in the preparations for this edition, I cannot comment. However, having proposed a session, I think it would be good if the call for proposals started early.

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.

I attended several of these sessions. It would be good if for the next edition, these sessions have more time to allow for further and more productive discussions. If possible, include two other languages for translation.

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)

these themes being broad, space was given to many sessions, some of which were somewhat scattered

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.

each type of session responded to a very specific framework. The speakers had control over their subjects. Interesting discussions but the time was insufficient

### 1.5 IGF 2019 participants

Very friendly

### 1.6 IGF 2019 village

A lot of booth

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

overall, good communication

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

more precise communication to help with travel preparations, especially for obtaining a visa.

### 1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

Great experience

## 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.)

If this procedure can start right after the January consultations with about six weeks of preparation to receive the proposals. Let the themes be a little more precise to allow more

inclusive sessions.

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

It would be good if these sessions were the priority for a better sharing of experiences and good practices.

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

Reduce the number of sessions to make the timetable more fluid and encourage better exchanges

## 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?

these themes can be kept but with details

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

Community intersessional activities as priority and reduce the others sessions.

## 2.6 IGF 2020 Participants

More women

## 2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

