

**Name: Amitabh Kumar**  
**Organisation: Social Media Matters**  
**Country and Region: Asia-Pacific Group**  
**Date of Submission: 08/01/2020**  
**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.)

This was well managed.

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.

There needs to be a lot more regional conversation. Being from India, I saw a few familiar faces, though the representation was scattered. Also the representation of civil society in the final documents and its process has to be made more accessible and transparent.

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 themes were amazing, but spread across a week. Also many experts were repeated in different panels. Hence attending the whole IGF was not as effective as it could be if better planned. Where days could be dedicated to a particular theme. Also the neck to neck planning of sessions led to some embarrassing discussions amongst scholars. I think the event managers need to space out time between sessions.

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.

Some amazing workshops. Would have been helpful if one could be a viewer to the high level sessions.

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

Amazing people

1.6 IGF 2019 village

Truly luxurious, thank you for providing the free public transport pass.

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

Very Well managed.

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

Amazing. Special mention to the security, extremely courteous staff.

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

## **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.)

Please ensure there is global representation. 2019 was very China heavy.

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

Needs better planning, to ensure different groups work together, also intergenerational learning needs to be focused upon.

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

Simpler structure as compared to 2019. Thematic days. Also keeping a standard length of session ensures easier organization.

## 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?

Yes. Safety, Digital Inclusion and Security.

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

There should be many more thematic workshops. Also having diverse speakers is important, the same expert on 10 panels is just repetitive and not productive.

## 2.6 IGF 2020 Participants

Global representation. The global south was minimal in 2019. Wish to see many more faces from South America, Africa and Asia.

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

looking forward to it.