

Name: Carlos Afonso
Organisation: Instituto Nupef
Country and Region: Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)
Date of Submission: 12/01/2020
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 is a recurring theme since the beginning of the IGF process: too many workshops, challenges in the methodology to select them, uncertainty in the capacity of proponents to deal with the theme etc. Doing several online meetings was an interesting process, and I think it worked well, although I think MAG members should better prepare (technically) for effective participation.

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.

This is a difficult issue to provide an opinion about, since it has been nearly impossible to be present in the many DCs and other intersessional activities. Speaking of the BPF on local content in which I participated as co-facilitator and session co-moderator, I think

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)

Reducing the number of tracks was a good idea. However, we'll need to be more careful in defining the specific themes in each track, to help workshop proponents to better understand the intended scope in each.

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 agree with the opinion expressed in some responses here that there were too many main sessions. Not sure if it is viable to consider (again!) a reduction in the number of approved workshops -- but I agree that the selection method needs improvements.

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

Will have to look at the statistics.

1.6 IGF 2019 village

Perhaps better signaling to help find the specific booths.

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

This would be a question better answered by people outside the organizing process, as the ones directly involved in a way or another had plenty of information.

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

In general, impeccable. As a half-deaf person, I was particularly well impressed by the excellent quality of the audio systems in the rooms, whatever their sizes.

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.)

I think I already indicated some suggestions in the taking stock portion of this questionnaire.

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

In general the intersessional processes need to be strengthened, as they provide a fantastic output to enrich the dialogue at the IGF itself. It would be crucial to insist with the NRIs to try and organized their events before the main IGF, to make sure they can bring their precious conclusions and recommendations to the main event. In some DCs which involve complex technologies, I would recommend an effort to bring more advanced scientists/techies to deepen the quality of the dialogues and recommendations.

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

There are suggestions to reduce the number of main sessions, and seems to be a good idea.

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?

At this point, I would keep the tracks as they are, but further discussions in the MAG may bring new ideas.

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

In general, perhaps we should find a critical time span for speeches -- define the number of main speakers so that a least, say, 10 minutes is available for each one, and at least half of the session time is reserved for interaction with the audience. This for sure will reduce the number of main talkers in most cases.

2.6 IGF 2020 Participants

n/c

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

n/c