Name: Nadira ALARAJ
Organisation: Self employed
Country and Region: Eastern European Group
Stakeholder Group: Civil Society
Date of Submission: 06/01/2020

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.)

> It would be good to move the event to October for 2021 because it is already announced for IGF 2020.

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.

> Seems the BPF and DC are being lost in the wider details. Repeating same discussions from previous years although the title is different.
> There is need to consolidate the work into substantial actions.
> Combining groups together

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)

> I liked the moderate number of workshops.
> In previous years, too many workshops makes the participants lost of selecting what workshops or session to attend. In general most of the sessions I participated in were of value discussions.

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 followed the track of data governance session.
Some workshops were well prepared and added value to the participants while others were not up to the standard of IGF workshops.

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

This year, inviting parliamentarians was an excellent move. Particularly when engaged in the group discussions.

1.6 IGF 2019 village

One room has less traffic than the other.

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

Excellent and timely

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

Awesome, to have ITU style of feeding all the participants.

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

To encourage more workshop from under representative regions

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.)

Allocate at least one workshop from under representative regions such as the Middle East and APAC, LAC

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

Focus on Youth IGF in terms of capacity building
Must have focus on the Middle East because it lacks of the introduction of IG.

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

Keep the same application

2.4 <u>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?</u>

Emerging technologies and their governance

2.5 <u>Programme content (workshops, main sessions, high level sessions, open forums, speakers)</u>

Narrow the format of sessions because as participants you can't find a difference in the format.
Or give examples to the different successful session formats

2.6 IGF 2020 <u>Participants</u>

Do have an invite to government officials to be habe more discussions with civil society.

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020