Name: Bruna Martins dos Santos
Organisation: Coding Rights
Country and Region: Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)
Date of Submission: 10/01/2020
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.)

> The MAG has improved a lot the preparatory process, with the definition of more proper deadlines for tracks delimitations and workshop proposals.

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.

> We are also content with the Intersessional activities situation, although it continues to be an issue the timeline for hiring the consultants for the BPF work. In 2019 the consultants were hired sooner, but considering that the BPF work relies a lot in this decision, it would be ideal for this process to be defined by February or March the latest. Otherwise, considering that some bpf can get a new consultant each year the time taken to onboard the new person can imply on the intersessional work starting a bit later.
>
> Another issue was the inclusion of the Legislators at the event, at the same time it is very much appreciated the intention of including high-level policy/law makers at the annual Event, the IGF community could take more profit of such initiative if legislators were included also at the NRIs. At least in the brazilian case, the parliamentarians present at the event were considerably disconnected from the Internet Governance debate in their country and region. The NRIs could play a stronger part in helping select these parliamentarians and also be more transparent about the selections to their local communities. As a result of such process, the brazilian congress turned out to be represented by far right-oriented politicians whose work is - inevitably - affecting a free and open Internet in the country.

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)

Stablishing thematic tracks is indeed a decision that has improved a lot the flux of information around the sessions and also newcomers and other attendees to be more oriented at the onsite meetings. Despite that, the tracks selected for the 2019 edition were too oriented around personal data discussions, lacking more horizontal discussions such as gender - for an example.

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.

IGF 2019 had an increased level of discussions and the addition of an opening and closing session per track also helped a lot in following the discussions, this was definitely an improvement.

1.5 IGF 2019 participants

Ok.

1.6 IGF 2019 village

ok.

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

ok.

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

In our case we faced a situation of intimidation/harassment by the locally contracted security

team. After contributing to one of the parliamentarian sessions - by taking the mic to politely and diplomaticaly provide a question to one of the IGF funded Parliamentarian from Brazil -, some civil society members ended up being followed by the security team and one of them even attempted at identifying them.

While attendees security should be a concern for any of the host countries, IGF should ensure that the onsite event also enables a harassment-free environment (besides enforcing an anti-harassment policy). It has also come to our attention that this event was not an isolated one as other members of civil society also faced some intimidation.

1.9 Any other comments on the IGF 2019

We should also have clearer rules for attendees privacy. Considering that some civil society participants might come from more hostile regimes/governments we should consider enabling the possibility of privacy oriented badges or even for us to opt out of being in pictures or footage.

In my case, the Brazilian Parliamentarian to which I politely provided a question at one of the sessions, edited a video from the IGF live trasmission that also contained my image in it and even resulted in mockery at the comments. This is a concern because such parliamentarian is followed by a network of actors responsible for actions such as gender-based violence online and spread of hate speech.

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.)

--

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

--

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

> Continuing with the opening and closing sessions for each of the tracks.

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>

> The thematic tracks definitely help shape the program and session proposals process.

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

> If the IGF continues to invite Parliamentarians to its onsite meetings, their programme should be more integrated at the general discussions and sessions. While the initiative is highly appreciated, we should come up with more participatory ways of selecting which parliamentarians are being invited or attending the IGF in order to provide a more balanced political representation.

2.6 IGF 2020 <u>Participants</u>

> IGF should ensure that the onsite event also enables a harassment-free environment and the community should discuss an anti-harassment policy for online and onsite participation.

2.7 Any other comments on the IGF 2020

> We should consider enabling the possibility of privacy oriented badges or even for us to opt out of being in pictures or footage.