ICC BASIS input to
Taking Stock of IGF 2019 and Call for Inputs for IGF 2020

1. Preparatory process (timeline, call for workshop proposals, workshop selection, MAG meetings etc.) *

- The professionalism and support of the staff working at the IGF Secretariat was appreciated both on the ground as well as in the run-up to IGF 2019.
- The IGF host country website was launched well ahead of the event and contained comprehensive information, presented in a user-friendly and creative manner. Efforts should be made to better coordinate host country communication activities with those of the IGF Secretariat so that a wider audience can be reached.
- Thanks to a timely announcement of the host country and MAG composition, sufficient time was allocated to the preparatory process, that allowed for thorough discussions ahead of important decisions. However, some crucial elements of the programme, especially some of those that were novelties this year were left to the last minute (opening and closing sessions for the tracks, newcomers' session, feedback process on workshops) which fuelled some uncertainty at times and diminished effectiveness. Efforts should be made to communicate the planning process ahead of time with a clear timeline and guidelines so that prospective participants are aware of the process and well informed about the various opportunities to contribute.

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. *

- The intersessional work of the BPFs on Cybersecurity, Local Content, Gender and Access, and on Internet of Things, Big Data & Artificial Intelligence, are strong examples of how the IGF can gather, catalogue, and share valuable tangible outputs without being prescriptive.
- Efforts to archive the outputs of the intersessional work streams and BPF documents and publish them on the IGF website are appreciated. They should continue to be promoted in a manner that is accessible and searchable to the lay user who may not be familiar with the IGF and its structure (or indeed with the terminology of "BPFs").
- Continued efforts should be made to better target communication and promotion efforts of these outputs. The targeted communications of the BPF on Cybersecurity to share their work widely and contribute to ongoing work in other venues is an example to be followed.

IGF 2019 overall programme structure and flow (in particular the three thematic tracks: digital inclusion; data governance; and security, safety, stability and resilience) *

- The overarching theme of IGF 2019 (One world. One net. One vision), while broad enough to include dialogue on major global Internet governance issues, was chosen with little community input.
- Concentrating the IGF programme into three thematic tracks was a very welcome idea and translated well into the final programme of the IGF, making it more digestible

and navigable for participants and also helping communication efforts ahead of the annual meeting, especially for first-time participants.

- The opportunity for the community to be consulted on issues to be discussed at the IGF through a call for issues was a welcome idea and should be continued. This aligns well with the bottom-up, open nature of the IGF.
- The MAG, Secretariat and host country worked well together in distilling community suggestions on IGF issues into sub-themes / tracks. The implementation of this idea should be translated into a formalized process going forward and communicated ahead, so that the community can accurately be informed on process and be ensured the programme reflects their responses to any calls for issues.
- Aligning workshop proposals under the three thematic tracks worked well and was helpful to the MAG in choosing workshops and defining sub-themes under each track. It would be a welcome addition if the programme schedule featured those sub-themes in tags.
- Efforts should be continued to align other sessions that are part of the official IGF programme (Open Forums, DCs, BPFs, NRI collaborative sessions, etc.) under the thematic tracks, from the start of the submission and evaluation process.
- Day 0 is a valuable part of the IGF, with its different status and nature, and the ability it provides for groups to propose formats and sessions which do not necessarily need to conform to the structure of the rest of the IGF week. It also offers an opportunity for networking and stocktaking to prepare for the week ahead.
- This year the host country, together with local stakeholders, made considerable and very welcome efforts to raise the impact of Day 0 by inviting high-level representatives of all stakeholder groups and showcasing the open and multistakeholder nature of the IGF and the value of such discussion, in a series of high-level sessions.
- To ensure that Day 0 continues to fulfil its potential going forward, the MAG should be informed and consulted on the goal, structure and composition of the Day 0 events, as part of the IGF programme discussion. With the host government responsible for organizing Day 0, the consultation of the MAG could both increase transparency to the community of Day 0 plans, and also provide helpful guidance to the host government, which might not be as familiar with the annual IGF meetings.

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. *

Main sessions

- The Main Sessions play a useful role in the programme of providing a space for a potentially different, e.g. broader, level of discussion and bringing in more high-level speakers. In this way, they help extend appeal to non-IGF regulars and in particular government and business, where attendance has been historically lower. It worked well that Main Sessions were oriented to meaningful exchanges on topics of broad interest, especially those that focused on practical examples of applying policy or practices to address challenges and allow for capacity building across the range of discussants and participants, thereby reinforcing the commitment to the multistakeholder approach.

- It was also welcomed that the Main Sessions allowed for some discussions which did not fit neatly into the three thematic tracks, such as those on Digital Cooperation and on Governance Challenges in the Digital Age.
- Two hours / session seemed to be the right amount of time to allow for a deeper dive into discussions and allow for audience input, while still maintaining the interest of participants throughout the session.
- Providing synergies between BPFs and main sessions (for example the main session on *Applying human rights and ethics in responsible data governance and AI*) also gave an extra opportunity to raise the visibility and impact of their work. The work and outputs of different BPFs was also well presented in workshops, thereby forfeiting the need to have allocated main session slot for these intersessional activities.

Workshops
- The workshop proposal and selection process was well organized. However, many IGF attendees noted they were unaware of the possibility of organizing workshops or the speaking opportunities this provides.
- The thematic approach helped reduce the number of workshops on the same topics.
- Some sessions worked well because they combined people able to give global, policy perspectives with others able to share more operational perspectives as they are deployed on the ground.
- A number of workshops and other sessions were lacking in balance and diversity in terms of speakers, with one or more stakeholder groups not represented at all in the discussion.
- The workshop rooms provided an open and comfortable setting for discussions. However, on some occasions, rooms were not fit for the more innovative formats (e.g. break-out discussions or fishbowl sessions).

IGF 2019 participants *
- At over 3500 onsite delegates participating, the attendance of this year's event reached a new record high and seems to have overcome the downward trend of the past five years.
- Remote participation is also at a new high with 3000 registered participants reported and 55 remote hubs organized, although more detailed statistics would be helpful in noting actual remote attendance of sessions.
- The remote-participation tools made available, worked smoothly and session organizers and moderators were successful in including remote participants in their sessions. The work of the technical support staff was excellent in supporting this. It is important that the IGF continues to encourage and support remote participation to improve inclusivity and diversity.
- The efforts of the host country to attract government officials, legislators and business participants, as well as supporting the participation of participants from the global south, were very well received by the community.
- While participation of government and business representatives has improved slightly, efforts need to continue to attract these stakeholders groups to future editions of the IGF.

IGF 2019 village *

- The IGF village was very well equipped, the booths were professionally set up and designed, offered plenty of storage space as well as ample space for quick meetings and discussions.
- The efforts of taking the IGF 'paperless' were commendable, however this did not work well in practice. Participants did not seem to make much use of the QR codes provided.
- There is a need to improve communication and guidelines on material that participants might wish to include in IGF tote bags, so that exhibitors can plan for the efficient use of their resources.
- The shipment of materials to and from the venue was very well organized and communication with the service provider worked seamlessly.

IGF 2019 communications, outreach and outputs *

- Showcasing the various IGF outputs in quasi real-time on the IGF website was very welcome and useful to demonstrate the value IGF discussions bring to the community. Capturing and promoting them successfully helps increase the reach of these conversations beyond the IGF session participants.
- The host country made commendable efforts to attract journalists and local media, which helped boost the visibility of the IGF help to secure a place for the issues discussed on the agenda of participants from all stakeholder groups.
- The IGF messages report has an important role in bridging consecutive IGF cycles and highlighting the various IGF outputs. Efforts should be made to better inform participants on the process of drafting of the messages and how their session summaries contribute to the final IGF messages. Sharing such information with session participants helps improve the balance in participation, which in turn increases the legitimacy of messages.
- There is an increasing need to raise wider awareness of current IGF outputs and support their better dissemination.
- Further discussion should be encouraged on what defines success for the IGF, what is meant by tangible outputs and what problem the outputs are intended to address in the field of Internet governance, including within the context of the Tunis Agenda.
- The IGF Secretariat should develop a work plan to identify, gather and better market existing outputs of the IGF. This would roughly follow the steps below:
    - Identify current outputs and outcomes, both written products and success stories of collaboration / impact
    - Organize and cross-reference these by topic, and possibly with tags, so that these can be easily searched
    - Identify potential audiences
    - Marketing, outreach and communication
- This work plan should be supported by a timeline, an analysis of required resources and responsibilities, and indicators and measures of success. The Secretariat should be equipped with resources to be able to execute this plan. This was a consensus view held at the IGF Retreat in 2016.
- To improve the marketing of IGF outputs, the following should be considered:
    - Pare down intersessional work streams to allow for more concentrated effort and better support for selected work

- Task the IGF Secretariat (not a recurring MAG Working Group on Outreach and Communication) with outreach efforts and dissemination of existing outputs (policy material, reports, and case studies of successful cooperation/projects that rooted in IGF meetings and discussions). Guest blogs or interviews about IGF success stories.
        - Equip IGF participants with a communications / social media toolbox or guidance on how they can help disseminate messages. This would help increase outreach and enable participants to act as multipliers to official IGF communication.
    - The legitimacy, accountability and balance of IGF outputs must be held to the highest standards:
        - The balance of stakeholders needs to be maintained in every work stream of the IGF in order not to undermine their legitimacy, and to implement the multistakeholder approach which is intrinsic to the IGF
        - Outputs of any intersessional work must ensure accurate reflection of all opinions
        - The MAG should consider ways to raise profile of the IGF and strengthen the participation of underrepresented groups and regions and enhance the credibility of IGF work streams by addressing their balance and ensuring representation of regions and stakeholders.

IGF 2019 logistics (venue, catering, security, registration etc.) *
- The IGF venue was well suited to accommodate the large number of participants, the various sessions and meetings.
- Staff in the conference centre was outstanding, extremely helpful and efficient. The professionalism and enthusiasm of the volunteers is to be commended.
- The lunches and refreshments were of very high quality and plentiful, their distribution went smoothly, even considering the large number of attendees. Participants appreciated having these offered at no cost. It was also appreciated to have take-away options at lunch, for those who had meetings or other activities scheduled over lunchtime.
- The Internet connection managed to keep up with the demand of participants, with small challenges at times.
- Bilateral rooms were well-suited for closed meetings and in-depth conversations. Host country organizers should clarify with the IGF staff the room names and numbers reserved for private meetings in the venue, and last-minute room changes should be avoided.
- The host country made a laudable effort in providing interpretation. It was also appreciated to have "overflow spaces and screens" for the high-interest sessions.

Any other comments on the IGF 2019
- N/A

What are your suggestions for improvements for IGF 2020?

Preparatory process (timeline, call for workshop proposals, workshop selection, MAG and OC meetings etc.) *

- There is an increasing need for a clear and easily understandable process, through which the community can contribute to the IGF agenda in a bottom-up fashion. A calendar and a visual representation of the process, such as an updated version of the [IGF Programme Framework Chart](#), would be welcome to outline the planning cycle for the IGF in a simple, yet comprehensive format, to illustrate the agenda and programme-setting process and mark deadlines and engagement points for the community.
- The IGF Programme framework, including improvements made in 2019, should be used as a base for the preparatory process in 2020 and should be further strengthened through clear measures of success, standards of work, and a critical number of people committed to lead/support the activity across all stakeholder groups. This would require an analysis of required resources and responsibilities, including of the Secretariat and any consultants, to ensure that any initiated work (traditionally part of the IGF or newly proposed) will be successful. There should also be clear mandates of authorization for each intersessional work stream.

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

- The increasing number of IGF-related activities throughout the year is creating confusion and can lead to fragmentation. If new initiatives are proposed, without building on past or reaching out to concurrent work on the same or related topics (where available and relevant), then the community becomes increasingly fragmented.
- IGF resources are not as unlimited as the appetite for groups to come together to work on new issues. The MAG should discuss and consider a mechanism to anticipate how to deal with the increased interest in DCs, BPFs, NRIs as well as MAG working groups. These activities all compete for the same limited IGF staff support, and at times stakeholder representatives' support, all of which only stretch so thin.
- A turnover policy should be considered, activities that have reached their goals or have lost the support of the community should be sunsetted to allow resources for new ones.
- There is value in exploring new and innovative ideas, but this should be about quality over quantity – there needs to be a clear focus on the quality and strategic goals of such activities.
- In addition, efforts should be made to ensure that any new activity has not just the interest, but the active support and foreseeable engagement of a critical mass of people from the wider IGF community, and particular attention is paid to stakeholder, regional and gender balance.

Overall programme structure and flow. In particular, do you think there should be thematic tracks as there were in 2019? If so, what themes do you suggest the IGF prioritises? 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? *

- Concentrating the IGF programme into three thematic tracks was a very welcome idea and translated well into the final programme of the IGF. The idea of three (or a very a small number of) thematic tracks should be maintained going forward to help streamline the agenda.
- It is important to consult the broader IGF community on issues to be discussed at the IGF (through a call for issues, for example). This input should inform the MAG's decision on the topics for thematic tracks.
- Aligning workshop proposals under the three thematic tracks worked well. Efforts should be continued to align other sessions that are part of the official IGF programme (Open Forums, DCs, BPFs, NRI collaborative sessions, etc.) under the thematic tracks, from the start of the submission and evaluation process.
- To ensure that Day 0 continues to fulfil its potential going forward, there needs to be discussion on the goal, structure and composition of Day 0 with input from the MAG, and also transparency on the events, at least to all MAG members, as part of the IGF programme discussion. With the host government responsible for organizing Day 0, such a discussion within the MAG could also provide helpful guidance to the host government, which might not be as familiar with the annual IGF meetings.
- An exchange between past and future host countries and MAG members on potential improvements and ideas for both Day 0 and the overall IGF programme would be welcome.

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

- IGF communities and intersessional work should continue to be included in collaborative main sessions on topics of interest and relevance to them, to contribute to a more cohesive and thematic agenda, as well as overall a more collegial atmosphere.
- Clearer guidelines are needed both for the proposers and evaluators of the timeline and the process of how session proposals finally make it onto the programme of the annual meeting (tracks, sub-themes, etc.). Clearer guidelines are also needed on how other sessions (open forums, DC and NRI sessions) fit into the thematic programme, as well as on their evaluation.
- A reinforced communication campaign would be helpful ahead of the workshop proposal process to ensure those new to the IGF are aware of the various possibilities to be actively involved in the upcoming IGF well in advance of the annual meeting.
- Efforts should be made to ensure a more balanced representation of stakeholders among accepted workshops, as well as among the workshop speakers. An analysis by the IGF Secretariat of the data related to speakers in IGF 2019 workshops and sessions could be helpful for the MAG to reflect on how the workshop evaluation process could be adjusted to better address this for IGF 2020. It could also prove helpful to better understand the diversity of participation in other sessions.

IGF 2020 participants *

- Efforts need to continue to attract government and business stakeholders to the IGF. Participation of high-level policymakers drives interest from their counterparts from other regions and stakeholder groups. Efforts should be made to continue the trend started in Paris and improved in Berlin, for the involvement of top-level actors.
- Efforts should be made to avoid organizing the IGF at the same time as international Internet-related policy events or major holidays.

Any other comments on the IGF 2020

- N/A