A) Taking Stock of 2016 programming, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the 11th annual IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?

Worked well
1. New sessions format were very effective
2. New tracking system was excellent
3. Booths of Dynamic coalition was an interesting and needs more collaborative approach
4. Best Practice forum are progressing
5. NRI groups has progress with exponentially further more concert intervention required
6. Better integration of communication in terms of young coordinators looks promising
7. Development of toolkits looks promising

Worked not so well
1. Needs better Social media & digital reputation strategy
2. Next generation leaders need more focus (#youthonthetable)
3. Remote participation was limited (Remote moderator requires training & monitoring)
4. More proposals were led by developed nation experts (Same people leading same topics)
5. Lack of standardization in terms of topics proposal (Proposal selection committee needs to work on possibility of diversity and dynamics)
6. Discussion Issues were more radicalized, we need to find a common point specially with issue of gender equality and sexuality
7. Lack of Balance of participation from regional as well as stakeholder perspective
8. MAG membership needs more integration from least develop countries
9. Dynamic collation groups and members are more focused towards their own nations and region so open survey and research should be integrated as of national level

B) Suggestions for improvements in 2017? (programming, preparatory processes, community intersessional activities and improvements for 12th annual meeting)

1. Remote participation needs, proper monitoring & mechanisms. People on the other side either should be given a chance to speak or their message needs to be displayed after moderation on a big screen mandatory.

2. During proposal selection the MAG nomination team should consider diversity. As of now Asia has been led by India only which needs to be characterized by other stakeholders and nations also. By doing so it will cause lack of standardization in terms of practice of IG process

3. Real-time data of nation and region needs to be updated so that people have an idea of what is happening in IGF (Participation +stakeholder +Region) so that it make the participants and leaders remind of where IGF is …

4. There should be certain reservations or strategy for least developed countries in terms of participation and fellowships. Last 4 years Nepal has no even send 10 participants to IGF.

5. Inter collaboration of internet organization like ISOC, ICANN is hugely seen during facilitating people from developing and least developing countries. Though policy level and expertise is hugely managed by developed nation representatives where they overshadowed the whole theme and scope of IGF. Multistakeholder from bottom up approach.

6. IGF needs more strategic planning in terms of participation and diversity, if it's happening in Europe more people from Asia should be sponsored for fellowship. The participation needs to be counter-balanced.

7. More effective use of Social Media Marketing and communication strategy.

8. **Data's and information are hugely lacking in terms of themes of IGF and discussion, next IGF if we could provide the details of Internet related information that could really help experts, and give direction to the discussion. Better info graphic status of world internet reports needs to be distributed (Internet penetration rate | Regional NRI membership | toolkit information etc)**

9. **Media needs a separate slot for its role play of discussion, as it has been ignored and has taken a back seat with private and civil society role. It need to own up or organization working in Media Development need to lead the issues of internet governance process.**

10. More practical information and guide book to be developed in terms of IG process and to be distributed.

11. Sad to see Individual fellowship were not allowed from IGF secretariat for IGF2016

12. More collaboration and cooperation required from internet organization (ISOC ICANN and other organization) may be a combined open main session of how we can collaborate is a must

13. I think we need more youth energy and leadership in IGF. It's high time to building something of a strategy in terms of what can be done for awareness and capacity building.

    We have recently started Learn-IG (http://learninternetgovernance.blogspot.com/) which is an open knowledge sharing platform. So such initiation needs promotion and support from IGF secretariat.

Shreedeep Rayamajhi
ICT for Development Consultant
Rayznews