

UNEDITED COPY

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION
DYNAMIC COALITION COORDINATION GROUP MEETING
MONDAY, 05 JUNE 2023
1300 UTC

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
001-719-481-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

(Standing by.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's top of the hour but let's wait another minute or two for others to join.

>> Your robot assistant?

>> Admin, he just joined. I call it a he, but I name Markus my robot assistant.

So yeah, but I see he just joined. He had no problem joining.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So I'm traveling. I will stay as long as I can. I am going to switch to another device.

So I'll follow it up.

>> JUDITH: Maybe they could post the live chat link and that could be another way of following it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Hello, again. I think it is one minute from the top of the hour. We have quite a full agenda. My suggestion would be to start the meeting now and we may have other people joining while we are moving on.

We have Ms. Celine Bal has created an agenda. You can see it in the chat. Our first Agenda Item as always is the adoption of the agenda. Before we get there I would also recall that the meeting is being recorded. Unless you have any objection we will go on that way. That is very useful for the Secretariat.

The other administrivia thing, the Secretariat doesn't always easily identify the speakers, if you indicate your

relation to the dynamic in the chat, I notice some of you have already done so.

With that can we go back to the formal agenda and can I ask whether we can move on on that basis and whether the agenda is approved as proposed.

And if I can't hear any objections, counting on three, I will take it that there is silent approval of the agenda.

As proposed.

So the agenda has been approved.

With that we can come then to the second Agenda Item that is introduction of newly create the Dynamic Coalitions. There is dynamickism in the Dynamic Coalitions. Celine, please tell us more about the new Dynamic Coalition that joined the group.

>> CELINE BAL: This is to let you know there are three new Dynamic Coalitions that have been approved and posted on the website. I start with the first one. I am always going to copy the hyperlink to the dedicated DC web page. It is the Dynamic Coalition on blockchain assurance and standardisation.

We also suggest that in any other business those who are in the call from the new Coordinators of those new Dynamic Coalitions, they should introduce themselves at the end of the meeting.

The first Dynamic Coalition Coordinators are Gerard and Dino, already in the call. From the government blockchain, supporting blockchain technology in governance.

The second Dynamic Coalition is on open educational resources. Here is the link. It is about mainstreaming open educational content and platforms.

The Coordinator is Zeynep Varoglu from UNESCO. Last but not least, the Dynamic Coalition on intelligence governance, Luca Belli, who coordinates to other Dynamic Coalitions. This is going to be about governance of personal data and artificial intelligence.

So that would be it from our side. We encourage you to visit the web pages and you can always reach out in case you have any questions.

Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Celine. This is an informational Agenda Item. There is not for decision for the Dynamic Coalitions as it is purely a bureaucratic process in so far as the Secretariat checks that they fulfill the basic criteria.

Nevertheless if there are any comments, the floor is open. If not, we move on to the next Agenda Item.

(Pause.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Doesn't seem to be the case, but I take it that in the name of all Dynamic Coalitions present on the

talk that we can collectively welcome the new Dynamic Coalitions to join our group.

And with that, then we move to the next Agenda Item, updates on IGF 2023 session proposals.

Please, again Celine?

>> CELINE BAL: So there has been a lot of interest this year. Because we have received more than 800 submissions in total. So this is a record amount of submissions, as you can imagine.

Most of them are workshops. So we have received around 430 workshops. And I thought that it might be of interest to you, the top three. The top three sessions were digital divides and inclusion. Artificial intelligence and emerging technologies. And the third one, cybersecurity, Cybercrime and online safety.

We have received other open fora Town Halls, pre-events but also a total of 24 DC sessions. One is still on hold because we just accepted a new Dynamic Coalition and we are still screening them because we again, as you may know, have this minimum requirement of submitting the annual report. So we are checking that every DC has actually submitted the 2022 report.

We will soon in the next couple of hours or days post them on the website. You are going to be informed as soon as they are reflected there.

Another thing that we wanted to let you know, we encourage you to also have a very diverse panel. That was actually one of the basic criteria for the workshops that have been submitted. Again, the workshops that will be submitted to the MAG had at least two speakers and one moderator on site. Also we did not accept any panels that were made, for example, only out of men.

Again we would really appreciate if you would have a diverse panel on your DC sessions.

Thank you so much and maybe you want to add anything, Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, yeah, just maybe again that was the point, to discuss various occasions, to eventually have a slot at the annual IGF meeting and several years back somebody said it's prime real estate. It was quite a presentment that DCs get it -- resentment that DCs get it automatically without any scrutiny by the MAG. It is what it is.

Just to say the fact that the DCs who get a slot, as long as they fulfill the basic criteria, it is actually quite a big thing to get that more or less automatically. And we should be cognizant of that and also be aware that there is a kind of scrutiny from the broader community.

We will look at the overall programme and I think, I take it that's what the Secretariat is trying to do. The DCs also respect the overall guidelines for the sessions. Just in terms

of diversity and also the ratio between on site and Oliveira participants at the meeting, that it is more or less that the guidelines apply also to the DCs.

That does not mean the top-down control. It just means making sure that there is a coherent horizontal quality check of all the sessions at the annual meeting.

There was also, I think, there was a bit of line that some DCs were surprised that they had to submit the proposal because it was considered to be automatic for DCs, which it is and it isn't. But the Secretariat needs to know in time for planning and schedule for the meeting how many sessions there will be. And the sooner you have the full picture, the better it is.

Again, this is essentially an informational Agenda Item and it is amazing to know that there are the interest that is positive news. The interest is still here. I mean, some people have said interest is going down for the IGF. People go to rights con or whatever.

That doesn't seem to be the case. If you have more proposals for the annual meeting than ever before that signals there is still huge interest in the IGF.

But these are just my off the cuff remarks and I don't know, anybody else has some questions? Comments? Questions to Celine as she has the overall picture from the Secretariat? Or comments, anything is welcome.

Yes, I can see two hands up. Avri and Fredaeric. Avri?

>> Once all these things have been through the million will they be open for editing again so people can add more Panelists and stuff? Because getting those all agreed to in time for the deadline was, of course, doing it at the last minute as I was is difficult, thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Celine?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, it will be open again for editing. Sometimes, for example, there were typos in the titles or descriptions. So we will definitely open it for editing again.

This is where you can add some more speakers or maybe even change a few speakers in case something happened in the meantime. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And Frederic?

>> Hello, everyone.

(Unable to make out his words, poor audio.)

>> I can say it is difficult for us to move a lot of -- we had last year to this new one because of some speech were already released. We don't have now how to handle it. It is important for us to communicate using devices. We had --

(Captioner apologizes, unable to make out his words.)

We have been coordinating the following meetings. It was for the UN, it was also for the -- we have overall event and

sometimes which stands ... For them it is important to communicate with them. It was a later engagement. Now we are working through the diverse Coordinators. Now we are still engaging with the DC. This is something I would have to read it and I get to await the coming of our networks and ... IGF and AUM.

We are waiting for a response and later it should be different, but now --

Thank you. I hope we can discuss any time later to have a questions and what we can do. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Unfortunately, the sound on my end was a bit muffled. I didn't get all that you said. Celine, did you?

>> CELINE BAL: Unfortunately, the sound wasn't very good, Frederic. I suggest you send us an email with the few items you mentioned right now. We can also discuss via email what your concerns were just right now. Thank you.

>> Frederic: Okay, I think I talk longer with the Coordinator and then we can speak with partners.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, you can always reach out to us afterwards either through email or a call.

>> Frederic: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Wout?

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Congratulations to have so many proposals. As you said, Markus, I think it is a very good sign, that so many people have signed up for sessions and so many Dynamic Coalitions want to have a session.

I have a very specific comment on perhaps the programme at this point. It is that I sometimes have the impression that a lot of participants at the IGF do not know what Dynamic Coalitions are an perhaps think that it is a sort of closed session because it is a Dynamic Coalition, not a member. Why would I go there?

That is something that perhaps we need to prevent somehow. What would be the best way to do that? I have been thinking about it in two ways. Perhaps to set the title first and then mention that it is Dynamic Coalition, because that may change the interest.

The other one is perhaps to put all the Dynamic Coalitions in one slot so that they compete with each other, but on totally different topics, but not in competition with workshop proposals.

I don't know if that is something that is feasible, but that would make it easier for people to go into one of these Dynamic Coalitions sessions.

But that is just two ideas I have. Perhaps when we think out loud we will have some more. But try to prevent that people have the feeling it is a closed session for members only.

So that is the message I would like to share here today. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And I will pass it on to Celine for consideration for discussion with the Secretariat colleagues. But again to look back. Originally the annual meeting was in a way like an annual general meeting of the Dynamic Coalitions, which was a little bit, well, it was never a closed meeting as such, but it was intended to be the annual watering hole for the Dynamic Coalition.

A question of re-branding it a bit is definitely something worth considering. Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Markus. Mark Carvell, IS3C, senior policy advisor.

Just chiming in on this because last year in Addis we had a main session for Dynamic Coalitions. Which was a prime opportunity for the coalitions to state their case as an integral part of the IGF ecosystem.

Forgive me if I missed messages but are we envisaging a similar opportunity in Kyoto for a main session on a topic to be decided as an opportunity for those coalitions that really do want to advance the whole generic concept of what Dynamic Coalitions are and their meaningful contributions to the IGF in terms of outcomes and so on?

And as a kind of footnote to this, many of us will have looked at the Secretary-General's policy brief on the global digital compact which has reference at certain points to the IGF and an appendix, annex or appendix listing processes of multi-stakeholder cooperation. There is no reference anywhere that I found to Dynamic Coalitions.

There is a reference to the IGF annual event. There are references in the listings to other specific instruments of cooperation, multi-stakeholder cooperation. But no reference, as I say, to the IGF's Dynamic Coalitions.

And our expanding number now. It is great to have three new additions.

So circling around the point that maybe we should consider a main session as we did last year in Addis. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, we had main sessions for the DCs since, I think since 2015 at least. And my assumption was that it was a given, more or less, that we will get the opportunity to get the main sessions.

But the main sessions will be decided, I think, at the MAG meeting in July. Please correct me, Celine, if I'm wrong. It is definitely a welcome reminder that we should maybe also turn

our attention to what do we want, if we want to have a main session for the DCs, how do we want to fill it with substance.

It has never been easy, actually. It is a bit herding cats as the Dynamic Coalitions are so diverse in terms of content and also in terms of structure. We all agreed there is no one size fits all model.

But this year in particular it is, I think, an interesting year with all the moving pieces around, like TDC and so on.

So that is something definitely worth considering. And I see a hand up. Dino, please.

>> DINO: Thank you, Markus and good day. I already put in the chat -- sorry, I hear some background noise. I don't know if it is my microphone or something else.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, we can hear you.

>> DINO: Perfect. I want to confirm my support for Mark's suggestion. Indeed, as has been alluded to, the new proposal, the new policy brief from the Secretary-General started an intense conversation within the IGF vis-a-vis what is the role of the, the new role the IGF vis-a-vis this new proposal.

I believe that extending this conversation with the Dynamic Coalition would be very beneficial to understand and to agree exactly on each part of the IGF how it will be contributed to this new vision, if you will, of collaboration, support, of the GDC. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

Are there other comments on this?

My conclusion to that is that maybe we should make that a main Agenda Item for our next call. And hopefully we will have a next call prior to the IGF MAG meeting open consultations, the July meeting. So we will have to look for another slot and if everybody agrees, we can then have maybe more in depth discussion on that and maybe also invite for written proposals or have a discussion on the DC coordination list that we have an online discussion on this and maybe also turn to Celine to check with the Secretariat and maybe come up also with some ideas from the Secretariat side.

But I see on the call there are many people who were involved in organisation of main DC sessions in the past. Welcome to my co-Facilitator Jutta, who joined a few minutes late and Avri was involved many years back. I don't want to put you on the spot, do you have any ideas, spontaneous reaction to Mark's suggestion?

As I said, I don't want to put you on the spot. You don't have to say anything. But I would be most welcome to hear remarks, comments from colleagues who have been involved in this for so many years.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Just to remind us all, as Markus said before, the session last year I think went very well. It opened up a pathway to what we are trying to do now.

So I think the debate last year was one of the best that we ever had in a session, a joint session, main session of all Dynamic Coalitions. And we did in advance, I think, change a bit our mindset that the Dynamic Coalitions main session is not kind of all Dynamic Coalitions present what they have been working on because that is in the individual Dynamic Coalitions sessions.

But trying to find a joint issue that we can follow up with also in intersessional work. I don't think that was the changed mindset. I would prefer to go in the same direction for this year as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Jutta. It is very helpful always looking back a little bit. You're right, where we started it was just to give the opportunity to the DCs to present them.

That proved to be very difficult because I said at the outset so many great variety of Dynamic Coalitions are focuses more on common themes. Last year, I totally agree, was actually the most successful session so far. I also see in the chat that Amy has said we should be guided by the top three themes mentioned by Celine and that we should be reflecting also a little bit the temperature in the room, as she put it.

Other comments at this stage? Should we move on? And you would agree then that we make this a major focus of our next call that we discuss, the next session? It would be good if you have a common understanding of that when we move into the IGF MAG meeting open consultations in July.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: I had a hand up, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry, I didn't see that.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: No worry. I'm assertive enough to come in, but thanks.

Following up on Jutta's comments on the session we had last year, I think I was not able to be present the whole time because I had to be in another session for the second office, you may recall.

We had a great discussion with the ONDIP with Paul Mitchell there and others. What could be an idea, we have been discussing how output of DCs can be made into more official IGF outcomes, for example. How they could be integrated into the programme.

So it could be an idea to have a session with relevant MAG members, for example, to discuss this topic, how can DC outputs become an integral part of the work of the IGF and how perhaps can they be aligned with workshop proposals or other sessions

being proposed. So that the interaction between the different silos has broken down a bit so that they influence each other and become more influential with IGF as a whole.

That could be an idea to discuss further as perhaps a Special Session or a session with, at the DC main session, but to make sure that some interaction is guaranteed. Again, like we had last year, a very successful year as has been mentioned. Just a suggestion. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. When I take back, your suggestion also is to interact with MAG members which I think would be a new element.

I see in the chat that Avri agrees with Mark and Jutta. She said she would have been ready to say something when put on the spot. Can I put you on the spot also, Avri? Always nice to hear from you. You have lots of experience and good ideas

>> AVRI: put on the spot three times. My word.

I don't have that much. I'm sitting and listening. It is not a thing I was thinking about before the meeting. Coming into the meeting, I think it's a good idea. I think the interactive approach -- I saw only the very end. I had a conflicting meeting.

Everything I have seen, everything I have heard, the interests active approach worked with people.

I think picking up one of the current hot issues is a good thing. I don't know that we necessarily need to go to the top three as it sounds like they are being well represented already. That is why there is the most of them.

Perhaps if there is something in the not top three that becomes something that we can coalesce around as a theme. But what I thought was a good idea is that at the next meeting we are going to talk about this a bunch much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, thank you. As I said, you always have good ideas. Thank you for that.

With that, do I take it we have broad agreement to focus on it at the next? I think we have already very good input and I take it there is a strong support for having it as interactive as possible and follow up on the model we created in the Addis meeting and, for instance, what Wout suggested to involve MAG members as well. And I actually like Avri's idea that we might be focused on a niche issue which is not already dealt with broadly by all the others but where we could have something particular to add collectively as a group of Dynamic Coalitions. All of this will be open for the next call and I would invite you to make contributions online. Think about it and maybe also make suggestions to Celine and encourage her to maybe develop a concept paper. If you have a first draft of something we could coalesce around.

With that can we then move to the next Agenda Item? That would be the draft charter of the DCs. It has been with us now for two, three, four months or so. In any case, many weeks. It has been a Google Doc. We discussed it repeatedly. Again, it didn't come out of the blue. It was the result of the exercise we did again when we had lengthy in depth consultation on the DCs. There was a very solid Secretariat paper that was drafted by Serena. You all know her. I think it is still up on the website. It did not make concrete proposals, but based on interviews, on discussions. It had sort of issues to be explored and they were then condensed by Ryan, who was serving as an Intern for almost half a year, I think, with the Secretariat.

And now Celine has taken over and after last call she tried to streamline a little bit of what we heard and bring in the proposals.

Can you actually show the new version of the Google Doc on the screen so that people can see the small changes you made?

I mean, there were comments made on the call.

On the screen. But Celine shared it in chat. It is now in screen shot.

>> CELINE BAL: I wanted to have a clean version, but we have taken Wout's comments into consideration and added here, after a period of two consecutive years, a DC that fails to submit an annual report will be considered and listed as inactive.

Here another sentence that we've added that DC Coordinators are requested and members of DCs are just encouraged to attend the monthly meetings organised by the DC chief.

That would be it. I suggest to send a final version, a clean version to the DC mailing list. Markus? Do you have anything you would like to add?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, just, well, it was maybe a bit quick for people. Again, if you can just go back to the two changes you made. There was at the last call there was the question of can we not be a bit clearer on the sanction. If DCs don't respond. That is now that after two consecutive years, then they should be considered inactive.

And the other one, there was a little, well, should I say people were not too clear. It was, the charter made it clear that the DC Coordinators are essentially requested to take part in coordination call. If they can't make it themselves they can always appoint somebody else.

I noticed ahead of today's call some DCs said precisely that, that they were replaced by somebody else.

These are not closed calls. The idea is that it is an open calm and all DC members are encouraged and invited to attend the

call. These are just these two small minor changes, but they gave rise to discussion last time.

Now, I don't know, you had time again to look at it. Are there any further comments, questions, or not? If not, I think what Celine suggested that she would send out a clean document for a last round of comments. That after that, we would consider that we have a rough consensus on the charter and that it will be formally accepted as a guiding document for the DCs.

Again, it is not the straight jacket. It is a document that respects the bottom-up nature and the diversity of the DCs. But it is part of finding a bit of a coherent approach to how they operate.

So the floor is open. Comments? Questions?

>> WOUT de NATRIS: This is Wout. ISDC. Markus, one comment on part 3 on DCs are requested to publish a list, et cetera.

Does it mean that we have to share each time we have a Working Group meeting who participated in that meeting? And is that not something which may be against the GDPR in Europe, to publish names just like that?

So what is the intention of this comment?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I mean, just to have a list of participants, I'm sure, is not against GDPR. I'm not an expert on the GDPR.

(Laughter.)

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Neither am I. If you become a member, everybody can see who is a member of the DC on the website and we do, we list everybody who is in a leadership position. So when you are chair of a Working Group, et cetera, and as long as they agree, right. But then I have to ask everybody do you agree to have your name on the, when they just attend the meeting?

The question is, what exactly is meant here? Is having chairs and Vice-Chairs mentioned enough?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think to have a list of participants in meetings is a fairly basic requirement for any organisation, association, whatever. I think in most jurisdictions. Also in terms of transparency. Here I think the idea would be just to see, okay, are there actually people attending the meeting? It is not any kind of control intended but just you could, if you take as a devil's advocate you could have maybe two people running a DC, chair and Vice-Chair and nobody else attending a meeting. And they can claim we are very active. Look we have a meetings. But nobody else would attend the meeting.

And here if you have just an orderly list of participants after every meeting, and if anyone questions then if it is a

real meeting. You can say look here, we have a list of participants. It is not just bill and Joe and me. We have a regular group of seven, eight, ten, 12 people attending.

I don't think there is any evil intention behind this. It is just a fairly -- yes, it is a good practice of transparency, but I am open to any comments.

Jutta, please, you have your hand up.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, Markus and Wout. I do think it is absolutely within the GDPR because it is a legitimate interest to process these data for giving evidence that the Dynamic Coalition is active.

So I don't even think you need the content of the person because if you have a legitimate interest and that is I think Article six of the GDPR, it is fine to store this. You must not publish, but if someone asks who has been attending the meetings, you are allowed to process these data and then have a look at it. So it is giving evidence and that is fine within the GDPR. There is no conflict.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: That is something different than putting it on the website, as it says here.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, definitely. Putting it on the website would be, might be difficult. But having, keeping that list, processing the data, that won't be a problem.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Celine is taking notes. We can delete putting it on the website. I think the idea, if I get it right, Jutta, you're obviously more familiar with the legal requirements. It will be essentially have a list ready if anybody wants to list, check it, it's there. But you don't have to put it on the website. Correct?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Correct.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Celine, can you then maybe edit it accordingly?

>> CELINE BAL: I will. I took note of it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent.

Mark says it makes positive noises in the chat.

Avri, do you need more body count? What about a screen shot for those who want to hide names? I think with what Jutta said, it would go -- again, Jutta, help me out here. If people don't want to have their name listed they can ask for that, correct?

>> JUTTA CROLL: They could ask not to be listed, you mean?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. If they have privacy concerns, whatever. And Avri asks what about a screen shot of those who want to hide names? Here we are just talking about really sort of the legal niceties of what we can do and what we cannot do.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I am not sure whether I got the whole idea behind that. Does it make sense to publish a list where not all names are listed? I would refrain from publishing the list on

the website. Just having the list in case someone is asking whether the Dynamic Coalition has been active or active enough to be considered active. But I wouldn't publish the list.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And that should in essence also take into account the concerns of those who don't want to be publicly listed, yeah.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Definitely. It might be the case that I don't want everybody to know that I have been attending a Dynamic Coalition coordinating meeting right now, but still I am here and so I wouldn't like to see that published, but if someone asks whether I have been attending this meeting this afternoon I would say okay, my name is on the list. But don't publish it.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Is it an idea that I suppose we have a meeting and you make notes. When you put in the notes who attended, then if somebody asked who is participating in your meeting, you can share the notes. Then the name is there. But it is not online. Who would be checking? It would be the Secretariat, I suppose, and nobody else.

I would not be checking on other Dynamic Coalitions whether they are in existence or not.

So is that an idea so that you have your notes ready on request of, when the Secretariat doubts whether a DC is really active? Or wants to check whether a DC is active? Is that an idea?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think the idea behind it is also if there is maybe a third party questions the Dynamic Coalition and asks the Secretariat how many people attend the meeting of this DC? The Secretariat would be able to go through the record and say look, we have evidence that there are 12 people attending calls regularly or whatever. Whatever it is.

But it would be some kind of track. We have a trace left. It is not again, it is when asked.

And I think if everything is a little bit airy fairy and up in the air and if odd questions are asked and then you weaken yourself.

If you have solid evidence to back up that you are a dynamic Dynamic Coalition with that many participants, I think -- I would think it is in our collective interest to be as transparent as possible.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: As I said, I'm quite happy to share meeting notes with the Secretariat. So also maybe each time we have a meeting of the Working Group. I'm quite happy to do that. When somebody completely strange asks me can you legitimize yourself as a Dynamic Coalition, that would be a different matter, I suppose.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: In any case, any question would have to go through the Secretariat as the ultimate arbiter and guardian of the integrity of the Dynamic Coalition.

And as we just said the list of participants would be an annex that would not be as part of the meeting notes posted on the website, but we have so far, correct me, Celine, the coordination meetings have in the annex the list of participants and they are both posted on the website.

>> CELINE BAL: There are. There is always a list of the participants shown in annex one. This one is shown publicly, yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Personally, I don't see anything offensive. If you are ashamed to be seen as being associated with the Dynamic Coalition then maybe it is better not to be part of it.

(Chuckles.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That may be a slightly flip pant remark but I think we are looking for problems where there aren't really problems. If there are concerns, if a Dynamic Coalition has the list of participants as an annex on their record and whenever asked or challenged, the Secretariat can ask for it. Can you please show us the record? Then I think -- also based on Jutta's comments, I think we should be well within the GDPR, handling it like that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And the comment in the chat, the idea of having information shared in confidence with the Secretariat could work.

So can we agree?

>> You have three of us with hands up. And have for a bit of time.

It is funny, I wasn't concerned when this started but as the conversation went on, one thing that started to concern me was sort of the only one way to measure things notion that we constantly get into. The one size fits allism. For example, you know, you look at something like the schools. It is the schools that are members and they show their slides once a year that they are members.

Some participate in meetings and some participate in editing documents and doing things like that in their own time frame.

Meetings are very difficult when you are trying to do, you know, the full world. You are always putting somebody in a bind. But people work on documents.

So there's many different ways of people showing.

So I think we have to avoid getting really strict. Because all of a sudden this move from yeah, maybe we list the names of people, to there must be, there is an annex and the Secretariat can quickly go to an annex to prove that somebody is active.

And I worry about that becoming a very fixed piece of one size fits all. I think we have to look at it some more.

Then the last thing you said, I beg to comment on, Markus, is that if somebody -- you know, some of the groups, Dynamic Coalitions we have -- certainly not schools, but nobody is getting put in jail that I can think of in many countries for participating in a group that talks about education in schools.

But some of these Dynamic Coalitions we've got could well have members who don't want their names listed in their countries of residence and such. So to say that if you don't want your name listed, perhaps you shouldn't participate. I would look to tone that down a little because there can be good reasons for people.

Again, any time we get into a one size fits all or suits all, we tend to get ourselves in trouble. I agree being able to answer the question, but who are you? Are there people that participate? But we doubt that Dynamic Coalitions are dynamic or coalitions. Please, prove yourselves! Then yes, we need to have something, but let's be a little bit more considered. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks. Excellent comments. As I said, maybe it was a flip ant remark but your point is excellent. You could also actually list there were three members who for various reasons asked their names not to be divulged. Just thinking allowed. There are ways and ways. It is all helpful comments.

I can't see for some reason on the screen I have in front of me whose name is up?

>> CELINE BAL: You have Alisa.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Alisa, please.

>> ALISA HEAVER: I did want to comment on this aspect. I was more wondering on what will happen after this charter is approved? What is the process after that? Would it be sent to the MAG or to the leadership panel? Or would it just be placed on the website? Do you have any idea what the follow-up process would be? Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Formally speaking it would not have to be approved by the MAG as such. As Dynamic Coalitions are, you know, bottom-up and not one size fits all, whatever. But we definitely would inform the MAG and presumably also the leadership panel.

It would be again a good segue to prove, I think following up on Mark's initial comments that Dynamic Coalitions exist and they actually work, and try to improve their cooperation as part of the broader IGF ecosystem.

First we need to approve the charter and agree on it. Then we can discuss also the next step.

Okay. Are there more hands up?

(There is no response.)

>> CELINE BAL: I don't see any, Markus. There aren't any.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. What Avri said is, I think relevant. The more you go into details, the more you see that the devil is always in the details.

But could we maybe -- and I think the, again, the diverse nature of the Dynamic Coalitions, what Avri just mentioned, some others may not have meetings but they may work on the common document, on a Google Doc or whatever. But they collectively participate.

And I went to the doc the summer schools on Internet Governance in Berlin and went again in Addis. I must say I was deeply impressed to see how many, some schools there are and how they really share experience and learn from each other. So I wonder whether we could have maybe another sentence as it may not just be meetings with active participants but then other forms of collaboration or so.

Just thinking aloud. I don't know, maybe Avri will have an idea how we could formulate this in a sentence and you could get back to Celine separately. Especially your concern that it should not measure Dynamic Coalitions, do they have meetings and how many people participate but there are forms of collaboration which indicate that they are active and they work actively on something. That we reflect on that also in the charter.

Again I don't want to put you on the spot, Avri, but you have quick reaction, it would be most welcome.

>> AVRI. Sure, I'll go look at it. I have to find the URL and stuff. I admit I haven't been active at looking at the charters. That's why I didn't have an issue until people started talking about it a lot.

I apologize. I'll look at it and see if there is anything I can say.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, that's why I have these meetings, when we actually have brainstorming together. We say okay, there may be a flaw there somewhere because we didn't think about that. The point that you made, remember that goes back to the Working Group on Internet Governance. Some people can say something if they don't get identified. If your name is behind something, if you have chat ham house rule it is one thing, but if you are identified in a meeting you cannot be identified.

So that is definitely something we have to consider. But can we leave it here and we do some fine-tuning before we send out a clean version? And we work on that particular aspect of the charter?

And I count on Avri to come up with a sentence or two maybe that can also be some four chapeau sentence that there are

various ways of showing that you are active and one way is -- again, we don't want to be prescriptive with this charter. I think we all agree on that.

With that can we now go to the intersessional event? I think we did present that at the last MAG meeting, the concept of the p intersessional event. And the overall reactions were overwhelmingly positive.

There were some concerns expressed as the meeting -- or the interest sessional event might eat into the MAG meeting open consultations at the crucial time of preparing the annual meeting.

And the MAG approved it provisionally, but the MAG said they would like to see how it fits in the overall agenda of the three days set aside for the MAG meeting open consultations.

So we will have to wait for the Secretariat presenting a draft agenda. That will either be adopted by the next MAG meeting or in an online procedure. But I would like to again turn towards Celine also to report a little bit on the interest expressed so far on how many people signed up. And also on the Secretariat's plan on how to make it operational.

And also with hindsight we are maybe over ambitious with the timeline. I think it is what, five weeks ahead of the next MAG meeting. We don't have that much time, but there is still some time.

Please, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Markus. The draft agenda is still under development and is going to be shared with the MAG meeting. There has been for now a total of 62 registrations. So you can really see the interest that people had in this intersessional event.

We have been waiting actually before reaching out to the various participants because it wasn't formally approved by the MAG meeting. But I will liaison again with Chengetai to see how the MAG will approve the draft agenda either at the next call or simply at the.

And also reach out to the individual groups so they can form Working Groups ahead of the intersessional event. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there questions to Celine on where we are?

>> ALISA HEAVER: May I, Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> ALISA HEAVER: Celine, I was wondering, how many -- you mention the 63 participants? Or people who registered? How many of them will be there in person? Or is that not feasible with the registration?

>> CELINE BAL: This is not visible with the registration. Those weren't 62 members. Sometimes there was one person

signing up for three or four teams. Those would be, you know, one person being involved in the different Working Groups.

When reaching out to them for how many works, we can reach out to them in important.

>> ALISA HEAVER: That is important for us to know from my perspective, how many people will be there in person. Also depending on that, how much time should there be offered from the schedule to meet, especially as there are so many workshop proposals and we will probably have a lot of trimming to do during the meeting.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, thanks, Alisa. I have noted.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If you allow, I think the intersessional event would be on the afternoon of the open consultations. So it will not eat into the workshop evaluation process conducted by the MAG.

Also the participants as such, if they participate in preparing input into the event, as long as somebody is present in Geneva, today they don't all need to be present there. Also we have learned to interact also with remote participation if there is a presentation being made online.

But again we would leave it to the Secretariat to find out how best to be -- essentially we have Working Groups and they would present the result of their work and we don't even know yet how many will come up with a proposal. But they would be related to the main themes of the MAG meeting. So there may be a five-minute, ten-minute presentation for each, followed by discussion.

So we obviously don't need all 62 people who signed up, they will not all be speaking themselves. They will hopefully provide a thoughtful input into the collective work.

Other comments? Questions?

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Yes, Markus. It is me again. Hand up as well.

Going to Alisa's question, I am waiting for confirmation that the session will take place because I won't be booking a ticket if it doesn't. Because then I don't have a role to be there, basically.

So I am a bit concerned that it is still not approved. I thought we were beyond that stage at this point.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think it has been approved in principle. But the final approval will -- it will be approved, they are approving the final agenda for the meeting.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Then also should we be starting work, basically? As you said, it is only four and a half weeks at this point in time. There is EuroDIG in between and ICANN and God knows where people go in the meantime. We better start

preparing, in my point of view. If it is all but formally approved.

If it is approved I will come for the first day of the open consultation to than Geneva. I can confirm that. If anybody else does, I don't know, but I will be there from the first day.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, as Celine said, I think the Secretariat will start working on how to get it started. It has always been clear that the whole exercise relies on Secretariat support. It doesn't just happen.

I don't know, Celine, do you have any preliminary information on how the Secretariat sees it?

>> CELINE BAL: No. So basically I'll follow up again with Eleonora ra and prepare the Working Groups and reach out with more information. But let me go back to the Secretariat and to Eleonora to see how we will proceed in detail. I will also follow up with Chengetai on that one too.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, I mean, part of -- as I said right at the beginning, we were maybe a little bit over ambitious and when we started with the concept note. A lot of the other components of intersessional activities are not really operational, but by now they are, I think, all operational, all the policy networks and BPFs. So my recommendation then to Celine, yes, please, get this started as soon as possible as there isn't much time left.

Are there other comments, suggestions on this.

>> HOUDA CHIHI: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Houda, please.

>> HOUDA CHIHI: Hello, everyone. I have raised my hand. In the -- consul. I want to know the technical working of the Working Groups so I can find a way to contribute.

>> CELINE BAL: If I may take over, Markus? Houda, you can send to us an email. We will share with you all the information about Dynamic Coalitions.

>> HOUDA CHIHI: Okay, thank you.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Are there other requests for the floor with comments? Suggestions?

>> MARK CARVELL: Markus? Houda does as well. Does Houda want to speak? She had her hand up before me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: She has spoken already.

>> MARK CARVELL: She has? Already. Okay.

Yeah, just one point is basically recounting that this is an important opportunity in the intersessional meeting. To communicate basically what is going on amongst the DC Coordinators community. But as you say, there are the other formats of intersessional work as well, the policy networks and the best practice fora.

I made a point in the chat, it is quite an obvious thing. The time allocated to these forms of intersessional work should be evenly split.

Within our time frame for DCs we need to prepare how we communicate, where the community is in terms of activities and this milestone leading up to Kyoto.

So I envisage that kind of format, how much time in terms of minutes we have, I suppose, is going to be crucial in working out how we present the status of what is happening amongst all the Dynamic Coalitions.

So maybe this is another Agenda Item for next time then to gravitate towards some planning. As Wout suggested, the time is getting short, though. June is an incredibly busy month ahead of the July meeting. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I don't know whether there is some misunderstandings or crossed wires somewhere, but the whole idea of the concept note, mainly it is issue-driven and not process-driven as such. It will not be time given to Dynamic Coalitions to make their point. But it will be time given to people who participate in the IGF community on an issue.

On one of these issues identified by the MAG as being the main themes for the Kyoto meeting.

So that was, I think, also the way we managed to sell it to the MAG as it will be an input in preparing for the main themes.

And you know, one of the guiding questions is: If you give in a main session to prepare, what would your focus be? The themes I know to this process to come up with will provide input to the MAG also for designing the main session.

So it is ambitious as an objective, but let's see how it goes and, as you said, there is very little time for it to happen.

Let's roll up our sleeves and get started. But we need the Secretariat to get us started.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Markus, my final comment, I think. I think that the MAG has, and the Secretariat has the overview of what the main topics will be at the IGF. We will be finalizing the very final workshops that go through because also they have been decided on already.

So that I think should be the starting point of our discussion where things match with the work that is happening in intersessional work.

So whether that is in Dynamic Coalitions or the prior policy networks or the BPF for cybersecurity, the interaction can start happening as soon as we know the same sort of work is going to be presented in workshops as it is presented in Dynamic Coalitions.

If that interchangeability of topics happens and alignment of the topics, I think that is where the IGF will go for.

So in my opinion that should be the focus of our session presenting, this is what our output will be. And where it is possible to cross pollinate. And if the MAG understands that and understands that then from then on, it becomes a normal topic to discuss together in the future. That is where things may actually change for the IGF and where the our discussion with New York is going to happen sometime soon of all the ideas that -- proposed, that is where we will become stronger and say look, we already have that, we are already doing it on all the topics you are envisaging, basically.

That is where our strength will be if we are able to align the topics and the outputs.

Let me stop there with the promotion for the IGF in general but also for the session we can have in Geneva in July.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think we are all saying the same thing in different words. I think the MAG defines what, seven themes? Maybe eight, I may be wrong.

>> CELINE BAL: Eight themes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: They were also given to the workshop proponents and they took them into account when designing their workshops.

We are now looking at how we can fill these themes with content also for the main session. So it should be mutually beneficial and cross-pollinating. And hopefully it will provide a useful input to the MAG meeting.

But again, the work lies ahead of us and mainly ahead of you, Celine. Good luck.

(Laughter.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And obviously it is not just you. You have your Secretariat colleagues to get that started and we count on all of the DC colleagues.

Now, I think we come more or less to the end of our formal agenda. I would then maybe, as you suggested at the beginning, invite the three new Dynamic Coalitions, if they are on the call, to present themselves shortly so that we know who they are and what think are working with.

Can I hand it over to you, Celine?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes. I see that Zeynep turned on her camera. If you want to say a few words on the Dynamic Coalition and the open communication resources.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: My name is Zeynep, senior programme specialist in the Communication and Information sector of UNESCO and the Coordinator for the Dynamic Coalition on open educational resources. The Dynamic Coalition is around the UNESCO recommendation on OEI which was adopted in 2019. We had

started as a Dynamic Coalition in 2020. And we are very honoured to have the part of the official IGF Dynamic Coalitions since two months ago. We are made up of large network, we have about 500 colleagues. They are from academia, from government, from IGOs and it is a very vast group.

And it responds to the stakeholders within the recommendation text itself which says that, which is the traditional educational community and cultural communities such as museums and archives and libraries as well as broadcasting bodies, media bodies as well as different IGOs working on different levels.

A very broad scope for the Dynamic Coalitions reflect this. I am here if you have further questions. It is an honour to join this wonderful group. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. I think the honour is ours. We are honoured that UNESCO joins us as a Dynamic Coalition. It is very prestigious to add to our network. Thank you very much for this.

You are most welcome.

>> CELINE BAL: Gerard is also on the call. If you want to be introduce your Dynamic Coalition, please, you can take the floor.

>> JERARD: Thank you so much. Dino is cochairing with us. Can I share my screen? I have a couple of slides. They say a picture is worth a thousand words.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, you can. I think it is open for others to share the screen.

>> JERARD: Almost. It says the host -- my old Professors must have called you and said you can't trust me.

I think. I am the associate Chairman of the blockchain. We are honoured to be part of this press teen just group. Personal introduction, I have been interested in this subject for a long time. I started a chapter at amnesty international when I was in college and majored in international studies. I did have a chance to speak at the UN a few years ago.

And spent some time in the military. I enlisted, when I left I was company commander, I have been all over the space. I did help the first organisation in the U.S. become an ISO9000 registrar and from that traveled around the world doing high maturity assessments. My background is in international affairs, and in quality of investments.

In 2017 we started an organisation called the government blockchain organisation, the first thing we wrote and most important thing on our website is the ethics statement. We obviously don't have time to get into it now. We do meetings literally every month and start every meeting with the conversation on ethics.

Our goal is to help the public and private sector connect, communicate and collaborate. The GVA has members in about 500 government organisations around the world. The at the state, local and international level. When you get that many people together with so many different interests you have to get specific in order to have some value.

So we formed works so the GVBA currently has 50 works in everything that blockchain touches. Block chain is about two things. It is about the movement of value and also about integrity and trust.

I can't think of any particular space where there is a movement of value or issue of trust where governments are not deeply interested and involved.

So in doing this, the works meet on a regular basis. We have about 50 of them. They are somewhat decentralized. They come up with their own charters. Their goal is to create value for the community. And one of our Working Groups is the international organisation, a standards Working Group led by Dino, who is also on the call. We have tools and mechanisms within our platform so Members can communicate directly with each other. We have a document management system, a communication system. You can see there is all sorts of different ways we connect.

Our site is pretty active. You go on at any point in time you can see members of the public and private sector communicating in realtime and being log on the system.

So these people are active now. And they are all over the world. They do all kinds of different things.

So that is it.

We also have a robust set of meetings. We do Zoom calls. We do conferences.

Carole House wrote President Biden's executive order on the responsible use of digital assets. Rob Pierce is one of the third wealthiest people in crypt toe currency and worked for Presidents trump and Biden in the National Security Council. He was responsible for national infrastructure security we have all kinds of incredible people.

This guy was the chair of the U.S. House ways and means Committee. Every dollar spent is under his leadership. He is founder of one of the first blockchains, this guy invented blockchain.

We have a lot of local meetings, this is the Ambassador from El Salvador. We have just a whole bunch of different folks. Anyway, I will tell you about my favorite person on here, Dr. Robert Brown. I don't see him right now, but he was born the great grand son of a slave sold to the railroad and became Chairman of the board of that railroad. He was an advisor to

President Nixon and has just done a number of amazing things, including help free Nelson Mandela from prison.

Which always warms my heart. When you go in the UN and see the bust of Nelson Mandela.

We bring the public together on issues where blockchain technology can solve problems of integrity and trust for governments at the state, local, national and international organisation.

That is about us and let me turn it over to Dino who can talk to you about our Dynamic Coalition. Thank you very much.

>> DINO: I don't know want to take too much time. We are at the end of the meeting. I'm the joint staff pension fund and member of the MAG of the IGF. I supported vis-a-vis the responsibility as a member of the MAG this connection and this reach-out to an organisation which I believe can add value to the IGF, the Dynamic Coalitions because I specifically implemented blockchain solutions for the UN pension fund in 2021 to support the digital identity of the 84,000 retirees.

One of the issues was that there is the novelty of this technology, there is not yet a set of generally-accepted standards to provide assurance and contribute, reliability of this solution. In the GBA indeed I found a lot of resources and competence tense and experience of other individuals shall subject matter experts that together work on this issue.

So this blockchain maturity model can be the starting point for meaningful conversations within like-minded individuals and also with Member States, with other association and entities that face the same issues. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Dino and Gerard. That is very impressive. We are glad to be able to come to you as new members to this group.

Celine, you said there were three new ones. Is the third one also present on the call?

>> CELINE BAL: Unfortunately not. The Coordinator is Luca Belli and I haven't seen him as a participant of this meeting today.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: With that we come to a close to our meeting. Thank you all for that.

We do have again the agenda set out. We will have, as we said, we will focus on our proposal for a main session for the DCs and will think about it ahead of time.

We also have to finalize the charter that maybe we can do that online,. The cleaned up version will be sent out.

We have to get started with the process of the intersessional meeting. We did agree at the last call we will have one more call ahead of the MAG meeting. Looking at the

calendar, when would that be best to do it? Right now, next week is the ICANN meeting and then there is EuroDIG.

My suggestion is sometime during the week of 26th of June. That would still give us some time ahead of the MAG meeting.

I don't think we will be able to agree on a date just now. So can we then suggest -- Avri says yes, again can you send out the Google Doc for the charter?

>> CELINE BAL: Just done it, yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. With that, there is one minute left until 4:30 our time.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: One fast question to Celine. The MAG meeting is 10 to 12 July, right? Monday?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, exactly. 10 is open consultation. The MAG meeting goes until the 12 and they still have the LP, a short meeting I think on Thursday in the morning, uh-huh.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: With that then I think we have -- again, we do need 90 minutes for our calls, not one hour. We have filled our 90 minutes. Celine will send out a doodle poll and we will stay in touch online. We will do our homework. I suggest, urge you to put your thinking caps on that we have good ideas for the DC main session we are going to propose to the MAG.

With that, I say goodbye to you all and thank you very much for your active participation. Bye-bye, all.

(Chorus of thank you and goodbye.)

(Realtime captioner signing off.)

This is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.