

RAW FILE

IGFSA

JULY 20, 2023

13:00 CET

DYNAMIC COALITION COORDINATION GROUP

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
800-825-5234  
www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\*\*\*

>> Recording in progress.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, everyone. Markus here. It's top of the hour and people are still logging in, so let's wait a minute or two before we start the call.

>> Always good to see you guys.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Likewise.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, let's get started. I think we have a core group of DC coordinators on the call, let me start by welcoming you all and hand it over to Celine who has circulated an agenda. Can you maybe show it on the screen?

Is everybody okay with the agenda or are there additions to the agenda proposed by the Secretariat?

>> June: Yes.

>> SECRETARIAT: Apologies. My computer is stuck.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, this happens. Well, I mean the main agenda item is in the way of preparing for the DC main session, but we would also, obviously, like to take stock of the MAG meeting open consultation, and can I ask you, Celine, as you are also preparing the summary record for the MAG of the meeting to brief the coordination group a bit.

>> SECRETARIAT: Absolutely. Thank you very much, Markus. I finally found the agenda and I posted it in the chat. Basically, we are already drafted the meeting notes of the open consultations day and also of the MAG meeting, which is currently with Paul Mitchell so the Chair of the MAG for his review, but I would suggest that I share his document as soon as it is publicly available. And in this document, obviously, we're also mentioning the

intersessional event. Markus is going to talk a little about it later, but we have consolidated the summary document of the intersessional event with all of the paragraphs that were sent to the IGF Secretariat, and this is part of the MAG and OC meeting notes.

We're also referring to the presentation, so we really hope that it gives some visibility to the MAG members especially when organizing the main sessions and shaping a little bit the IGF program.

Overall for information, the final workshops were selected last week during the MAG meeting, the evaluation groups of it presented a list and this time it was very well organized because they graded and evaluated the workshops that we received already in advance and not during the MAG meeting itself, so the Secretariat is going to notify all of the workshop proposals and organizers today about the acceptance and about the rejection for those who did not make it this here.

And we also decided to inform all other remaining session organizers at the beginning of next week, so that means that you will also all receive confirmation about your DC sessions and should you have submitted other sessions under other session types, you'll also be notified as of the beginning of next week.

Also part of the MAG meeting was discussion about the main meetings. Markus and Jutta was present and do not hesitate to correct me if I'm wrong, but they identified five main sessions that they would like to build on, and they still have two other topics that are let's say pending, that they didn't find agreement, whether they should be cross-cutting or also have their own main session. And the topics are gender and human rights and freedoms.

So, that would more or less it from what happened during the open consultations at the MAG meeting. Otherwise, the two days after the MAG meeting was also the leadership panel, which was a very successful meeting, and they primarily discussed the paper that they were working on, on the Internet we want, so how the leadership panel is shaping, let's say, the idea of the Internet that we want. This document will also soon be made available together with the meeting notes of the leadership panel that will be available to everyone publicly, so there is also a document that I can then share with you. If you have any questions, maybe Markus can elaborate on the intersessional event and DC session that was proposed last week. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Celine, for that, and there were also other people on the call who were present in person in Geneva, and others followed online and invited also to chip in, but back to the agenda which you have seen. It's a very straight-forward agenda, so can I take it that we all agree to that agenda? With that I assume we have the way to move back. I would like to get back to the intersessional event, which we did label

it as an experiment and we had, in a way, very little time to prepare it.

But all in all, I think it went extremely well and I would like to commend all of you who participated and who prepared contributions. Personally, I thought it went very well, and I was also having spontaneous reactions from some of the participants without going to them and asking them what do they think of the event, but people came toward me and said, hey, that was actually quite interesting. And I think the DCs who participated really showed that they were able to deliver to this approach we had collectively chosen. So that, clearly, I think a positive solution we could make and showed how we could rally the intersessional community, so to speak, behind one theme to work in a cross-sectoral mode.

Having said that -- well I just would like to open the floor. Are there comments by others who participated in the event who are listening to the event or talked with others or had any comments on our intersessional event.

If not, I have a few comments on the overall MAG meeting and what was there was certain, shall we call it, dissates Frank of the malg with the overall influence they have of shaping the program of the IGF. Yes, I spent a lot of time on selecting the workshops and we had this discussion before. That has been an old tension where there are events selected by the MAG, and other events where the MAG had little to say.

This became very open in the discussion. There were open forums and town hall meetings where the MAG has no say tall in the selection. There they started looking at them and said, hey, these are workshops in disguise, and why should they go through without us deciding on that. Then some people also mentioned, well that actually also applies to the DCs, and maybe obviously not to this here session, but some MAG members would like to revisit the selection process, and in particular, the dynamic approved by the sessions. If you're approved by the Secretariat to have automatically a session at the IGF, and some MAG members would like to revisit this principle and put also a stronger scrutiny of the MAG over the proposal, but as I said, there is no decision on that, but they put it forward as an element to consider for next year. So I just wanted to give that as a warning to don't take the status quo for granted. There may be in the future stronger scrutiny over the session proposals that the DCs have.

Now, any comments from participants? Questions?

>> CELINE BAL: Wout, Jutta and Maarten.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. For some reason I can't see them. Yes, now I can. Yes. Wout, Jutta and Maarten, that order.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. I think you summed up what happens pretty accurately. What I would like to add is that during the meeting, several MAG members, even by direct

communication, started asking me why are we doing this, what is the meaning of this event, why are we holding it, as if they had not been briefed in any sense.

And I know that they have. Also, that I've discussed this with some of the MAG members in depth at some point, and even during the meeting they were still saying, why are we having this event, why is this important?

Then I think, okay, have you never been listening to what we've been trying to share with you in the past year? The answer seems to be, no.

If we evaluate the event, I think it went really well because we all really stood up and we presented excellently on the work that we're doing, but that somehow there is a miss match between dynamic coalitions and the rest of the IGF, and that is something that perhaps we need to work harder on to make sure that that is bettered in the future. Because when at the end of the MAG meeting, one of the members said we have to scrutinize the Dynamic Coalitions, and then I thought have you not grasped anything that we've been trying to tell you in the past two days? That we would like to have more integration, more cooperation, and more synergies between our work and your work. And apparently, that message has not come across, or they don't want to hear it. But I don't know how -- exactly how to proceed from here with a message that is so elementary to the future of the IGF, does not come across with the MAG members. And I would like to hear from others what they think and also what is the most sensible next step. I think we suggested to have a meeting with the MAG in Kyoto to discuss further and perhaps that is something that we can try to develop, but I'm curious what others think because I was not the only one who was present physically or online. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for the comments. Yes, maybe I had said that indeed. That we had questions during the sessions. I tried to explain it when introducing the session. I tried to explain it during the session. And it was also not just about the MAG. It was bringing together all of the intersessional components in our eyes, and and BPFs and Policy Networks, but it was just not -- I'm a little bit less critical than you are in that sense. It was an innovative approach to produce substantive input into the MAG meeting, and that was lost a bit by some of the MAG members. It was -- the whole idea was, yes, we give you an input in shaping the main sessions, the themes, and there I think we have also to blame ourselves a bit. Yes, we did say it, but maybe we were not good enough with communicating objective for that. What I learned is you cannot be simple enough. When you teach kindergarten kids, you have to say right your name on the top right-hand part of the paper and you have to repeat it time and again to make sure that everybody understands what you're actually after.

But so I take that also on us on us is a bit, that we were also -- it was an innovative experiment, and when you come with innovations, you have to explain and explain again and be very clear.

Anyway, your comments are well understood and thank you for that. Jutta next.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you for the floor. My impression was as innovative experiment, it went very well and it became quite clear that a group or many people were working intersessionally on Internet governance issues. And that -- given at that that was appreciated by people in the room, and I think also those who attended online, then it was quite astonishing that on the third day, the workshops for dynamic coalitions were still questions or questioned, and people were saying that we do not understand, and these were MAG members. They were saying, we do not understand why workshop proposals and dynamic coalitions are treated differently.

So the question was on the table that workshop proposals for dynamic coalitions should go through the same process of workshop proposals. Of course, both are in the format, both are workshops, but given that we had shown and demonstrated on Monday that a group that forms a Dynamic Coalition is completely different to some people who are co-organizers of the workshop. The latter are only coming together to do that workshop proposal and send it in, and the people that form a Dynamic Coalition are working for the whole year on a certain issue. That definitely makes a difference. And I can't grasp why MAG members on Monday agreed that it was important to learn more about intersessional work and that it's acknowledged and so on and so on. And then two days later, it seemed completely forgotten that there is a difference. I'm not sure what we can do about that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you for that. Again, I think it's a classical power struggle, and we are victims of I think, other proposals and that's the open forums and the town hall meetings which are really much more like bypassing the threshold of workshop submissions. So it's much easier to get a town hall than a workshop and there is a clear difference between a town hall proposal and Dynamic Coalition. Maarten, you have a hand up?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. I wasn't at the sessions. I first heard you and that already triggered me to raise my hand. Next year may be different. And if I hear about, and Jutta, then it's like hey, come on, the IGF, the global IGF biggest success, I think, is that they've had by leveraging regional IGFs, and initiatives of ours, where it's not just which country will visit this time, but where we're really trying to progress topics.

And I think in some way, shape, or form, I hope that understanding will come true to the MAG as well, as well as to the powers that be, that this is something unique, something that determines more the value of the IGF than the sessions in Kioto

themselves, so that's one side.

The other side is that much of this work happens by volunteers that don't get paid at all. At least they have that support in the back, a little bit of leverage to carry out the work, with help to get the message once the work is done somewhere as well. I think it's two very good reasons they should be very much aware of. I'm sure you've been trying to convince them too of that time and time again, but let's not forget that. If next year is like everybody else, I think you'll see a big problem this year shake out, in particular the volunteers that don't get paid are but are engaged because they care.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. While I can hear you, and we obviously have to think about it and how to approach it, and if we can have a meeting in Kyoto with the MAG, except it may be a bit different to get the slots, but we may propose a standalone meeting call with the MAG members and maybe also the other intersessional components.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maybe breakfast, a breakfast meeting.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: A breakfast meeting or whatever, but you know, yes, we can also listen at the concerns and say attend the DC meeting, as many as you can, and is there one that you find did not meet the quality standards expected from a meeting under the label of IGF or was there anything that wasn't good enough, or what are the criteria that need to be -- I mean we have moved a long way. I mean we have basic principles. We have this charter where we can tick the box to abide by certain standards or principles, you know, so tell us what you expect from a DC meeting. I think I would say, most of the DCs would fulfill all the criteria of the selection process.

But, again, my feeling is it's a little bit of frustration of the MAG that they spend an awful lot of time on selecting the workshops and the workshops are maybe what, 50% of the total program. There are many other slots that are filled outside of their authority. Wout, you have your hand up again?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Just reflecting on what has been said. I think that I totally agree with you that we have to run the message home time and again. When you do something for the first time, most people usually don't understand it or it's something influence. I think that is one.

I think the second one, and that's more addressed to Celine, that the feeling that I have over the three days and I was there for two days physically and one day online, at that I think there is a mismatch between a large part of the IGF and the MAG mandate.

Why am I saying that? The MAG is responsible for creating the program.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yep.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: The theme, workshops, main sessions. What we are doing is in no way underneath the MAG, so there is no responsibility oversight of the MAG like was said during the meeting. We already have so much work and now you're asking us to do more.

And where they're asking us, basically, to do less if we go through the workshop process. So, since Celine in the process in the message that you could look into, if we are talking about an IGF + or IGF + + as they call it, where does the MAG fit in? Because if the goal is to come up with substantive outputs and the dynamic coalitions in principle are doing that, it does not fit in with anything that the MAG does, and the MAG is not taking any responsibility for that content as we heard.

So, there is a mismatch, and I don't know how to close that gap now, but it's something that perhaps is in the mandate, and that is something that I think needs discussing if the IGF wants to evolve as everybody is talking about to have substantial outputs, and those outputs are more than just the messages on the basis of workshops because, as I said last year, the dynamic coalitions were not even reported on in any of the messages that were shared.

In other words, we are as dynamic coalitions, we are doing work on severe serious without puts that could -- that the IGF could profit from as not as a standard-setting body, but let's call it that way because we're looking at ideas and standards and policies and guidelines as an advice to stakeholders, so how do we get to the recognition of our work or at least it's on the IGF website as output of the IGF and not something that is way, way, way back in a place where usually nobody finds it.

I think that is the challenge that we're looking at. And isn't that the discussion we should be starting.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, I mean, your point is a kind of mismatch between the MAG and the overall mandate. That's clearly something to be looked at, and I think also Mark in the chat refers to a very congested IGF program, which is a fact, and that's I think also part of the frustrations some MAG members feel. They're very busy, but they don't really have -- you know, they have an important mandate for shaping the program, but in the end there is a lot of it outside of their sphere of influence, and the DCs, we are a very small part of the program as such, but at the same time a very substantive part. I think we have not found a way to bring us together with the MAG that we work together and not as antagonists, and that I think is a lot to do with the frustration, that's what I felt, of individual MAG members. So, my plea will be let's not go into confrontation with the MAG but let's really find a way of working together. Look, we want the same thing. We want a strong IGF, IGF +, IGF + +, and how can we achieve this together, and we do understand that you have concerns, but please

look at the program and tell us where you think we're not good enough, what we could improve, and so on and so on.

But we definitely don't want to be under the control of the MAG. I think that's one of the institutional or foundational principles of the DCs, that we are independent and bottom up, and let's maintain that because that's also part of the strength of the IGF that we have this part of the IGF, which is of self-organized and independent, but yes if the MAG has a feeling that we need some common quality criteria, let's sit together and see what they could be.

I mean, quality criteria are by definition, not easy to define, and we have so far not ventured into that field. We have more concentrated on more procedural criteria, and we have come a long way. I mean we started with the three Os open, open membership, open lists, and open archives, and even that is not that easy, but let's continue that work and be constructive and I can sense, yes, there is also a certain frustration on the side of the DCs that their contribution is not appreciated enough, and again understandable. We have to recognize that we have two groups. The MAG is frustrated and DCs are frustrated. So how can we bridge the gap and make sure that instead of being equally frustrated, we are actually equally -- at least equally unhappy and move towards equally happiness.

With that, can we move to the main agenda item that is the main session proposals? We have said let's put our main session proposal under the heading, the Internet we want, and we just heard from Celine that the leadership panel is working on that, so I think we would fit in well as we -- as a Dynamic Coalition main session. We come together with a contribution. And, again, when I shared the concept note for the main session, there was quite a bit of pushback from some of the MAG members that said why should the DCs have a main session. And we had to say, well we had had it for several years, and we thought it was a very useful way of showcasing the work that has been done by dynamic coalition but we also said that this time we would not like to have stock-taking session of work in the past of dynamic coalition but rather forward-looking session where the dynamic coalitions say what they can contribute to the main theme in a way as we did with the intersessional session we had at last week's open consultations.

And as Celine said in her outline that the MAG picked up some of the main themes that -- some of the subthemes that were defined in Vienna, but there were two subthemes left open, and that was gender and human rights and freedoms, if I'm correct. Celine, please correct me if I'm wrong. So these were not picked up by the MAG as main sessions, so these could be possible points of entry for where the DCs come forward into the main session, just thinking aloud, but we could obviously leave it fairly much open.



And I know that we had a quick exchange before the call, and Jutta remembered that we had an approach when we focused on the SDGs and we had a common template. Jutta, could you maybe recall us how that worked? That was in 20 -- 2018 or 19? When you had the session on the SDGs?

>> JUTTA CROLL: I don't think it was 2019 in Berlin.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Paris, yeah?

>> JUTTA CROLL: It was Paris, it would have been 2018.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct, yes.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Time was too short to look up the template, but I do remember it made it a bit easier for the dynamic coalitions when we were preparing for the main session to have some guidance from that template on how to bring forward what they have to bring forward to the main session of dynamic coalitions. Because although at that time I think we were much less than 20 dynamic coalitions, like many of you may remember, it's always a bit tricky to find that joint issue that we are dealing with. And that year we addressed it to the SDGs, had a look at how the work of the respective Dynamic Coalition is related to the SDGs, and to be honest, I do think that from that time on, it became usual that we also have that connection between workshop proposals and the SDGs. It was put into the template for workshop proposals also from that time on. We did not have that in the workshop proposal from the beginning.

And so, it might be an option that we prepare also such a template for this year because we are a bit under time pressure. It's only three months -- less than three months to go before the IGF takes place, and if we want to have a Dynamic Coalition main session, which of course is beneficial because of course then we will have the interpretation and the UN languages, and it gives more visibility to the Dynamic Coalition work. But then we need to be quick to put together what we are going for.

And a final remark from which is my personal perspective, I already argued in Geneva against the MAG not to have human rights dedicated session because I think the message counts. And if people look at the subthemes for this year's IGF and see okay human rights are even not considered for a main session, that is really not the right message from my personal point of view. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jutta, for that. I think, in essence, your proposal will be that we as dynamic coalitions pick up what the MAG has not considered, and there will be the other theme that will be gender which is another issue, which has -- but I mean there have been discussions with how to deal with that and many said it should be a cross-cutting issue. Whereas I think think it should be a standalone issue. But I think it might be easier to rally behind human rights than behind gender for the dynamic coalitions, but there are also other dynamic coalitions. I don't know how

Maarten would feel about human rights with Internet of Things. Is there any connection? There may be.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: There is. There is. Ranging from privacy to inclusivity.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There you go. Yes. I hadn't thought of that, but yes, I mean it is also a very cross-cutting theme, human rights. Yes. So could that be an approach? Would we would obviously need to formulate it in a way that allows --

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think it's pretty essential. One of the things we were looking through in IoT, one of the biggest changes is AI and algorithms steering what is happening with the tools, the networks, the data, et cetera. In that the human rights are a crucial perspective with respect of that. So, I for sure can emphasize that. It's not the current focus of the work that we do, but just like we can talk about the impact of our work on the different SDGs, human rights is for sure easy to at least devote a paragraph or a couple of minutes to.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you for that. This is precisely, I think, what we would like to hope to achieve collectively that the DCs from their collective expertise can make a contribution to one particular theme, and human rights will be -- yeah, I think it would be a good heading to attract some attention, and as Jutta said, also to correct an imbalance of the other main themes. So that the DCs could make a valid contribution to balance the program.

Are there other views on that? Or could we all agree on rallying behind human rights? I mean I see there are many active DC coordinators on the call.

>> AMY CROCKER: I'll just come in, Markus, if I may. I put a note in the chat, but absolutely I support. I think it's really important for us also to not think of human rights as something that we can just use to form an artificial connection. I mean human rights underpin every element of human governance, or at least they should do, and that translation to the digital world and whether we're talking about connectivity, those are rights, denial of those is a denial of a right. And obviously from our perspective, we're specifically looking at children's rights, but you know we also are very much mindful of impacts on boy human rights, child rights, policies to give an example. I mean so it's absolutely essential and I think it could be not something just for a session but something actually to explore as a sort of unifying element between all of our DCs. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. There are more positive comments in the chat. I see Stephen Wyber, interesting angle in how to deal with the potential conflicts between rights, what does a proportionate, reasonable, necessary approach look like today?

If the feeling is that we could make a useful, valid, and interesting contribution under this theme of what our contribution is, that would be I think a very -- it could be an interesting session. Wout, you have your hand up?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I'm rooting for the SDGs in general, as I think that there are so many topics that need to become better where the SDGs are concerned that focus only on human rights, could do really enormous disservice to the other ones. And we know that they're not going well, and that it's somewhat of the future is even being contested by the Global South, because they're afraid it will go against the SDGs, and that's why I think that the SDGs in general with the subtopic on human rights would be more valuable to the world than only human rights, but that's my personal message, but as that I3C will have not much to contribute to human rights because that's not our focus. Our focus is the general security of everybody on the Internet. That's my point of view. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right. Well I'm just thinking aloud. Could you not from the standard side also think, you know, security, like Maarten said, there is privacy elements on standards and so on on human rights. Jutta has a hand up and she's more of a expert than I am.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I'm sorry. Thank you. I just had looked up what we did for 2018, and I'm not sure whether it's possible to share the screen, but I could show you a matrix where we had clustered the SDGs and 16 of the dynamic coalitions that we had in that year with their relationship to the SDGs, and I agreed that was a good image, but if we do it again, the SDGs, we should have a look whether something has changed over these last five years. So I could do that probably quickly. Can you see that now?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. You will see the dynamic coalitions starting with accessibility, and then we have Blockchain, child online safety, community connectivity, core Internet values, gender and Internet, innovative approaches to Internet rights and principles, net neutrality, platform responsibility, public access and libraries, I need to make it a bit bigger. We have schools and Internet governance, island developments, Internet of Things, trade, and Dynamic Coalition. You can see all of these green boxes show that they are related to some of the SDGs. That would be another approach to go for the broader image of the SDGs, but then really I do think that we need to underline how we have developed further from 2018 to 23.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Looking at this Excel sheet, it seems it's not too easy to manage a session with that broad focus, whereas if you have a theme, okay, we could maybe have human rights and SDGs, and if there is a Dynamic Coalition that cannot be a

contribution toward human rights, they could maybe pick one of the SDGs where they feel very strongly about. But my main concern would be, I think we worked well with the intersessional meeting we had last week, it was much more focused, and it was always difficult with the DC main sessions that they were so open, very difficult to have a strong single focus around. I mean we've learned collectively over the years, and I think last year's session went remarkably well in Adis, but I think it could still be a gain from being more focused. I see Stephen has a few comments in the chat. Why don't you want to come in, unless you have d.

>> STEPHEN WYBER: I can. I'm sorry. I got off a flight from New York this morning so I'm a bit groggy and not all there and coherent. I was just saying that, the comment Wout was making about the Global Digital Compact and Summit of the Future and indeed that's some of the argument. The official of the UN line is about this is the how of how we deliver the SDGs and how we fill in some of the gaps on capacity and the gaps on what are the structures that we need to get in place. So it's almost like adding goals on to SDG 17 that we need to get better more or less, and then yeah the only other point that I -- the only other point I put down there was the idea given that the SDGs, I suppose, you know, it is a rights-based development framework, you're supposed to leave no one behind, guarantee absolutely everyone's rights and maybe there is an angle in there about saying, you know, what does it look like to guarantee the digital rights necessary in order to achieve the SDGs. But that's just one way of trying to tie the two together.

That sounds like a elegant way forward. Wout's comment in the chat. What if you break up in four or five groups on topics.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The idea was with the concept paper that based with the paper submitted, we would form some clusters which would more or less be the end result of saying as what Wout is proposing. But I like the delivering digital human rights to accelerate the SDG, for instance, sounds like an elegant formulation to link the two together, and I think it will also be open enough for those who want to have a slightly other focus. Celine, you have a brilliant idea, please.

>> CELINE BAL: I hope it is brilliant. I told you just at the beginning of the meeting that the leadership panel is working on their key messages about the Internet we want but kind of gives guidelines or directions, official ones, so again I do not know when the document will be final, but they've been working on it during last week's meeting, and they have I think five, five ideas. So maybe, just because Wout offered or suggested to break up in four or five groups, it is again, just a suggestion. We keep the Internet that we want and we work towards those four or five groups that the leadership panel identified.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think that sounds like a

pretty good idea. I think it will have an additional benefit to take that approach to show that the DCs are actually team players, and they like to fit into the big scheme of things and which has been defined by the leadership panel, and that we would say, okay, we take up and we fill it with content, so that could be one approach. It would be slightly different from what was proposed in the concept note, where you would actually wait for the papers coming in and then form clusters, but we would form the clusters based on what comes to us from above. But Maarten?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No, I agree. I think that's a brilliant idea, Celine. That makes a lot of sense. My remark would have been that the SDGs are basically based on human rights and that's why they're at the UN level and so that is by definition a link. The other that I came up with that I prefer, I think, is that one of the things that we're facing is the digital divide shifts. Less and less people on the side of have not with digital access, but at the same time the digital divide is getting deeper because the less people are on the non-digital side, the more they will be expected to have the access that the other parts have, so that was another fault of something to dreaths, but maybe we can even -- maybe it's even coming up in the 5 points that panel will come up with. All about (?), I think.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for the comments. Yeah. That's also an interesting remark about the change of the digital divide. Yes. I mean it's true in our societies for those who are not connected or for some reason left behind, the elderly or whatever, it's finding it more and more difficult actually to fit into society. Yeah.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Different ways you see it even in affluent countries like Switzerland or Netherlands, but as if you look worldwide, it's similar. Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Absolutely. A question to Celine. We obviously don't know when the paper will be out. Did they give any indication?

>> CELINE BAL: Unfortunately not. It is about to be final, but I do not know when they want to present the paper. What I know is that they thought of actually holding or having a session at the main IGF to present the paper. But because the paper is about to be final, I can imagine that they already want to issue it earlier. I can ask when the Secretariat and let you know.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please do. Yes. The difficulty -- yes, it's the timing a bit. I mean as you said, the session is in less than three month's time. When exactly -- anyway, it's around the 10th of October or something. Yes. And we will need to move towards that, so how do we -- you know, your idea is brilliant, as I expected, but we cannot work on that basis until we have the paper, and we don't know when we have the paper, so that's the difficulty.

>> CELINE BAL: What I could do is maybe share the five headlines of those five subgroups.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. That we have already. That's good enough. That's good enough. If we have the headlines, we would have the five clusters.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maybe one or two lines under it what it means. Not the full text, but at least, I don't know how clear the headlines are.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Do you have them right now? Can you share them on the screen?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes. I'm going to share them also in the chat so you all have them. But I would still prefer to first go back to the IGF Secretariat to know how much I can share. Maybe they're going to tell me that I can share the whole document. In that case I'll also do so, but at least I'll share now the headline.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I mean the headline would be a good start. I think that could be enough for us to move forward on that basis. Obviously, if you are able to give us more background to fill us in, the better, but I think the headlines will be a good starting point.

>> CELINE BAL: If you give me one minute, I'll find the latest version and send it in the chat. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There was some chat going on. Please feel free those who have something to say, to say to all of us. All right. Mark says I3C just decided to review the components of its work that are relevant to capacity building and sustainable development. Okay. Well this is also something with linkages between G DC and the 2030 agenda and SDGs. There is some chat about digital human rights. Okay. Human rights in digital spaces. These are the more nicer elements of formulation. Yes.

I like that human rights in digital spaces is there. It's an important point. Not that human are digital, but the environment in which we have to realize human rights. Right. Are you ready, Celine?

>> CELINE BAL: I'm sending it in the chat. That would be it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Whole and open, universal and inclusive, free-flowing and trustworthy, safe and secure, and rights respecting.

That sounds fairly comprehensive agenda, and I think that everybody should be able to find one of them to rally behind it. I think, Wout, you should be happy with safe and secure.

Yeah, Olivier, with the core Internet values. Yes. It's actually very elegant. I quite like them, the headings.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I have one problem with this that I wouldn't -- I have a very hard time to one of them because I think for most of us all five apply. No, it's more like a matrix. It's

not like the silos that we are. It's applicable to most of us.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's so true. Okay. Avri is leading. Okay. I know there is a meeting of a strategy group that some will also attend.

But I think it's a good start, and I mean we could stick to that with the heading. I think what Stephen proposed on how was it again? Can you refresh me? Delivering digital human rights to accelerate the SDGs or something along these lines,.

>> STEPHEN WYBER: Delivering human rights in digital spaces to accelerate the SDGs. It's not quite so streamlined anymore, but something like that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That sounds more like a subtitle. Well, it could be human rights and SDGs or whatever.

>> STEPHEN WYBER: Or 18th century novel.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. (Laughing). Then we could have the subheadings as a point of entry, and yes, again, you may choose as Martin said that each of them works for me, or you can just focus on one. If Wout has problems with human rights but safe and secure should be no problem.

(laughter).

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I would not like to have that on record, Markus. (Laughing).

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I didn't mean that you have problems with human rights, but for you dynamic coalition it would be difficult to focus on human rights in that sense.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: For your dynamic coalition I think it will be easy to focus on safe and secure. So, and we could sort of take an approach, and pick as many of them as you want or just pick one of them. But we all fit in under the overall heading of human rights and SDGs and Stephen may wordsmith a title of 18th century novel of how we accelerate SDG in digital spaces and make that elegant enough, but I think we would have a flexible enough framework that should allow each DC to fit in.

The question then is what next?.okay. June also some human rights association including the SDGs. I think we again, it's worthsmithing and we might find better words of doing it, but I think what I'm happy about is that we have I think a general agreement around a basic concept, which again the beauty of it is that it would fit in with what the leadership panel is appropriating. So we would really make a good contribution to the overall meeting here, the DCs. You heard what the leadership panel is thinking about, and here is our contribution to that, and which could give us a strong linkage, I think, to the main element of the IGF which in itself I think would be a positive win-win for the DCs as such that we would show we are contributing to the greater good, and we are not -- yes, we are proud to be independent, but we want to work with the rest

of the IGF as a message at the very basic level. Then obviously there will be a substantive message.

So my main question is now, how -- or what are the next steps? What can we do? What is time needed?

My guess would be that we would need to move pretty fast, again, given the time constraints and I discussed it with Celine before and also with Jutta, and we thought that we really should aim to have a very tight deadline and ask the DCs who are interested to participate in such a session to make a contribution, produce a one-pager within three weeks from now which would bring us to the 10th of August. Could that be acceptable?

We are aware it is prime holiday season in the northern hemisphere, that's a fact, but we also know that each of you, we are keen on these issues and most of you don't go on holiday without your laptop in the sack, and you would find maybe half an hour under some shade at the beach, drinking a gin and tonic and putting something into the computer. Could that be done? 10th of August?

I see positive thumb's up.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus, I just raised my hand for a while, so if I may.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, of course you may.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I just saw that now that we have these five headlines, we could do the same exercise like we did in 2018 with the SDGs, that all the dynamic coalitions have a look at these five themes and tick the boxes where they are most related to. If we refrain from ticking all 5, which Martin has already suggested, that might be the case for some of the dynamic coalitions. I do think that most could say, okay, for me this and that might work best, so that we get a bit of an overview like we have seen with that matrix before where the dynamic coalitions are most related to, and that would also help us to structure the main session because in the end, we will only have 90 minutes, and we have to give it a structure that follows then of course these five titles, and we need to kind of group among these five titles.

I assume we could to make it easier for the Dynamic Coalition representatives to send in that one-pager that we create a short template where we have the five headlines and also have one or two questions that have to be filled, and then it's probably under some shade done within 15 to 30 minutes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. Stephen made an important remark. You shouldn't pour the gin opt laptop. Yes. (Laughing). That sounds like a brilliant idea. I see lots of positive comments. Oliveier, a one-pager is pretty straightforward, and I mean you guys are all working on these issues and you care about them, so you don't have to do much research and it should be pretty quick to have it done. So can we settle on that? Then, Jutta, can you work with Celine to produce -- well I think



it was fairly straightforward to have this. I think that will be then also helpful for clustering the session and organizing the session.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I just thought with that, Stephen, saying a mini survey, Celine, could we do that with the forms, with Microsoft Forms so then even we do not need to send words or PDFs or whosoever via email to you, but if we have a Microsoft Forms, you just would get the input directly.

>> CELINE BAL: Stephen, how would you do the mini survey if I may ask?

>> STEPHEN WYBER: So we use a bit of outcome, but that would allow for example the five areas, could say you could fit in three things or do it by priority which would get you a slightly sort of richer dataset out and also interesting limitations on people not just prioritizations and not just picking on everything. And can you have open answer boxes in there, so but you know, Microsoft Forms may be sort of better on that. I suspect the outcome is properly proprietary and so offensive to people.

>> CELINE BAL: Okay. Thank you. Jutta, I would say I will explore different options of how to best do the survey, but Microsoft Forms will definitely be an option. Yeah.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. Great.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. May I suggest that you can also get back to Stephen, link up with him to see how best autoed it just in case you have questions and he has brilliant ideas.

I think we all agree that that is a best way forward, and then we have our feedback by 10 of August, and we can take it from there and we can look at what we get as a result, and then try to make a first outline for the organization of the session. And then have maybe then call on the group again, that will be when is the week of 21 of August. They would have to move then fairly quickly. It would be great to be ready by let's say mid September to have all the names ready and also of the people who will be in place in Kyoto and who will be presenting remotely. There are also certain criteria set by the MAG, there should be, yes, we make it, and please correct me again, Celine, what is the accepted standard. There should be I think, yes, all sessions will be hybrid but there should be at least a minimum equal number present on site. Correct. Yes. All of these sort of things that we should have ready by mid September at the latest so that we know where we are.

>> CELINE BAL: Markus, maybe if I just may add, minimum of 3 people that are actually present. There must be at least one moderator on site and one moderator online. Then speakers as well online as in person, and then was very important to the MAG, too, is gender balance so that a session when preparing it, we take the various gender perspectives into considerations. Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yeah. Okay. I think the DC

group is fairly -- I think fairly good with gender balance. Yeah. Not too bad at least, I would say. Obviously, what we don't know is who will be in person in Kyoto and who won't and so on. These are all elements that we have to take into consideration. I think we have a broad agreement on the next steps and way forward and on the overall heading and priority of the session, so I think -- and Tracy, yes, there is also a question of travel support. Yeah. Yep. That's well noted.

Well, you know, the MAG is not in charge of travel support. The MAG sets the broad overall rules and then travel support depends on the funding, but I think there is a big effort of on site of the UN to make travel support possible, and presumably again that those who have an active -- well now I think it's too late now. Yeah. The deadline has passed for travel support. Yeah.

>> CELINE BAL: Deadline was on the 12th of July. Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right. I was going to say maybe it will take into consideration of whether people have a speaking role or not, but that is passed. Yeah. That's too late.

Okay. Then geographical balance, yes, of course. I mean there is the usual overall balance issues we have to take into consideration.

Are we all ready to go? I think is there anything else that we need to discuss? I think we have ticked all the boxes. We have a plan of next deadlines which is important, and as always, the Secretariat has her work to do, so I know you are very busy preparing now, and it will I think not get easier now, but more will pile up. Unless there are other comments, anything that we may have forgotten and should think about?

If not we can move to any other business. Is there anything under any other business?

Okay. Doesn't seem to be the case. Jutta, do you have anything? Last comments?

>> JUTTA CROLL: No further comments from my side. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, and also for your helpful suggestions. I would like to, in that case, give you back 20 minutes of your life. Call yourself happy.

Thank you all for participating and for being very collectively very constructive.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for facilitating.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, everyone.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus. Bye-bye.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Bye-bye.

(session completed at 9:12 a.m. CST)

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
800-825-5234  
www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text is being provided in a realtime format.  
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are  
provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may  
not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\*\*\*