

RAW TRANSCRIPT
1031IGFSA-DC1330UTC
OCTOBER 31, 2023
8:30-10:00 A.M. CT

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
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.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello. IGF Coordination meeting. It's 1430 on my clock, so it's time to get started. But let's give others another minute or so to join.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Hello. I hope you are well.

>> Hi, Wout.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Let's get started. The Secretariat has sent out an agenda, and it starts -- it's posted in the chat. The usual first agenda item is the adoption of the agenda. Then update from the Secretariat. And then the main agenda item will be taking stock of our input into the IGF. This is the Dynamic Coalition session but also, of course, all the other sessions you organized your individual DC sessions. And then (Indiscernible) any other business.

Can I take it that we agree with the proper agenda and that we adopt it as proposed? As I can't hear anyone speaking against it, I take silence for approval, and the agenda is then adopted as proposed.

With that, I would then invite Celine to give the Secretariat Update and also invite my Co-facilitator, Wout. Would you like to have to add anything at this stage?

>> JUTTA CROLL: I don't have anything to add at this stage, and I'm trying to speak as less as possible because I am a bit -- I have a bad cold today.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, sorry to hear that. Okay. So we'll keep you in the background, but don't feel shy to speak up when you feel like it.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: With that, then, Celine, can you give us the update?

And I think -- well, I just -- from what I hear from people (Indiscernible) impression that it was a highly successful meeting with record participation. But please, Celine, over to you.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much, Markus. So first of all, I hope that all of you could rest a little bit after the IGF but also the ICAN meeting that was just following after the IGF Week. What I wanted to do is basically send you the link here in the chat in case you have not already seen it. It's basically our IGF 2023 Outputs page. And I'm also sharing with you the participation and programme statistics where you can have a detailed look at the number of people who were on site, online, connected, in general, from which country, from which stakeholder group, et cetera, et cetera, as we normally do so. And basically, on the IGF 2023 Outputs page, I also wanted to draw your attention on the draft IGF messages which are under public consultations until tonight.

So in case you want to have a look at these draft Kyoto IGF messages or in case you have any comments, you can do so until close of business today. The link you can find it directly on the IGF 2023 Outputs page, which I just shared in the chat here. And otherwise, there is also the taking stock, in general, for general activities related to the IGF 2023. I'm sharing the link right now in the chat. It is open until the 19th of November. So please feel free, if you have any comments, to share them with us via this forum.

Again, the deadline is the 19th of November. And perhaps also another thing just to keep you in the loop, as of the 20th of November, we will issue the call for input for the IGF 2024. So this is also something that Markus will mention shortly, shortly after. But we are thinking of perhaps organizing another call. It is a question to you, in case you would like to have a common approach when it comes to the call for input for the IGF 2024. So there that will be it from my side. Unless you have any questions, I am happy to respond. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this. I wonder whether there may well be some questions, whether there will be any of the participants in the call have any questions addressed to Celine? Please, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I don't have a question. I am just wondering, with the deadline being so tight, whether we have an option to once more remind all the Dynamic Coalitions to give their input to the IGF messages. From the children's slide coalition, we found the messages very useful. We have made some comments, and I've seen other parts of the messages that could be a reference to the work of other Dynamic Coalitions, so I really would like to encourage the other Dynamic Coalitions to take that chance and probably also send out an email again reminding them that we have a deadline tonight, and probably one or the other will put some input into that.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. Apologies, Markus. Yes. This is an email

that I can send out later after this call to all the DCs to remind them that the deadline is today, COB. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, close of business tonight, Geneva time.

>> CELINE BAL: I'll have to check, but I think it's UTC. Midnight UTC. I'll have to check what's in the system.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Midnight gives us a few more hours. But thank you, Jutta. I think this was very (Indiscernible). There are things Dynamic Coalitions can and should do individually, and there are other things that we can do collectively. Celine already alluded to this. You may consider providing a collective input into the call for issues, or we may not. But this is something to be discussed, and I don't think we need to discuss it now, but we can then discuss it at the next call, whether there's any need for us to try and provide a collective input. But I think we have, over the past years, increasingly growing -- have been growing together and worked collectively to signal issues that are concerning us altogether. So that is something we may well do.

My question to you, Celine, it's all very nice to have all these links, but could you give an update in a nutshell from the numbers? I mean, as far as I understand it, we had record participation of more than 6,000 people. Can you just give us a nutshell summary from the Secretariat what you see as the highlights of this year's IGF?

>> CELINE BAL: Of course. Thank you so. Indeed, one of the highlights is the participation. We had over 9,000 participants this year. And it's also to my understanding the highest number of in-person participants at an IGF so far. So even more than in Berlin. And, of course, one of the highlights was the participation of the Prime Minister of Japan who also held a press -- a press conference afterwards. And we had around 355 sessions, which was also a record. We have also received some comments that we should actually not have that many sessions in the future just because then there are too many sessions in parallel and in competition, and it happens that once in a while there is a session that has very little attendance. So that it would be it.

We also have a lot of newcomers. I think over 60% newcomers so far, which is a very good number. Of course, a lot coming from the Asia-Pacific and also from Japan. And there is also a short paragraph in this link that I shared regarding the participation in programme statistics, a short paragraph comparing with the IGF in 2022. So there is an increase, indeed, by 11% of the private sector, and there is also a higher, of course, representation of the Asia-Pacific region, while the number of stakeholders from Africa decreased by around 30%, 36%. That, of course, makes a difference with having the IGF taking place in Asia and not in Africa like it was last year.

So I'd really invite you to have a look at the second link that I shared because it does give a lot of very interesting statistics. It has a breakdown for both the participants but also the kinds of

sessions that were held this year. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. No, this is very helpful. And clearly I noticed also there's an increased presence of young people, or youth, they call it, coalition. I personally don't like the term "youth." I think it's more young people. And they have also seeing some trends (Indiscernible) teenagers, I think, explicitly, that it's just really young people as opposed to young professionals or young adults. So that is on the one hand. On the other hand, actually, I noticed also I saw many people I haven't seen for years who are really veterans who have been around at the very beginning. So it was a nice mix of really seasoned veterans of the IGF and of WSIS and of newcomers, and that's definitely, I think, was one of the great strengths.

Unless there are other comments on this overall aspect, I would then suggest -- but please don't feel shy. The floor is open. If not, I would then move to the next agenda item where we address more of the DC-specific aspects. Mark, yes, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you very much, Markus. I hope you can hear me okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you loud and clear.

>> MARK CARVELL: Thanks. Yes, I was very impressed by the diversity of participation in Kyoto. I think it was great for us as a Dynamic Coalition, really, to have the opportunity to connect with quite a wide range of people and to explain exactly what we are doing, people who are new to the whole concept of a Dynamic Coalition and the fact that there was work going on throughout the year in between IGF events to talk to people about that. It was great.

I found sometimes attendance levels in individual sessions very patchy. I remember going in early on two or three days to sessions, and hardly anybody in the room. That was a bit worrying. I don't know if this is something to be looked at in terms of how people participate in the IGF, whether online or in person. Do they gravitate to particular timeframes within the week at the expense of very important sessions that are scheduled at perhaps for some people challenging times, early in the morning or late in the day? I just felt sometimes it was curious that we were being formed and the numbers were very high, but I'd go into an empty room, and there were desperate pleas from the panel to come forward, come forward, you know, engage with us closely because of all the empty seats in the room. So that was just one point.

I saw a figure that I think 16% from governments. I still feel this is low. I mean, I speak as a former government official and somebody who championed in online governmental context the importance of using the IGF in addition to expressing support for it. I don't know whether that's a feeling shared by others, but particularly, you know, in the run-up to these critical discussions in New York, first of all, on the Global Digital Compact and the potential role of the IGF in landing and taking forward the Global Digital Contact following the Summit

next year. And then secondly, of course, the review. So government attention on the IGF should be really escalating, and that attention should be manifested in actually joining and at least attending to see what this IGF phenomenon is all about.

So I don't know. I just wonder if there is a wider sense of feeling of disappointment that 16% seems quite low for government participation and maybe with the IGO figure as well, that could be looked at and wonder what's going on there in terms of recognition within the intergovernmental organizations, the U.N. agencies and so on about the value of active participation in the IGF. Okay. Those are my comments. I hope that --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> MARK CARVELL: I hope that was helpful.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: These figures definitely need to be analyzed and also looked at the reasons for the various percentages, as you said. 16% does not seem to be high, but then on the other hand, you know, if the overall number is that high, 16%, also is a fairly big absolute number. Again, it deserves further analysis. Jutta, you have comments?

>> JUTTA CROLL: (Indiscernible) to rooms and very low attendance was there in the room. I do think that room allocation was quite a bit difficult. We had some meetings in rooms that were crowded and other meetings which were just gave the impression of (Indiscernible) we were so huge and big in so many places in there that the 10, 15, 20 people (Indiscernible) in that room. (Indiscernible) mentioned when it regards improvements for 2024, and the second thing is that allocation of sessions in the schedule was also not quite straightforward.

Myself, I was supposed to speak in two sessions on the same issue that were located in parallel, and that, I would say, could be very easy -- I was listed for both sessions as a speaker, so with the rights, it might be easy to avoid that. Even with speakers, we have overlaps in the sessions. And also, of course, it was for the participants very difficult to decide whether they go to one or the other session, which were both related to the same topic. So I do think there is room for improvement, and I hope it can be made better next year.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, I know that Celine was heavily involved with the scheduling, and it's not easy, I mean, and it's almost impossible to make everybody equally happy. The most you can aim at is to make sure that everybody is equally unhappy. Wout, another comment?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I have delivered (Indiscernible) today to the stock taking. What I noticed, I think, what Markus said, what you just said, I was totally in agreement with because even as a moderator, I had conflicting sessions twice. So there is definitely room for improvement there. But also attendance that you have people flying in from all over the world, and you sit with seven people in a panel,

and there are three people behind you in this huge, huge room, and 1 1/2 hours later, there's seven. And that happens to me all my sessions except main sessions.

And so we have people working year round in the Dynamic Coalitions, and you see a room with 20 people and where you make it interactive like you announced, half of them leave instantly. So there's almost no inputs that we need to attract. So I've put some suggestions how to potentially improve that in the future in the taking stock. But if Dynamic Coalitions, as we've been telling is a Dynamic Coalition in the last 1 1/2 year, deliver major and tangible outputs to the IGF, and how is it possible nobody knows that these are presented at the IGF, that you have to sort of guess that they may be -- something may be presented, because it's not announced. It's not announced during the IGF. It's not announced before, and you have to compete with other sessions, which I also hear may be empty from many other people. So we have 6,300 participants, but also myself, I am guilty of being in as many private sessions as possible. And I notice government people are almost 100% of their time in bilateral meetings and using the IGF for something else, which is fine because they meet at the IGF, but they're not in sessions. They do not learn what's actually going on there except from the messages they get.

And the final comment is that in a session I was in with four people, at the same time, there was a big reception going on with hundreds and hundreds of people that the German government gave at the same time. So can we please stop having receptions during workshop hours? Because that draws people away from what the IGF is about. And I think that that was the biggest mistake of this IGF, personally. My session was a session I was present in, but there was nothing there, and everybody's having beer. So perhaps there are learning lessons that we can take along. But the fact that I've never seen so low attendance in meetings. There was no online participation, no online question in any session I was in. That's worrying. So that's why I think it's important to have the MAG do some sort of an analysis of this information so that actually some lessons can be learned, perhaps. Less sessions, perhaps more urgency to some of the workshops that are organized. In that sense it was not a good IGF, but over the whole, I had a perfect IGF. So don't get me wrong there because I definitely was able to meet the people I wanted to meet. So let me end there, and hopefully we can discuss this further in the future. Thanks, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Those are all valid comments. I would like to suggest that all of these comments that you provide them as input into the overall stock taking. I would not suggest that we try to give a collective input into the stock taking and the overall, but I would leave that to the individual Dynamic Coalitions, and we then focus on the main session. But you have one more comment, Muhammad, please?

>> Yes. Thank you. Am I audible?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: You are audible. Yes, we can hear you.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you, Markus. And I agree with the comments and certainly the scheduling could have been better, but from the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, I have a couple of points to flag with regards to the accessibility of this year's event. I've been to a couple of IGFs previously as well. This year's event was -- it was good, I have to say. The support that I received from the IGF Secretariat was wonderful. But in terms of accessibility, it was a little bit disappointing because in Berlin, in 2019, in terms of accessibility assistance, it was a much better event because there were personal assistants, some internship assistance was provided to persons with disabilities, and I, as a person with a disability, had used those assistants on different occasions.

This year, some of the organizers, they did try to provide those kind of assistances, but those assistances were sporadically available. So the kind of an experience that one as a person with a disability would want to have in person -- at an in-person event would be, I would say it was a sort of disappointment.

One crucial point that I want to make is for the personal experience. One of the assistants, when I told that on the last day of the IGF I had an event just across the hotel, across the venue in the Prince Hotel, it was an event organized by the -- by some organization. So I was categorically told by the assistants that they were not allowed to leave the venue. So what's the point of organizing an event which was not essentially accessible for some of the participants? Or I would even question the availability of the assistants which were not available to go outside the venue even if it was just across the venue?

With regards to the online accessibility, there have been much better scheduling options. There could have been better options to edit the sessions. I think the next year IGF website, this is going to be prepared by the Saudis. I'm not sure -- (no audio)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Are we losing you, Muhammad? I can't hear you anymore. Can you hear me? It seems we have lost Muhammad. I would strongly suggest to the DCAD also to make these comments as the overall stock taking. I think this is very important, and DCAD has been very much in the forefront right from the beginning as suggesting -- making suggestions to make the IGF more accessible for people with disabilities, and all these comments will be helpful for next year's session.

Celine, as you have been involved in -- very much in the scheduling the overall organizations, do you have any comments to add or reaction to the comments received?

>> CELINE BAL: Perhaps just to answer a few of these comments. So first of all, we took note of everything, what you've said so far, and also I would like to, you know, really encourage you to also submit this online because we're going to consolidate all of the feedback received.

So regarding the room. So what we noticed is that it really depends also to what extent the organizer is communicating and advertising their own events, to what extent, you know, they are doing that effort via their own, let's say, communication channels or social media channels, et cetera, et cetera, so that they attract a little bit more of attendance.

There has been definitely, to many sessions, happening in parallel, and especially in those big rooms. So what we decided -- or let's say what we are trying to do for next year is having just less sessions within IGF so that we have more sessions that we could actually focus on. When it comes to the 16% of governments, it could very well be found, as you said, that a lot were in bilateral meetings, which, on the other side, is positive because we do provide during the IGF the possibility of government officials to meet. But, indeed, they could take part in more sessions on their own.

What they've been doing, in general, we could not really -- we could not really tell, of course. But on the other side, 16% of those 9,000 is still as such quite a number.

When it comes, then, to the attendance, in general, it was spread over the week. So there were a couple that were just there on day zero. A few others that were on day zero and one. Some others who just arrived on the second day. And one thing that we also realized is that as of next year, we would like to spread the high-level sessions throughout the week because this year, as you may have noticed, it was on day zero and day one. So that we actually also tracked more high-level people throughout the week instead of just having them on day zero and day one.

So those are a few comments that I noted down. But I might have some others that come to me a little bit later. But, yeah. Any other questions so far?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. My suggestion would be that we leave that and we focus now on the actual taking stock of our DC input of our DC session, and that would include the collective mind session we had and then also on the individual DC sessions, if you have any comments related to that.

Can we, then, move on that agenda item, the DC main session? Well, again, taking stock means what worked well, what worked less well, what could have been better, what should we have done better with hindsight? I think all in all, it was a next step we have to take. In the past we tried to accommodate as many DC sessions as possible. This time we tried to cluster them and have a more thematic input. And I would like to turn to Jutta again. Would you like to give your assessment of how well it went?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Very briefly due to my speaking. So in general, I do think the session went very well. First, we thought that maybe in the main hall, that was a bit large, but then I do think that we also got the attention of people who maybe, at the beginning, were

only sitting in that room because they usually sit in the main hall. But in the end I thought we were successful in gaining their attention to what was said in the session.

I still think the session would have benefited from more Dynamic Coalitions bringing in their perspective during that phase when we were open for statements and questions as well. I think it was a lively debate on issues that were brought up at that stage, and it could have been going further with inclusion of topics from other Dynamic Coalitions who either weren't present in the room or didn't take the floor at that stage. And that's all from my side.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you, Jutta. I mean, that's very much my own impression. It was also very intimidating to note that we were in the last an of in a very big room. My fear was it would be empty, but as you said, people sit there for the comfort anyway in the main room. But in the end I think our objective was to make it as interactive as possible, and in the end it was interactive. It did have interaction with participants in the room, not just the panel. And the panel, I think, worked also very well.

You know, a good sign is actually (Indiscernible) we ran out of time, and that happened to our session. A bad sign is if you don't know how to fill the time. And here we could have gone on longer, I think. I had to cut off Alejandro, one of our panelists, because I was not aware that it was actually him. But we already reached the full time. And, again, it was unfortunate but it's not a bad thing if you run out of time as such. It's a sign that there is an engaging session. And we have comments in the chat. Olivia says it was an interesting session. All in all, I think the experiment was successful. Obviously, there's always room for improvement but something to build on. But, please, I would like to hear your comments. Stephen, yes, you were a Rapporteur. Thank you very much again for your work. You did an excellent job. Please, Stephen.

>> STEPHEN WYBER: No, I didn't raise my hand. (Indiscernible) flatteries. I liked that it was thematic. I know when we've had sort of 16 DCs up there, it becomes show and tell, which isn't quite -- I think that's not the best advert for the DCs as a model, and I think there was enough in there to come out with some thematic threads. I think also just to echo the point about do we use surveys? Do we use sort of contributions beforehand and actually have -- if we do this again, as sort of an overview of what's being said across the board or a display a bit like we did with the MAG a few months earlier in order just to make sure that each DC does get its name up there on the screen and so everyone can tick the boxes they need to tick without ruining the continuity or ruining the thread of logic that runs through the piece?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes. All good suggestions. And thank you also for the overall confirming that the overall approach was worthwhile, trying not to have the previous approach of the show and

tell of 16 Dynamic Coalitions. I mean, that was, I think, the major change between previous DC sessions and (Indiscernible), find a common thematic thread.

Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Markus. And thanks also to those -- I don't know who needs the acclamation here in terms of the authors of the report of the session. I think it's a very valuable account, and it name checks a lot of active Dynamic Coalitions. And I think -- I hope it has had an impact this session, and maybe if there's some way we can use the report to advance the recognition of the Dynamic Coalitions, their contribution not only to strategic, ongoing work of the IGF but also to (Indiscernible) preparation for the global implementation of the compact, the contribution that Dynamic Coalitions have stated that they are keen to make. And this was a point, I remember, in Addis was recognized by the tech envoy who said clearly there was the potential for the Dynamic Coalitions to contribute to the landing of the Global Digital Compact following the Summit.

So -- and I hope this emphasis of the contribution of Dynamic Coalitions is registered with the leadership panel. I know Vince was there throughout the session, one of the Co-chairs. It would be useful to know -- maybe you know this -- it would be useful to know what he has taken away and how he is -- and maybe other leadership panel members who were in the audience, I don't know if there were, but there may have been a few others, I guess -- you know, what they are, you know -- how they are reacting to this session and the clear statements about, as I say, the role of the Dynamic Coalitions and what they're doing, you know, their commitments to action. I mean, we've heard throughout the whole digital cooperation initiative and process launched by the U.N. Secretary-General that the IGF needs to be more active and needs to deliver, it needs to have impact. And this is what the Dynamic Coalitions are doing, and the session, I think, very helpfully highlighted that, you know. The IGF is more than an event. There is a deep, active commitment by stakeholders to working out solutions and identifying best practice and making policy recommendations and delivering messages that need to be promoted with business leaders and governments worldwide. So the leadership panel, I hope, is alert to this and what we have provided through the session in particular as a sort of focal point. But to continue to be linked into leadership panel thinking as it looks now to advocate those messages from the IGF, from Kyoto, and not overlook what the Dynamic Coalitions are doing, which is highly relevant to those messages, relevant to the sustainability development goals, relevant to the Global Digital Compact, and relevant, ultimately, to turning the mandate into a future commitment of the U.N. at 2025. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, and I think it's all very good points, and that could lead us into, you know, the session of not an end in itself but that it's something to build on, and it could

be a starting point for our collective input into the call for issues the Secretariat will be launching end of November. So we could build on that and provide an input. Olivier?

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Markus. Olivier speaking. Speaking after Mark, it's very difficult because he takes up everything you want to say. So I second what Mark said. Vint is following several Dynamic Coalitions, the work of several Dynamic Coalitions very closely. I know he's on the mailing list of several, and I've seen him intervene in several of them. And he also has mentioned on several occasions that he relays the work over to the panel.

Now, the fact that he was at this main event is really good. I have no idea whether he took notes or -- he must have taken notes, you know, but I have no inside track as to whether he's relaying this. But I think that -- and here I'm speaking from someone who followed that session remotely. I think that the overall point was the -- the Dynamic Coalitions as a whole are working on the Global Digital Compact. They are an integral part of the IGF ongoing work and especially when it comes down to addressing the SDGs as well, which I think we need to reaffirm as well because that's a wider WSIS+20 thing. So, indeed, we have to look at the WSIS+20 as a goal and make sure that the voice of the Dynamic Coalitions continues to be heard.

More so I think we need to continue trying to get more people to be involved in our Dynamic Coalitions. I know some are doing well through the work they are doing, but it's never enough. And looking at the figures of having, you know, 6,000 people at the IGF, well, we haven't got 6,000 people involved in those. So we'll have to see. We probably need to try to get more.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Wout in the chat said "can we invite Vint and the Austrian Minister to be a part of the DCCG meeting?" Well, the Minister might be a bit hard, but with Vint, we could definitely try. And we could also invite the new MAG Chair. MAG Chair is ex-officio a member of the high-level panel. And I think -- well, Vint is very busy, of course, but as Olivier said, he's fairly engaged with various Dynamic Coalitions. I think he's interested -- he has always been and has provided funding for the accessibility work. He's very committed to that, and he's also very committed to the standards and the core Internet values work. I -- that might be a possibility, but we definitely should also invite the MAG Chair to maybe listen in a bit on our collective meeting. And I think she is (Indiscernible) I would say engaging in Dynamic, and that definitely could be an option that we invite Vint and the MAG Chair to join our coordination group meeting if we have one in November to discuss also the input we may wish to provide into the call for issues the Secretariat will launch.

Other comments? Suggestions? Well, I see we seem to be all very much on the same wavelength, which is a good thing to be. Very harmonious. But can we take that as an issue to follow up on, that we invite the Chair of the leadership panel, that is Vint, and MAG

Chair, Carol, to join our next session to see how we can highlight -- that would, obviously, need some coordination with them, but I think it would be good to have that after the call for issues (Indiscernible) 20th of November; is that correct, that we could aim for a call after that late November or early December? Would that make sense? I see heads nodding. That we then, obviously, also maybe we could have a prep call beforehand if you have -- if you manage to have both Vint and Carol on the call. And the aim would be that we build on what we have and, again, the report. Let's give credit. You're not fishing for compliments, Stephen, but you've done an excellent job, and we are very grateful for this report. It is already up on the website, if I'm not mistaken. And so we have really something to build on.

Well, with that, can we, then, close the discussion on the taking stock agenda item that was essentially the main DC main session? But I would also invite comments on your individual DC sessions you have had. Are there any particular insights apart from the points already made by Wout right at the beginning, and his DC wanted an interactive settings, and then people are afraid and left the room? But that's also part of the overall comments you may wish to provide, what did not work so well. But the floor is open for other comments.

And, obviously, the timing is always an issue. Nobody likes to be on the last day. Somebody has to be on the last day. And maybe there the wish to the Secretariat is also maybe to make sure it's not always the same people who are on the last day.

Jutta, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. There is one issue that I wanted to raise, although not so many Dynamic Coalitions are present on that call, but my concern is that we really have a growing number of Dynamic Coalitions now at the IGF. Of course, everybody can initiate a Dynamic Coalition, and that's very useful. And I think we have -- I think we have set a standard what Dynamic Coalitions can achieve with their work throughout the year. But in the end, as you said before, Markus, no one wants to be on the last day. Given that and given the number of more than 20 Dynamic Coalitions, I'm wondering whether it's really feasible that all Dynamic Coalitions have their session in the programme of the Internet Governance. I wouldn't say that if we are not in the closed of Dynamic Coalitions here in the coordinating group because I know that Dynamic Coalitions and their sessions are always questioned in the MAG meetings. But we should be aware of that. And even before we invite high-level people like Vint or the Minister to our meeting, Dynamic Coalition representatives need to be aware that there is no guarantee for Dynamic Coalitions in a way that you have a Dynamic Coalition, then, and then you have your session at the IGF, except next year we have double of room and more possibilities. I don't expect that.

And on the other hand, as we are talking about the main session of the Dynamic Coalitions, I think that is somehow the way out. The

more prominent the Dynamic Coalition's joint main session is, the better it is, and maybe that could be a way to keep the Dynamic Coalitions all on board but still not focus too much on a 90-minute Dynamic Coalition session which in the future just won't be feasible if we don't see a decrease in numbers of Dynamic Coalitions. Just to let's face facts.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jutta. It's always good to have a realistic assessment of the situation, and your point, I think, is well taken. It has always been a bit of a struggle to get the sessions, but here I think the distinction needs to be made, you know, Dynamic Coalitions are kind of the annual general meeting of the Dynamic Coalitions. And it does not necessarily need to be a public session in that sense. It could also be -- you know, if they're given the room where they can meet to discuss their work, to many of them it's a once-a-year opportunity to have a face-to-face meeting. So, you know, it's a question of how to frame it, but that is definitely -- I, for one, definitely defend the right and the need for the Dynamic Coalitions to be given a space where they can meet and discuss, but maybe it needs to be set differently in the programme. And the discussion will come up again that there are too many sessions at the same time, you know. But, again, something to consider. But I see two hands up. Wout and Mark. Wout was first, I think, and then Mark.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think I'm going to say the opposite of what Jutta said. But our own session, I think what we were able to present at the IGF was really outstanding. I think we presented reports that people worked on for a year, and we had the opportunity to present them, and the people who saw them, read them, came with very positive feedback on our work. So in that sense I think that everything went well, leaving aside the attendance numbers. But what I said before is that who knows that these reports by Dynamic Coalitions are produced? Where are they? Somewhere hidden deep in the IGF website. No news announcements saying, we have these reports of intercessional work.

I think that having been to several sessions all over the week, there is an opportunity to have more coordination. There were sessions on AI going on at the same time, on AIoT going on at the same time that at some point I had to cut myself in three to be able to be where I had to be. So that's not an option. You make your choices.

If there was a better coordination, it would also become more feasible to put intercession work, and I mean all intercession work, more central to the IGF. So if there is a Dynamic Coalition on IoT and there are sessions on IoT, it would make sense to combine them somehow and that the input that is delivered goes into the Dynamic Coalition who can then come up with an overarching report at the end of the IGF and make the main points that have to be made. The same could be for other DCs, and on AI, I think that we're best there. There were a lot of people involved in that work, I understand.

But if we were able to coordinate better, the outcomes and the

messages, the recommendations, the policy recommendations would become more urgent because more people know about them, know how they were made, and probably start participating because they can't afford not to be present because then you're not heard anymore.

So I think that putting intercessional work as a whole more central in the IGF means that perhaps you don't have an individual session anymore, but you have common sessions between different stakeholders leading to commonly agreed recommendations. So I think that's one of the recommendations I made in the taking stock. But that's an opportunity to fulfill the promise that the leadership panel and the MAG Chair have sort of made in the Global Digital Compact in the letter they sent. Who's going to deliver? And I think that the intercessional work is better, both to deliver on the promises made there than individual workshops where people tell what they know and go home. So let me leave it there as a food for thought. Thanks, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, that's definitely an interesting suggestion, but it also reminds me the saying of a very seasoned colleague in the U.N. who said everybody's in favor of coordination, but nobody wants to be coordinated. We always hear the same things about workshops when we suggested, well, that looks to be more or less on the same theme. Why don't you merge? So everybody's in favor of merging. Nobody wants to be merged. It's totally different. We have a totally different approach. But, you know, to change the focus a bit, once we have the themes, that we then try to group them and don't have the workshop driven but rather having driven by those who are working on these themes. But that was another thought.

You know, you mentioned your Dynamic Coalition, presenting a report, so that's obviously a session that deserves to be in the programme because you have something to present. But there may be Dynamic Coalitions and, again, while Aubrey is not on the call today, but they have Dynamic Coalitions, schools of Internet governance. They are of no interested to anybody not involved in the school for Internet governance, but to them it's of high interest because they compare notes, and they learn from each other. So it would be a shame if they're not given a space, but it is completely different in character. So maybe we ought to make a distinction between Dynamic Coalitions who want to talk among themselves because it's their annual general meeting and Dynamic Coalitions who can present something to a broader audience. But then what they have to present, and there need to be a kind of assessment, are they -- do they deserve a bigger stage, or is it really worthwhile or not? But that's, again, something in the past we have shied away, a quality assessment of the work of individual Dynamic Coalitions.

Okay. You can tick a box. Do you have a report that can be read? But then there will be the additional thing, is this report actually interesting? And that's the more difficult step to take. Sorry, I've been talking too much. Mark.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I totally agree, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah. As Jutta pointed out, this is a bit of a challenge, how to ensure there's adequate space in the IGF programming for action-oriented multistakeholder activity to be presented. It's not going to be easy. I mean, the model of Dynamic Coalitions is a successful one. We're seeing new Coalitions being formed. And that does put pressure on the time space as the Forum. Then, again, we do need to protect this space for those Coalitions that are action oriented. That's what I distinguish between the range of Coalitions that there are. They have a different kind of objectives and purposes, but there are some that are action oriented, and because they are motivated in that way and they want to deliver recommendations, toolkits, guidelines, whatever, that's going to be potentially taken up. They need to be connected to those sessions in the IGF programme where they are addressing those issues, those problems, what we're trying to identify how to realize opportunities. Perhaps of the fact that there are no relevant Dynamic Coalitions. So coordination and connecting these elements in the IGF programme is so important.

And my only thinking about what the solution might be is that we hold again intercessional event where we bring all the Dynamic Coalitions together. They're all invited to participate. And it's an open forum, preparing for the IGF event where there's a lot of space for reporting. This is what the individual Dynamic Coalitions have been doing. And this is their normal report, and then it kind of feeds into the preparatory process for the IGF event. And with the message that if you're holding a session on, in our case, ISCC, a session on the cybersecurity standards, check with the Dynamic Coalition. Maybe they want to contribute to that session, that discussion, so there's a connection. There's a link between exploratory discussion and actual activity being conducted by Dynamic Coalition. So there's that. You know, let's have a look again at the intercessional event and see how we can use that as the mechanism for more effective integration in the programme of Dynamic Coalitions.

And then secondly, maybe we seek an extended period -- sorry, an extended session for the Dynamic Coalitions. You mentioned at the beginning, Markus, you know, it was getting difficult. Time is running out and, you know, we had a lot more potentially to say. If we had a large enough time slot, like two hours or something like that, in the morning, a dedicated morning for the Dynamic Coalitions, building on what was reported earlier from an intercessional event and really placing center stage, as Wout was saying, what it is the Dynamic Coalitions are contributing to the IGF model and how that then feeds into the GDC process and into the SDGs or to WSIS and so on, is that something worth considering? And then that eases pressure on us from the MAG saying, you know, you're taking up too much time with all these individual DC sessions. A two-hour session as a follow-on from an

intercessional event, which is high-profile. Maybe there's a solution to the pressure points that Jutta was describing based around that idea. That's what I offer anyway. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Much food for thought you give us here. I think there were various points. I think, you know, the distinction you make between action oriented and not action oriented, I think, is extremely important or is extremely valid. That we have those Dynamic Coalitions that have an outcome that is action oriented, and they will be given more -- a higher level of visibility. I think that would make much sense. But they have something that can produce something and can show what they have produced, so that's an objective criterion. And I think that's definitely worthwhile to be looked at. And also you mentioned a word "connect various times." I think that may be the better term to be used than coordinate. Coordinate has always a little bit of a top-down connotation. It's bringing people together and connecting the Dynamic Coalition with those who want this main session. I think it's in, in a sense, less threatening, and it's more neutral in that sense, more friendly.

And also the -- you mentioned, again, the intercessional event. We had that for the first time at the July MAG meeting. It was, again, an experiment, but all in all, I think it went rather well. I mean, it could have, again, it could have been better, but I heard, actually, spontaneous positive comments on that, and they were very -- also from MAG members and new MAG members, it was a positive surprise to them, the substantive contribution the DCs can actually make.

And going forward actually suggesting another intercessional event of the sort, maybe the -- it could be the second MAG meeting or so next year. It could be part of the input we will provide into the call for issues. And, again, what worked well this year was that we actually linked with the MAG themes, that we said, look, we can produce something. We're not in competition in the MAG, but just saying we can actually provide input into the themes you decided on, and we can connect again with you there.

So these are my sort of thoughts on that, and definitely worthwhile follow-up on thinking about it, and I'm sure Stephen has great suggestions, too, how to do better than my suggestions. Please, Stephen.

>> STEPHEN WYBER: I think what I'm going to say is that you've already said 95%. I'm just wondering if it's a useful exercise for us to list all of the bad stuff people have to say about DCs and DC sessions and DCs getting time at the IGF and just run through those arguments that I think we're all integrating into what we're saying right now and think of how do we respond? I think just to do the sort of comprehensively and make sure that we're covering all -- all fronts here is, obviously, there's competition for space. There will be worries about DCs sort of pursuing individual people and individual organizations' agendas. But just to sort of putting these on the table within our group to

make sure that we have a good answer every time one of these come up. And this is just work doing systematically and doing what we are doing implicitly in the conversation we're having now.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, the basic argument, I think, is -- in a way -- a structural situation, that the MAG is officially in charge of the programme, and here the more DCs there are and thematically given a session that's without any MAG oversight. And so, you know, what's our role in all this? It's an in-built conflict, I think. There's no point for us to be confrontational, and I think, you know, the way to see itself in a way bring in the MAG, take your energy, and make sure -- and I think a lot of the proposals that were made in this discussion go very much along that way, that we actually want to, and we did last year work with the MAG or, you know, show that we can actually work towards what you are aiming to do. And I think this year's main session is precisely that. We can highlight that. Look, we worked hand in hand with you, and we provided an input. But what I hear is -- and various suggestions were made to go a step further and to have next year's IGF that the DCs are more actively involved in the shaping of the programme and the main session also a go-to resource for some of the themes. We have -- do we have a DC on AI? I'm not even sure. We do have a DC on IoT, for instance, had that for many years. And we have DC on children's rights and so on. You know, that the MAG actually proactively looks at the DCs, hey, can we work together? That's, I think, would be a positive message. We are here, ready, in a way, like, the letter which has now been sent off to the Secretary-General's office that the IGF is ready to work with the GDCs, so are the DCs already to work. Jutta, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. Thank you. So I do think that there is always, in the MAG, somehow the suspicion that people might think it's easier to set up a Dynamic Coalition and run a Dynamic Coalition over the year than bringing a proposal -- a workshop proposal through the process of the MAG evaluation. Of course, we know that isn't true, and most of the Dynamic Coalitions are working throughout the year, producing their papers like Wout has already said. But still, from my feeling, I would say a little bit more obligations for Dynamic Coalitions. We are holding these calls at least once a month. You can see how many or not many Dynamic Coalitions have turned up today. We had a pre-meeting before the main session in Kyoto. Very little of Dynamic Coalitions showed up at the meeting. So maybe it's necessary to have a bit more pressure on Dynamic Coalitions to show their commitment, because I'm pretty sure, like Markus has said before, in all MAG meetings, we are always stressing how important the work is of Dynamic Coalitions. We have had that study on the work of Dynamic Coalitions, but still we have to argue, and it would be easier if Dynamic Coalitions themselves would feel the need to be more present. And maybe it's the way to do it by an obligation. I don't know. It's just my thought that I feel a bit disappointed of all that people that haven't shown up in

this call today because I think stock taking is a very important exercise and, yes, you can see the same faces like we always see in these meetings.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, all valid points, but we have actually, over the past six, seven, eight years, have tightened up a little bit the framework, and we are now -- obligations Dynamic Coalitions have to produce an annual report of their activities and soon. But that is also one of the questions in this paper you mentioned. Should we go a step further and have more obligations? Wout?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think building and following off of Jutta. If I look at the discussion we had almost now two years ago after the Poland, Katowice IGF, I think we've made enormous discussion in our progress, in our visibility, in the way that many people perceive what these DCs are doing.

So after two years, it should be possible to start harvesting. What I notice is that one of the most vocal people who often objecting to DCs and voicing what Jutta was saying of DCs is no longer a MAG member. And I spoke with several MAG members at the IGF in Kyoto, and they said what you are asking should not be that difficult to achieve. Of course, we should be able to come up with some sort of a framework so your work can be recognized, but it's time the MAGs start acting upon it.

So if we can convince these people to start the work and then probably we will have the distinction between active and less-active, as Mark mentions, DCs. And perhaps even -- the outreach we do with an open hand saying we can actually assist with making the IGF more relevant, and that is not because we started IGF to have another sort of workshop. That's a pretty elaborate way to get a workshop, I can tell you, to have a DC through the whole year and trying to find funding for it and come up with reports, et cetera, and to have a 90-minute session.

So in other words, I think that we have convinced many people of the valid work DCs are doing, and now it's time to start harvesting. And but that does mean that our message will have to be good and sharp and very understand building what we try to offer and what we try to achieve. And that is a message that perhaps we should be starting to think about and start writing so that at the first open MAG meeting, we can have this discussion in the way that we would like to have it. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, and that also may be a bit of a (Indiscernible). You know, a lot of the MAG work is focused on selection of workshops. And maybe also that should be reconsidered is that really the most important work that you have to do, and should you also not look at the broader overall programme, and, again, connect the dots and connect people, the intercessional work. But, obviously, if the MAG is not in charge of -- if the feeling is the DCs is something that's outside our jurisdiction, then automatically you take not as much ownership as you would take for something you organize yourself.

So the challenge really is to bring DCs together with the MAG. But as you said, we have come a long way. Well, time to harvest. I'm not sure whether that maybe a little bit too ambitious. It's not something, you know, that will be given, but we have to work on improving the cooperation. And all this is all very good, but let's then bring that forward in our suggestion, then, for -- well, again, to Celine, what will the call you open, how will that be worded exactly? How would we fit into that? Obviously, that's not so much an issue, but it's more how to shape it. But nevertheless, I think in my view, it will be a worthwhile input, and that will come, then, and will be digested at the very first MAG meeting in the new year.

But turning to you, Celine, can you explain exactly what will be the public call?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Markus. So I won't be able to tell you exactly how it is because I wasn't part of the team last year when they did this call. But to my understanding it's to shape the eight -- or the subthemes of next year's IGF. So perhaps I can say just a few things regarding what was discussed just before. I think it is a good idea to have the MAG Chair coming to next meeting just because it will help her to also have an idea of what exactly the DCs are doing of what we are discussing during the DC DGs just because the MAG will be shaping the schedule of next year and also will be meeting at some point to discuss about the types of sessions that we will have, so this will, I think, also be an opportunity for the MAG Chair to really understand a little bit better the Dynamic Coalitions and how they could fit actually for next year's on the IGF programme.

So I can go back to my colleagues to ask exactly what kind of questions will be asked for the call of thematic input. But to my understanding, it is to shape the subthemes. So as we had this year the eight subthemes from AI to cybersecurity and whatsoever.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, the question is we could, obviously, also come up with subthemes as Dynamic Coalitions. Can we agree on subthemes to be put forward? What we discussed now was more procedural, and I think as such, that could also be a valid point. We think what themes are and Dynamic Coalitions stand ready to help and to provide input from our collective wisdom and past work, intercessional work, which is considerable, into shaping the subthemes, more procedural input and not thematic. But, again, I am open and, yes, a little bit disappointing, as Jutta said, the people who are participating in this call, but then as I can notice, they are very high-brain-power people, very active with good ideas. Sometimes quality matters more than quantity, and let's take advantage of the quality.

What are your ideas? Could we -- would it be valid in providing some procedural input, or should we just focus on a substantive input, or could we do both? The floor is open. Yes, Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think it's an excellent

suggestion. What I would suggest to make a distinction is that as DCDG, we offer our open hand, as I said, and to work with the MAG and to assist with creating the programme, however we exactly formulate it, and that as individual DCs, we can each come up with the themes that we think are important because that is not something that we could be coordinated unless we find a common theme that we would like to bring forward. And that is something we need to do by email, say can we do this, I think, and then discuss it. But to make this distinction, I think that in my opinion, but I'm definitely interested to hear what others think. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, it goes without saying that each DC is free, of course, to make a substantive thematic suggestion. And if we are able to agree on a theme collectively, fine. But we may not be able to. But I see IGF Secretariat, hand is up. I presume that's Celine, yeah.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to make it clear, sobasically the call as of the 20th of November will only be substantive. It will only be about the themes. If you would like to provide some procedural inputs, this is your chance to do it during the taking stock that is until the 19th of November. But as of the 20th, it's only going to be the themes. Yeah. I hope this clarifies a little bit. I just discussed it with my colleague, Anya. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. So if you have a procedural input, that should be done prior to the 19th of November. Correct.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, exactly. Mm-hmm.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, shall we aim for that, then? We leave the substantive input open for each Dynamic Coalition. I think should we agree as a collective group to make Wout's suggestion on one, two, three themes, fine, but let's leave it to the DCs. But if we want to make a procedural input, then we will have to hurry up. That will be in, what, less than three weeks' time. How shall we go about? Then I think we need another call in two weeks' time at the very latest to finalize that. And we would need to have some kind of draft.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Markus, as I said, I delivered my personal inputs to taking stock today, this morning. I can take some of the elements out of there, put them on the DCDG mail or Google Doc and that people can start working in that Doc and leave their comments. Because what we discussed is sort of in their -- not exactly in the right wording, probably, but at least a start of a discussion. So is that a way to go forward?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I was looking for a volunteer, and you've come forward as a volunteer. So if we have a volunteer, then we have a plan.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I think that Stephen is suggesting the same thing. Perhaps, Stephen, that we can work together on this. I see your thumb. So that we work as coordinators and then present it to the group.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I see the chat, yes, that sounds excellent. Yes.

That is the answer, and that is all -- I like the idea also tie it in with the Summit of a few themes so that we can have a link to that, that we connect with the Summit. So in that case, we have a plan.

The question is timing. When will -- that will happen online, but we would definitely need a call. My suggestion would be two weeks from now, roughly, that we could then finalize the input and that we try to invite the MAG Chair for that call. I think maybe not as too much, I think, in working. But, Mark, Meese.

>> MARK CARVELL: Thanks, yes. Sorry, not directly on the point you're discussing now, but my expectation is that the Global Digital Compact will continue to frame the thematic direction of the IGF, as it has done over the last year or so. And that's -- that's important for the Dynamic Coalitions because, as the call -- the first call for action from Kyoto, from the Dynamic Coalition session, makes clear that there is this -- sorry, I forget the exact wording -- but about the structure of the GDC should include Dynamic Coalitions, something along those lines. It's quite specific in terms of the action framing, links in a very concrete way the role of the Dynamic Coalitions to the GDC. Now, the GDC is going to move fast because the summit is September next year. Negotiations will start in earnest in New York on the substance of the Compact end of December. So we need to build on that call for action about the GDC in a very coherent way. You know, we've got to develop a narrative about the Dynamic Coalitions and their place in the GDC process. It's not -- and we don't have anything detailed on that yet. And my worry is that we might be sidelined as a sort of, oh, it's a high-level ambition for the Dynamic Coalitions to be, you know, involved in the GDC process. I think we need a document, a narrative, and perhaps illustrated with possibilities for individual Dynamic Coalitions on IoT or whatever, cybersecurity, child protection, data protection. You know, this is where Dynamic Coalitions can contribute within a structured GDC process. So -- and I think we've got to work on that now in tandem with our inputs into the IGF procedural and thematic development. They do link because the expectation, as I say, is the GDC is going to be the mainframe work for the IGF in Riyadh, yeah?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, in my understanding, it's the same thing. We need to -- you know, what we are trying to do as part of this stock taking and way forward is to link all this together. But, Wout, you have your hand up, and Stephen made a comment in the chat. I would invite you as we will be holding the pen, anyway, to make your comment orally. Wout?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. There was one point I wanted to make at the beginning and forgot about, so I'm making it now. What I sort of noticed is that where governments are concerned, it seems the IGF is moving from economic, telecom affairs, whatever they are called in their respective countries, to foreign affairs. You can see that the Global Digital Compact is run by Ministry of Foreign

Affairs. So the focus of our work perhaps has to take that into consideration, that we are starting to engage with another set of civil servants that we have in the past. Is that something that people recognize, or is that just that in the Netherlands they were a three or four-person delegation of Foreign Affairs, and as usual, only one from Economic Affairs?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, it's a valid point. I mean, it's -- you know, the action is moving to New York, and New York is much more political, and there's much more foreign affairs. We are coming to the top of the hour. I wonder, Stephen, what do you have? You made some comments in the chat and as you will be helping with the first draft on the Google Doc?

>> STEPHEN WYBER: Yeah, no. I was just going to say -- I mean, I'll take (Indiscernible) from Celine what we can do as a group or DCs engaging in loose order. It almost feels like having a set of sort of ideas or defined position, as Mark was saying, about what we want out of the GDC, and I think we can look at the policy brief from back in May, which includes at the end some reasoned, clear ideas on these other paragraphs of what's probably going to be the backbone of whatever the GDC looks like in the end. If we come up with a paragraph that we want, and I'm happy to share -- I've got an Excel file with the contact details of all the U.N. missions, and so we can mail merge, like anything I suspect we're not allowed to do that, if we deliberately called ourselves the IGF DC coordination group, it wouldn't be permitted. I know there's sort of standard engagement tactics we can use there if we can come up with a sort of paragraph -- the paragraph that goes in the text, the page that explains it, and then maybe a longer piece to give some weight to why we're saying that DCs need to be part of it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That makes very much sense. So by when will we have a sort of Google Doc we can comment on? Is that Stephen and Wout will team together and --

>> STEPHEN WYBER: Might it be too Docs? So we have one for the responses directly to the IGC -- sorry, the IGF, sorry, I do IGC stuff as well -- to the IGF substantive inputs and procedural inputs and one for defining a position on what we want to do with the GDC or?

>> JUTTA CROLL: I have to say good-bye. My next call is knocking. Bye. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks for joining. My feeling would be it would be easier to just have one doc that includes both. Make it a little bit simpler, yes. Why don't you give it a go, and inform us on the list where we are, and then we can comment on and add also as individual DCs, see what they would like to add their strength. And we try to find a date, roughly two weeks from now, and it will be good if we invite the MAG Chair to be on that discussion if she can make it. Does that make sense?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: And I will open the doc tomorrow, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent. Okay. Well, thank you all. I think it was a very good and productive discussion. Thanks a lot. Bye-bye. Bye-bye, everyone. Bye-bye. Thanks.