RAW FILE

IGF-SA
DCCG MEETING
DECEMBER 1, 2023
1500 UTC

(Captioner connecting and setting up Zoom captions)
        >> MARKUS KUMMER:  Markus.
        >> Would you like to give a summary of the paper as you are holding
the pen.
        >> Markus, just before we jump to that, can we hear from anybody
else with regards to what was said?  .
        >> MARKUS KUMMER:  We can do that.  Anybody else want to jump
in?  To react to Wout.  He's never shy to jump in.
        >> Is that good or bad?
        >> It's good and bad.
        >> Good and bad, okay.
        >> It's what we're doing delivering report.  The first toolkit
will be delivered hopefully on Monday.  It depends on the rep
administrator.  But it's ready to go.  Another one will be there in
the winter of 2024 and we're defining our outputs for next year.  Egg
I think that is our strength to go into your comment immediately that
we're able to as a community to come up with reports that
    Our weakness is how do you get the message across that -- well,
if we look at the previous IGF, we were in a meeting with 13 people
presenting two significant reports.  And nobody seemed to know who
they represented.  That's not only our own weakness, not getting this
message across despite of inviting hundreds of people directly.  It's
also a weakness of the IGF, I think.  The opportunities are certainly
there.  Because we are able to do this.  And we are providing guidance
and recommendations.
    The threat this is a piece of paper on a fairly obscure website,
which is our own and the IGF's.  So in other words, I think that this

is something that we hope to improve in 2024.  And that the DCs that are willing to under go some sort of a process and come up with this -- with these reports that they also strengthen the IGF.  I think that is a discussion I think our paper is trying to get across.  It was written by Mark Cavel who could not be here because he's travelling with the assistance of Stephen, and he's not able to speak.  This is the best summation I can give at this point without really having prepared looking at the paper again for this, I apologize.

But I think that that is my contribution for today.  I hope to discuss this further with you and the MAG in the first MAG meeting where it will be.  So thank you for the opportunity.  But also thank you for your thoughts, Carol.  Because I think they're very positive and very forward looking and definitely are willing as a DC to cooperate with you on this.  This is my view.  Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you, also Mohamed has his hand up, please.

>> Go ahead.

>> Yes.  Thank you for this discussion and for coming up and for the opportunity.  Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability is one of the earliest Dynamic Coalitions at the IGF system.  And it has had a huge impact when it comes to the participation of persons with disabilities in the Internet Governance, not just in the IGF but in the IG ecosystem.  When I talk about the SWOT analysis of (?).  The strength of die CAD is that we have over 100 members who include board persons with and without disabilities.

(Screaming in background).

>> Please just ignore the cries.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Don't worry.  These things happen.

>> Yes, this is my two-year kid making his protests known that he wants to speak.  And I just told him that he needs to wait some years.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  We're in favour of participation.

>> Exactly.  He ensured that his participation is included.  I was talking about the strengths of Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability.  So we have both people with and without disabilities.  And this is our stand that nothing about us without us, the phrase is actually happening here.  The weakness has been that-- (Audio breaking up) leading the Dynamic Coalition back in 2017, '18 or '19.  There was a pause in the activity of Dynamic Coalitions.  But since this start of this year, we have tried to rejuvenate the Dynamic Coalition once again.  We have had successes in terms of making people with disabilities participate in the IGF system unique characteristics was we were able to provide fellowships this year, specifically to persons with disabilities to give to.

And in that we had people from Africa, from Europe, and from Asia including both from Asia in terms of Japan as well as from some other country.  So we had about six people funded through the gender on Dynamic Coalition of accessibility and disability and have them actually participate in person in the IGF.  And we hope to continue this programme.

The opportunity, as I say, is already there.  There is a lot of work to be done when it comes to the participation of accessibility

and disability in the IG systems.  One of the key issues that we have been talking about is the accessibility of IGF forum, its websites and inclusion of persons with disabilities in the decision making there is a a STAR in the DC group.  There's a separate letter from myself to the leadership panel, which is already with the Secretariat and is included in the STAR ticking as well.

When it comes to track.  The track lies in the inherent system of the IG, and it's multidisciplinary and bottom up.  We do have -- we do get people with disabilities participate in these IGF S and IGF ecosystems.  But when they see action and very less action when it comes to inclusion of persons with disabilities, repetition of same issues, such as inaccessibility of websites, assumptions with regards to the capabilities of persons with disabilities and the (?) is provided in person and online events.

When the same issues come up again and again in the ecosystem, people get disheartened.  And this is where I feel the most certain in terms of keeping people intact in the IG system.  It takes time for people to understand the system.  And when they start understanding the system after some time, they get disheartened by the lack of response from certain quarters.  And then they start contributing, because it's a volunteer setup.  We cannot force anyone to contribute.  So this is the threat that we feel.

I stop here.  Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you for that.  With all the challenges, I think we need to celebrate success.  Your collaboration has been extremely impactful not only in the IGF system but in other organisations as you said.  It's an important issue and you have achieved a lot. Of course, there's much for to be done and understand the frustration that you have to say the same thing all over again.  But, again, the glass, I think is half full and not half empty.  Kudos to the work your DC has been doing over the years as you said since the beginning. Rajendra had his hand up.

>> RAJENDRA:  I appreciate giving different -- if you ask me the strength of IGF, I come from India.  I lead three Dynamic Coalitions, disability, environment, jobs, this tells you this is a common man's platform.  I don't come with a reference.  And I must say that it's not an easy job that Markus Celine and JAN handle.  We get phenomenal support.  That's a very small start, we're able to give in yo toe. This is a platform where you're given an opportunity.  With you coming in supporting our team, it's a great motivation.

I think this is the biggest -- there's nothing more powerful than this, when you can get people across the world, get them to think relatively and all you have said the strategy, delivering, it gives direction to every DC.  This is a ground movement.  This year I was given the opportunity to be the organiser for the main plenary.  I didn't expect that.  I don't know whether I did a good job or not. I owe it to Celine and Markus and others on the team.

Coming to weakness.  The only weakness, typically you become even focused.  This is where we should see more spread out across the year in terms of what we can contribute.  As DCs, we focus on coming on

the thought leadership with annual reports on topics we believe are very important to the needs of time given the mandate of IGF.  We focus, spend time energy, resources to do that.

I don't know what's the way to make it more broad-based.  Because we're also volunteers.  We have a day job.  We do other things.  So how do we balance that out?  I think this is a great motivation that you are stepping in as MAG chair to interact.  Maybe we'll get more it direction in terms of how we make it more broad-based.  I think that's the weakness we feel.

Opportunity, phenomenal.  Today Internet with this gender GVI has pulled the carpet under our feet.  I think the work we do at IGF seems more than ever before.  We need to think about the future and plan about I don't think the world is on the same page or ever will be.

I think on the threat.  We're our own threat.  So if we continue to motivate our members, give them the opportunity the way we have given, we will continue to be a vibrant community driving the thought leadership and probably giving direction to this Internet dominated society economy and politics now.  So I think the weakness could be bigger than the opportunity if we don't have the ecosystem together.

It's needs much more and the MAG sees the challenge and opportunity with us.  But I have in the last so many years found it really inspiring to contribute to key agendas that make a difference, more so to SDGs.  I'm normally optimistic maybe overoptimistic, no matter what our weaknesses are, our good intentions and we'll still do better things and make this world a better place.  Thank you, all.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you for that.  Let's not just look at the SWOT but the STAR qualities.  I must admit it was new to me as well.  But I think it's a great way of framing discussion and kudos again to you, Carol, for coming up with that.  And I want -- I had mentioned before you joined that our DC, the core Internet values had been in touch with the co-chair of the leadership panel and whether you would like to jump in.  Actually, I thought it was a very good example of how our DC can be definitely relevant and strategic.  I'm not sure about agile and transformative, but definitely relevant and strategic.  I don't know -- sorry for putting you on the spot, but I just read with interest the email exchange you had also with Vint Cerf if you would

>> Yes, I indeed had the Dynamic Coalition and values.  We have had the luck and the chance of having Vint Cerf among one of our regular participants since inception.  We had several other people.  In fact, most, if not all of our sessions at the IGF has had some high-level speakers that we've tried to pull into this sphere, not only pull into the coalition and to discuss the core Internet values which are very much aligned with the Internet we want with what is currently the paper under discussion, but also to bring new faces and new high-level speakers into the overall IGF sphere.  Not all mindful speakers know about the IGF.

So it's good to always have new faces being brought in.  But, yes, Vint has been very helpful in being able to take some of the direct outputs of the -- of our coalition and being able to bring this forth

over to the high-level panel.

One of the -- I think one of the points that we can make as a whole as Dynamic Coalitions is the kind of work that gets done there is not just work that gets published but actually can get used by other parts of the community.  It might be something that had lacked a little bit in the past.

I have expressed some concerns and Markus will know in our previous discussions that there could be some that are still into this very parochial position of saying, well, this is a topdown process.  This is a bottom-up process.  Who controls this?  Who has initiated these ideas?  And ultimately, I firmly leave that we as a community, the IGF community, the wider IGF community, the Internet Governance community are mature enough to go beyond who has had this idea and where does it come from and actually work together for this common goal we have, which is to defend a multistakeholder Internet Governance system worldwide and defend all the good parts of the Internet, all the things we like about the Internet that fosters innovation and that is able to also ensure free speech and also defends human rights.

This type of Internet is what we want to fight for.  And the IGF is definitely the location, the forum, the community that we need to continue supporting as a whole.  That's definitely what our DC is trying to do, support the IGF and also bring the discussions that we have in our own fora as a community, the IGF community outside elsewhere as well whenever we can.  I hope that summarizes a little bit of what Markus was alluding to.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you very much for that is there anyone else who would like to contribute to this initial exchange?

If not, yes, there's Daniel.

>> DANIEL:  Hi, hello everywhere.  My name is Daniel omaily I'm one of the co-coordinators for the journalism Dynamic Coalition.  The points -- basically what our coalition has been doing, we've been around four or five years now, so before the pandemic, it was a challenge during the pandemic as everybody became dispersed.  We're in a period of rejuvenation and we saw a lot of activity at Kyoto.  We're trying to bridge the divide between the conversations that are happening in the news media space with the conversations that are happening in Internet Governance.  Of course, those two conversations impact one another.

But it does mean that we're kind of bridging two types of communities, which itself entails a lot of activity and work.  Of course we are essentially volunteers.  So that creates a lot of challenges for us.  There's a great opportunity for our members when they're able to participate.  Each year we produce an annual report that collates kind of the research, the finings, the recommendations from our community.  I am very pleased that we are multistakeholder which can be a really big challenge in some of these spaces where you have a lot of Civil Society activity.  So we've been happy with the amount of private sector, government, and even the multilateral systems engagement with our Dynamic Coalition.  I would say that's a bright spot.

What I think is challenging is that a lot of our work goes into

maintenance, making sure our knowledge products are ready by the time the IGF comes around, so we can have our session and planning that. We put a lot of emphasis in terms of diversity and inclusion and we spend a lot of on that. By the time the IGF comes around, we're worried about pulling all that together in terms of our focus, so it becomes harder for us to engage in the broader platforms. We would love to, but there's limited bandwidth. I think that's a challenge that we're facing. It's a challenge that we want to get over. Because I think it creates more value for everyone in this entire ecosystem if we're able to do that. So that's our goal.

I really appreciate this opportunity to speak and the work that this group has been doing to try and foster and the efforts that the IGF Secretariat has been doing in this regard as well. There's definitely a lot of effort in that regard trying to make these connections and make things work for fluidly. So I really appreciate that. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus, for giving me the floor. I'm not leading the Dynamic Coalition on children's rights, but I'm replacing Amy who is urn unfortunately she couldn't join. I'm a founding member of the Dynamic Coalition on children's rights in the digital environment. I founded it in the second year of the Internet Governance Forum in Rio de Janeiro under the name of Dynamic Coalition on child Internet safety. You can tell from the title that we have to be at least very agile. That is not only due to the fact that one-third of all Internet users worldwide are a child in the sense of the UN Convention of the rights of the child but also since young people are the early adopters of any new service type of technology that we are facing around digitisation. Therefore the Dynamic Coalition has to adapt all the work that we are doing to that development.

The Dynamic Coalition consists of a broad variety of different organisations. Of course, several Civil Society organisations coming with child welfare, well-being background, but also platform providers and companies industry are taking part in the Dynamic Coalition. Looking back at what we've done over the years, I do think that we have also, besides the work that each of the members are doing, the members is doing in their area to enforce children's rights in the digital environment is also trying to find the connections, the links to the work that other Dynamic Coalitions are doing, which is very important to keep this ecosystem of Dynamic Coalitions also running and seeing whether cross-cutting issues that need to be addressed in collaboration of Dynamic Coalitions can be identified and then follow up with. That's from my side. My two cents. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this. Is there any other Dynamic Coalitions that would like to join this initial exchange?

If not, I would invite, Carol, maybe, can you have a quick reaction on what you heard?

>> CAROL ROACH: This was very helpful. Thank you very much. It's added to what my vision of what you do. I had an opportunity and quite a few of you made mention to being able to get out there,

because you really busy trying to get to prepare for the end of year event or forum.  Everybody has another job.  So it's very challenging.

But in your Terms of Reference is the mention of a framework for outreach to policymakers.  I've been bringing this up to a lot of different groups.  It's great having a multi-Stakeholder Group, but at the end of the day, the government is a key stakeholder, because they represent the country, the country that we all live in, the country that we all want to change.  And they're the ones that make the policies.

How does your framework, if it exists, give an outline or guideline to all DCs to try and coordinate either with your local government, central government, or whatever so that your outputs can be put to great use?

I know I was talking to somebody at the IGF.  And they said, you know, the DCs really work -- it was a small country -- and they take what they get from their DC or their national IGF, and they're able to present to their government, and the government creates policies from it.  I know that's easy for a small country to do.  But is there some kind of formula with some variables that can throw in there that persons could use to make use of these great outputs that you produce?  What is your framework?

It's the same question I've asked the MAG.  What is our reporting framework?  How do we get it done?  That's about being relevant.  If you don't get the information out there.  It just sits on a shelf or on a website.  So that is something we don't have to solve today.  But I think something we need to look at at formulating.  I know we have a very big agenda.  So I'm going to cut Carol off at this time.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Well, thank you.  I think you, in many ways, you touched on the elephant in the room.  There's an awful lot of output here from the IGF over the years.  As you said, it's sitting there on a shelf and not enough use has been made out of the valuable output provided.  But that's not an issue we will solve just in one call.  It's definitely something -- some food for thought to reflect upon.  But I see Olivier wants to jump in

>> OLIVIER:  Thank you very much, Markus.  Very briefly, I don't think anyone can emphasize enough the diversity of the Dynamic Coalitions.  So we all work sometimes in different ways.  Some of us have more of a way into Civil Society.  Some work directly with governments.  And I guess that's one of the strengths of the community much Dynamic Coalitions.  And that the government -- I'm totally with you, by the way, on getting governments involved.  Government involvement is something which I think is not only required but many recognise totally and have worked with both their local government or even in other fora in order to push the points which they're working on.

So it's -- but most of it, I guess, comes from sometimes from personal connections of the members of the coalition and so on.  And there would definitely be a benefit to have some more formal way or maybe -- I don't know if it's the right word, formal, but some facilitated way to be able to access the right people, and the right fora for the work that we are all working on.  And this is as general.  I'm not a speaker

for all the Dynamic Coalitions.  Judging from the work that many of us have done, support in helping each other out is something which would be really very welcome.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you.  Wout?

    >> WOUT:  Yes.  Thank you, Markus.  Also, thank you, Olivier, for those words.  I think the question that more or less Carol asks is exactly where perhaps many Dynamic Coalitions run into the limits of their abilities.  So most people are working voluntary as was mentioned already.  I can say that I am lucky that I can spend part of my time paid to do what I am doing.  So that's different from other Dynamic Coalitions.  I'm also able to hire professional researchers to do the actual work.  Because we have found the funding to do so.

    But we run into limits of influence.  In the end it becomes my personal network where I can reach people.  And the limited time I have available to do so.  That's one of the reasons why I think it's important that the IGF as a whole thinks about what the outputs are and how they could be positioned in the world.

    Because the IGF has a tremendous network as a whole.  So how could the output be presented in a more visible way to have the influence of a individual Dynamic Coalition or best practice P & A may never reach because of the network that's available within it.  It is about having personal contacts.  He has contacts obviously to invite people like Vint Cerf to come to his sessions.  Well, I've tried, but he's not available.

    In other words, it is it also personal connections that makes the influence of the Dynamic Coalition and perhaps that is something we should take to a different level as a whole of the IGF.  So let me leave it there as food for thought.  Thank you.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you.  Maureen, please?

    >> Thank you so much, Markus.  I hope you can hear me.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER:  I can hear you.

    >> First of all, I wanted to support what Olivier mentioned about the diversity.  I wanted to mention, thank you so much for holding this meeting at 5:00 AM for me instead of the regular 2:00 AM when they have normally been.  I want to apologize not to have been able to make the meetings at other times.  I appreciate to be able to attend this morning.

    But I'm from a (?) representing a DC.  We have really, really appreciated the opportunity that the IGF platform and the experience has given.  Our diverse, sort of like DC, because it covers like three -- it's global.  So we can't just focus on sort of like just one area.  It is actually looking at the three regions and trying, of course, to find some convenient time for three regions to get together has been a real challenge for us.

    But we do value the fact that the IGF offers that opportunity for a platform that allows us to do that.  We're looking at how we can create more opportunities to be able to get the three regions together more conveniently.  So we can bring those widely diverse perspectives, which is a real challenge for us because of the timing issues.

    But I do appreciate that like, for example, the support as has

been mentioned before about how important it is to have support from regional organisations and know that in the Caribbean region CTU has been absolutely superb in supporting us as much as possible.  They participate in all our activities, which is a real starting point.  We sort of feel like we're still a young group.  We are because we're not as fully established as a lot of the other DCs who are good models for us.

But we do appreciate that opportunity.  So being able to have a platform that we can actually meet.  So thank you for that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you.  And your point about the timing is well taken.  We'll try and improve.  Are there any other people that would like take the floor at this stage?  I mean, this was not expected to have this initial exchange, but I think it was very good, very helpful, and very interesting.  But the essential aim was actually to look at the very concrete proposals we collectively made and see how we could implement them and follow up on them.  And see whether there's any low-hanging fruit.  Without any further ado, without much thinking, with much deliberations.

Stephen said he was not able to talk.  Has it changed?  Is he in a position where he can talk?  If not, can I ask you, Celine, to introduce the paper we submitted and I think yesterday, you put the link in the chat.

>> Thank you, Markus.  This is a document that was drafted also by the DC, so I would just ask Wout if he would like to present it instead of the Secretariat.  Otherwise, I'm happy to quickly go through.  And I can also share my screen.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  I see in the chat is that Stephen is at five minutes.  Does that mean he would be able to do so in five minutes?

>> So in the meantime, let me quickly share my screen.  Good.  So basically this is a document that was -- that came to life, let's say, after the IGF where all the various DC members wanted to write a comment taking stock document.  But this document is not only about 2023 but also providing some suggestions for 2024.  So really looking forward, looking ahead document.

It has seven parts.  The first one, let me quickly go through, is of course the potential of DCs to contribute to the IGF outcomes.  So one of the ideas in that paragraph is mostly that the IGF is a forum that could become more and more outcome oriented and also impactful.  And it describes more or less how the DCs could contribute to IGF outcomes.

Moving forward to the second part, it's about the framework for IGF recognition of DCs' tangible outputs.  This is something that's been quickly discussed just before introducing taking stock.  How we can bring the DCs outputs, how to make them a little bit more visible and how to advertise them a little bit more in the community.

Moving ahead to DCs' participation in the annual IGF.  This is something we've discussed more and more often right now.  We are currently 28 Dynamic Coalitions with another one, with a 29th that is currently being created and probably going to be introduced in January 2024.  This, of course, makes it a little bit more competitive in the IGF programme.  Carol introduced already this idea to you.

Now, this is the contribution of Dynamic Coalitions to how we could have the DCs within the IGF programme in future.

The fourth point is to create positive synergies in the IGF stakeholder community. So if you all may recall, we had this intersessional, the first ever intersessional event during the second open consultation during 2023 where we really tried to have all the intersessional work, communities work together and provide some input for the preparation of the IGF -- of the annual IGF.

And this is also like an idea that is very much welcomed also in that paragraph. Continuing to the sixth paragraph is about the DCs' contribution to the global digital impact. In 2022 the Dynamic Coalitions had main sessions on the global digital impact that was also attended by the UN tech envoy and he very much welcomed the Dynamic Coalitions and their contribution to the global digital compact. Here it's to reinforce the idea that the DCs would continue to support DDC process.

Then the last point, the seventh one is the accessibility at the IGF meetings, something that was already shortly presented by Mohamed just before, how to make the IGF also a little bit more accessible than it was in the past. I do think we have a lot of work ahead of us. And this is perhaps just to reiterate also from the IGF Secretariat that we are and we will closely work with our host country in 2024 to make the IGF meeting as accessible as possible. And probably also consult DCAD whenever we need input for that.

In the meantime, I'm not sure if Stephen or Wout or anyone else would like to add perhaps a few comments on the taking stock document that was submitted. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Celine. I think that was very helpful. Obviously, as you said, and also Olivier mentioned in the chat, some of the points already mentioned in the initial exchange. But I think what this more operational part is how it's point 3 of the paper on how better to integrate the DCs -- I think there was a feeling in our exchanges that the DCs could be more involved in designing of the programme, being involved more upstream, be that both in the selection of workshops in the shaping of main session. The DCs have some relevant expertise to offer and how to do that is no sort of silver bullet, I think. But I think it will be also very much a question of both the MAG when devising the programme, thinking of the DCs. On the other hand, the DCs being maybe more proactive in putting up their hand and saying, hey. We work on this. We have been working on this or on that issue for years.

Can we contribute to it? How can we be part of it? So it goes a little bit both ways. But I think that is one of the core issues that would need to be addressed. Then also should we again aim for having an intersessional work? I think that was very helpful. We had that in the July meeting of the MAG. It was helpful, both for the DCs to think of how we can contribute to a common theme. And it was helpful to the MAG to understand better what the Dynamic Coalitions are doing.

And also maybe taking a step back, I think this year was actually

the first time we agreed collectively as Dynamic Coalitions that we
will not just focus on what we do but more focus on what we can contribute
to the main themes of the meeting.  So that was, I think, a big step
forward for the DCs working towards the common programme.

So these are, I think -- what I would say some of the main issues
that will be helpful to address.  And I see that Rajendra is leaving.
Shame you are leaving, but thank you anyway for joining.

Who else would like to contribute?  Is Stephen in a position to
talk now?

>> CELINE:  Carol raised her hand, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Yes, Carol, please.

>> CAROL ROACH:  So I went through the list of the DCs.  And I
can see that there's a possible few things.  There's human rights,
what I'm calling tech, connectivity, data, health, environment.  And
then a few specialties.

I did that based on something I read in the report.  And if we can
have, I don't know, DC day at IGF or DC week, whether we have two weeks
online or whatever.  And instead of doing individual presentations,
could we group them so that there's some cohesiveness and let it be
all encompassing with regards to what's being presented.

So, for example, the health one, putting those two together.  And
it's more comprehensive.  It also avoids having to find a slot here,
a slot there, just a thought.  As I said, that thought came from out
of the report.  When I actually looked at the DCs, it's a possibility.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you.  I think we have also toyed with
the idea when we discussed this.  I mean, understanding that there
is strong demand for slots.  But there's also one thought that to have
the DCs -- it's the one and only opportunity for the DCs to meet
physically is at the annual meeting.  There are other options.  Maybe
it could be just that could be given a room that's not part of the
programme.  They have their annual meeting, so they have a physical
opportunity to have an exchange among themselves.  But that would not
be part of maybe the official programme, which is obviously very -- gets
more crowded and crowded.

But we have seen already some reactions.  There's Mohamed, Wout,
and Jutta would like to come in.  Mohamed, you are first.

>> MOHAMED:  Yes.  Thank you, Markus.  Just a quick response to
Celine's last point with regard to accessibility and efforts for the
next year.  So I, on behalf of Dynamic Coalition and accessibility
and disability can say that we are ready to support any of the effort
to make the IGF system or the IGF event accessible for everyone, including
persons with disabilities.

So for the next year, if the host wants to contact us, they are
more than welcome, MAG, or the leadership panel, or the Secretariat,
of course.  Thank you.

>> CAROL ROACH:  Can I jump in there one second?  I attended an
accessibility meeting.  And some of the presenters spoke about the
tools that they use.  And I think we need to probably look at these
tools and see how we can incorporate them into the IGF.  We are also
looking to make online participation more interesting and more

inclusive for those persons.

So I don't know if you could probably provide us a set of tools to see if those tools are available to use within any of the online platforms. I know you see how there's an AI companion. There are all kind of apps that Zoom has added to its portfolio.

So if you could give us an idea of what we can make use of, I think it will help us.

>> MOHAMED: Yes. So there are a number of tools that are used by persons with disabilities to access and interact with the digital environment, both in online spaces and in physical events. And these tools are both the handheld devices, the physical devices, as well as softwares.

So it would not be appropriate and not (?) to use the tools here. But some of the tools that are used in IGF system, for instance, the website, the application that was designed for the event, those tools need to be ensured that these tools, those websites and softwares when they are being decided, that these tools would be used for this year's event. Those are tested from accessibility point of view.

Because more often than not it happens that we decide on a tool first, this is a tool that we would be using. And then we come across the barriers that people with disabilities face. And when they're highlighted, then sometimes the tools are changed. Sometimes it doesn't. But what we need to ensure is as DICAD has been advocating, that inclusion should be there right there from the start when we are taking (?) that's why DICAD advocates that the inclusion of persons with lived experience of disability is essential in the decision making processes. Because when things are being decided and when -- once they are decided, it's difficult to change, because it's a huge event and huge system.

So right from the start, if people are there to talk about the issues, to safeguard the interests -- I'm not saying that people without disabilities don't care about these issues. They do. But sometimes they may oversee things with a person with living experience of disability would not.

So my letter to the leadership panel, which is already with Secretariat highlights some of the tools. But along with that letter is that this letter highlights the issue that we face this year from the accessibility point of view. Website and physical accessibility of the event were one of the constant issues that we have been highlighting every year after year. But then there were some other issues as well. We stand ready to expand on these if MAG or anyone else wants us to expand. I hope that answers your query.

>> CAROL ROACH: It does.

>> CELINE: Perhaps I wanted to include some comments from the Secretariat. Thank you, Carol, for your interest in that matter. Mohamed, one of the ideas this year is to include you and DCAD from the start. It could be that it goes first through the channel of the IGF Secretariat. Once we start actually start meeting with not only the host country but also representatives and focal persons from the venue, that we start consulting you to. If possible, this is nothing

I can guarantee for you now, but I'm pushing for it, that you join once in awhile in a meeting when we start discussing accessibility. I want to make sure this happens from the start and not a couple weeks or months before the meeting.  This goes, of course, for the annual meeting itself but also for everything what is throughout the years, for example, when you're mentioning the website whatsoever.  Just to let you know, be ready to receive a little more emails from my side trying to consult you on as many topic as possible.

    Again, we want to include you and people with disabilities because there are a lot of things.  For example, the various tools that you were referring to and you've also been very detailed.  Again, it is not the same when it comes from a person without any disability than when it comes with the perspective from someone with a disability. So we will be including you.  This is what I wanted to share right now.  Thank you.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you to both of you.  I think that is actually a very productive way forward to integrate the DCs right up front and upstream when preparing something.  We also have Wout and Jutta.  Wout? .

    >> WOUT:  Thank you, Markus.  I would like to elaborate a little on chapter 3 in the document.  I think that what we are trying to get the message that we're trying to get across is not that we want to take over the MAG or decide the points the MAG has to make or the theme or whatever.  So please do not read that in the message.  But what we would like to discuss with the MAG is the commonalities in the programme.

    So once the programme has been set, and there is a big match with any of the intersessional work taking place within the IGF that the the best practice or the Dynamic Coalition it concerns is consulted in the process.  As Markus pointed out, we do work for the whole year long.  And we have certain outcomes projected for Riyadh.

    So on the one hand we can deliver some input.  On the other hand, we can gain inputs from the process and get more accessibility to knowledge out there in the wider IGF context of people who are not knowledgeable about intersessional processes at all because they only interact through workshop.

    So when there are certain workshops that are really on topic, perhaps it would be a good idea to discuss how the two could interact in between. Perhaps have a representative of a DC or a best practice forum or a policy network in the workshop.  And the other way around, that the outcome of the workshop is reported on in a Dynamic Coalition or best practice, et cetera, context.  So that there is a strengthening of outcomes and most likely in the future more interaction between participants in workshop processes and in intersessional processes. So that both do not remain in more or less an incident in the process but become really an integrated part of the process.

    And the MAG is ideally placed to coordinate on this or to monitor these processes.  I think that that is the context within which this part of the contribution through the stock taking process could be process could be read.  And we're very open to discuss this in the

future with a new MAG.  So thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you, Wout.  I think the point you make is very well taken.  This is not about a turf fight, whatever, but essentially an offers to be part and help and contribute to the problem. That reminds me I was involved with the cybersecurity one year.  There was a main session on cybersecurity.  But there was very little, if at all, any at all interaction between the best practice forum and the people who prepared for the main session.  Obviously, that's not a loss of potential synergies I think.  There would be very little effort needed to enhance the synergies between all the various components of the IGF.  But that is in a way the result of the expansion of the IGF ecosystem and more activities taking place.  The MAG and the programme committee was here and asked to shape the programme. But then part of the main task was essentially selection of the workshops. But now with more and more components to the programme, the MAG, so to speak, has lost a bit the oversight of all these components.  I think it will be very good if we could try and put the components together a bit more and see how we can actually help to enrich each other.

But Jutta, you would also like to say something.

>> JUTTA CROLL:  Thanks again for giving me the floor.  Your reference to the programme of the IGF gives me a good way to come in to the debate.  What Carol mentioned before with all the Dynamic Coalitions, we all know the number is growing and squeezing them all with their individual session into the programme is kind of like square in the circle and might be very difficult.

Nonetheless, the IGF, the annual meeting of the IGF is not only an opportunity, like Markus said before, for the Dynamic Coalition members to meet each other once in a year.  It's also an opportunity and a platform for Dynamic Coalitions to reach out to the whole community to make people aware of their work, to acquire new members to the Dynamic Coalition and for a platform for collaboration across all these different kinds of forms like national, regional initiatives, like the Dynamic Coalition, everything that is going on throughout the year.

And in the end, all Dynamic Coalitions and all the other parts, I think they need also visibility in the programme.  That's where I would like to discuss further whether we could achieve this visibility for the work the Dynamic Coalitions are doing.

We had a very successful main session this year, which was jointly organised by several Dynamic Coalitions and prepared by Rajendra.  And I do think this could be a good opportunity.  Maybe a bit more time to discuss further.  We were running out of time with our 90 minutes last -- this year, the last IGF.  But that could also give visibility, putting the work of Dynamic Coalitions in the focus and help them to make their message spread against the Internet Governance community. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you, Jutta.  There were concrete proposals in the chat.  And there was a suggestion by the Secretariat. And please, Celine, how we're creating a timeline that also aligns with the IGF 2024 timeline, including strategic goal, dates, processes, and events.  There were people that reacted positively to that.  That

will be, I think, a very concrete outcome, a low-hanging fruit out of this meeting.

Carol, can I look back at you and see whether you would like to comment on what you heard so far?

>> CAROL ROACH: Yes. I heard and I must say Wout is a big proponent for DCs in the MAG meetings. He's very focal, which is good.

So just a question, so-so far we have 28 DCs. Probably more on the horizon. Do we have an assessment, for lack of a better word guideline for each DC to be able to present at IGF? Like how the MAG goes through workshops, do DCs have to put forward a proposal? Do you have a subcommittee or something of the sort that will go through them? Or it's just that everybody wants in?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. In answer to that, I think part of the problem is it happens very much in silos. And the DCs traditionally they are given a slot for their own individual meeting provided they have fulfilled some conditions like presented an annual report and have proven that they're active. And that's part of all the documents we agreed on. But there is not much of, shall we say, common framework that would link it to selection of workshops or whatever. And I think this is very much part of this paper from the DCs and part of the ask they have to be more integrated in the shaping of the overall programme in whatever form that will take, that is an open question. But we -- (?) said it in the chat. The DCs have to apply for the slot. But up to now, they have been given a slot if they had fulfilled these very basic prerequisites.

But there was not a selection process in terms of content and the MAG, in that sense, was not involved in the selection of DC sessions. As on the other hand, the DCs were not involved in the selection of workshops. That is a little bit the feeling that could be married in having a more integrated approach. I don't know whether I helped or I created confusion at a higher level. But I'm asking colleagues to jump in and to say what their ideas are or also correct me if I had been wrong in my description of the situation. Carol?

>> CAROL ROACH: That did help. But that also brought up something else to mind. But not quite on topic. But we have two other hands up. I think they probably want to comment on what you said, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I see. Daniel and I have La, is that Stephen and Wout. Daniel was first.

>> DANIEL: Again, this is Daniel I'm one of the co-chairs of the Dynamic Coalition for journalism, sustainability of journalism. I think this is a really important topic, and I can understand how the proliferation of Dynamic Coalitions makes the agenda even harder to pull together. One perspective that I did want to add -- I think it's important to take into account -- is that for the members of our Dynamic Coalition, having that slot on the agenda is kind of one of the value propositions for our members. Because it is very kind of difficult to get these issues on to the agenda. There doesn't seem to be, in terms of the MAG's selection of topics, necessarily the ones that our members think are the most important and need to be brought to attention are not the ones that are picked for slots on the agenda.

So this is a way for us to make sure that the voices of the news media sector are on the agenda.  So anything -- I would be hesitant to recommend anything that would alter that we would need to combine with another one that really wasn't a great fit.  Just because if you take away that value proposition, it changes the incentives for the existence of Dynamic Coalitions from the get go.

So I just want to add that as something to think about as we think about how to address this issue.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you for that.  IFLA meet 8 is that Stephen.

>> STEPHEN:  I apologize about my camera.  It's something on what you said, Markus.  I think that hopefully comes out throughout the paper that I know the Dynamic Coalitions and DCs themselves are implementing the MAG and providing an extra stream to the IGF in terms of having this infrastructure of people working throughout the year in a multistakeholder way in order to produce, in order to discuss, in order to debate to make sure that the IGF is more than just it exists in 51 other weeks in the area, not just the one week when everyone is actually meeting.

Secondly, when the discussion comes based down to how we allocate time to the IGF programme, I suspect it's kind of an unfortunate framing for a wider discussion about what that role is in terms of into a zero sum game where I don't think that is the case most of the time.

I think something brought in the chat is, what we want to go for a more checking of things and everyone has to run through 800 proposals is not an easy way to go.  I don't necessarily want that.  If there's a way of being able to share information up front and given that opportunity to actually consider what's going on, because I'm also aware that about three or four days before the IGF where people are looking at the programme in depth then you're playing catch-up.  Is there a way that Dynamic Coalition where we not only do an annual report and then we share with the MAG see if there's opportunity for feedback if need be.  But I think to get away from that mystery and always having to catch-up.  I don't know if that makes any sense.  I apologize.  I'm calling from an airport but I'm not yet on the plane so I can do this.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you.  I think that's all very helpful.  I think there's no easy answer to that.  And I did not anticipate that we would come up with a very easy plan forward after today's exchange.  But I think it's been very helpful to discuss also with MAG chair and give her some food for thought.  And how to make the programme for coherent.

Avri said in the chat she can't raise her hand.  I take it that you raised your hand and would like to give you the floor.  Please, Avri.  We can't hear you.

>> I had written it but I guess I can say it.  I mean, several times during this meeting I've been somewhat worried about things I heard.  But not being able to raise my hand had advantages.  But this one I really want to say, there's really two types of Dynamic Coalitions.  There are those that are thematic, that are looking at things and really can fit themselves into the thematic flow of each year.  And then will are those, whether it's the disability one or the schools one that

I coordinate where if it's not thematic, it's about how to do something, how to either teach Internet Governance or how to make, you know, Internet Governance more open to diversity or to disability, et cetera.

So in any of the rules we make about how a DC fits into that MAG we have to make sure we take into account that there are different ties. I know we've talked about them all being diverse. But that's a division that's really concrete. And if you start making rules about, you have to do this to get that, you will be leaving out the different type of DCs. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, I tried to make the point in my introductory remarks that there are different kinds of DCs. Some are more about sharing experience and learning from each other, and the DC on Internet Governance I think is very much that kind of nature. Wout, you also have a hand up.

>> WOUT: Yes. Thank you, Markus. Avri, every opportunity I have on speaking on behalf of the Dynamic Coalitions, I usually try to make that division as good as possible. So that we do not exclude each other in one way or the other. Going back to what was said, I think, about the programme. I'm very distracted by Avri I notice now. Stephen mentioned it.

I think what is important I'm trying to gather my thoughts again because I was distracted by the concerns of Avri, which is -- I totally agree with. The programme, I think it is important that we try to look at what the outcomes that are projected for the year are. And with the suggestion of Celine, I think that becomes extremely well possible so that the MAG knows what to expect. And then it also becomes easier to become a part of the programme where it fits to the themes that have been selected.

And in that way we will strengthen each other's process. I think I cannot say that enough is that when a DC has a projected outcome, then when you go to the IGF programme that Carol mentioned at some point, applying for a workshop, as IS3C, we have done that three years in a row. Three years in a row we were not accepted and that was even on presenting the report, to have a programme to get input on the report. And we did not get the slot.

So if we do not apply for a day zero or for an open fora through friendly governments or our own session, then we would not have the opportunity to present at all. So in other words, that's the only option a DC has to be assured of some time at the IGF.

If, however, there are other options, that would probably mean that the need for a specific slot would become less important. And that way you win time and room at the IGF. But I think that is something that we need to consider is if the DC or any other -- also the best practice fora and the (?) get the opportunity to interact and show what they have presented or what they can present at the IGF. That would mean that room is created. But if it's the only option to have your own session, then that's the only option that is left for an intersessional activity.

So I have to leave in a few moments as well. Carol, thank you very much for being present. I may not be able to get to the end. But

thank you very much, all, for the input.  Because I think it's very valuable work we discussed today.  Markus, back to you.  Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you, Wout.  We are coming to the end of our 90 minutes and there's no partner room for the second part of the agenda which I somehow anticipated.  But I think we had an excellent discussion.  I'm not sure whether we're making your life easier, Carol, with that.  But I would like to giving the floor to you to wrap up.  Maybe the suggestion by the Secretariat a timeline would be a next step and might be helpful.  Please, Carol, what is your reading of the session?  And once again, thanks for joining us.

>> CAROL ROACH:  I must say, I am more wiser, I think in regards to your thoughts and how you operate.  And I hope you invite me back but not to take over your meeting, to hear, to hear more of what you have to say.  I think Celine's idea with regard to having a timeline is extremely helpful so people know whether they're coming or going.  I think that is very useful.

Another thing I would ask you to think about is how do you measure a DC's performance?  I noticed the Terms of Reference, there's no way to dissolve or terminate a DC.

So you can imagine maybe five years, ten years down the line when we may not be here.  You might have 100 DCs.  Then what.  So we need -- you need to, I suppose, to think of a little bit more structure and strategy with regards to moving forward.

But Celine can say, I push for the intersessional work.  I think it's a huge part of the existence of the IGF.  And I want you to continue to push and say, hey, I'm here.  Me! DC.  So thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thank you very much.  And your suggestion about measuring the performance, this is also another elephant in the room we always shied away from that.  We had formal requirements.  Have you written the report?  Yes or no.  But actually, judging the quality we have never even dared walk into.  If you give us the guidance and also the order we should do it, then it's something to be considered.

Anyway, I take it you said hope to be invited back, and I think that's a very concrete outcome of our meeting.  And we look forward -- we're not suggesting that you attend every single session we have.  But from time to time we have a session with you as a MAG chair, I think, would be most helpful, most weekend by all DC members.  And you have seen the interest it generated to other direct link to you.  I think that was very helpful.  And I think I can speak in the name of all of us, that we are very grateful for that.

Jutta, would you like to add anything and conclude the session, please?

>> JUTTA CROLL:  Thank you, Markus.  I just thank all the people who contributed to this session to make it really informative.  And I think we have taken a step forward.  At the road in front of us will be a long way, and I hope that Carol can continue from time to time to join us and help us to liaise the MAG and integrate the intersessional work into the process.  Thank you and have a nice weekend to all of you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER:  Thanks. Bye-bye.

(Event concluded at 1631 UTC)