

RAW FILE

Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group Meeting #81

Wednesday, January 31, 2024

1:00 p.m. UTC.

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Hi, everybody.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hi, everybody. Markus here. It's a little bit early.

It's the top of the hour. Let's just wait one or two more minutes to see whether more colleagues will join.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Good to see you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Likewise. Hello, everyone.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, Markus.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Is there a rule that only the speaker should have their camera on?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There's no hard and fast rule, but it's friendly if you show yourself, especially if you're a speaker. But it's really up to you.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I think it's better when you speak, if you speak to show -- if you can, to show yourself.

But sometimes when there's too many videos on, the bandwidth grows and some other people have trouble.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There is that.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, if you're not speaking, you could turn your camera off and then turn it on when you are speaking.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That makes very much sense. But it's definitely nice to see the people when they are speaking, to see them in real life.

It's one minute over the hour, and I think more people have joined. So, I suggest, then, let's move to the agenda.

My co-facilitator, Jutta, is not on the call. She is on vacation this week. So, unfortunately, she cannot join us, but

she will keep informed.

Celine showed the agenda in the chat. Can you show them the screen sharing? I sent it out beforehand. It's a fairly standard agenda, and I think there should be the work plan that Celine has given us to prepare.

Can we adopt the agenda as it was proposed? And there was also -- see was had under any other business had some contribution to make. And I see hands up in the -- yes,.

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Do I take it that the agenda is approved as proposed and we had, under agenda item number 2 was updates from the Secretariat. And it is my understanding that Chengetai who joined us on this call had comments to make on the role and the dos and not dos of Dynamic Coalition. Chengetai, would you like to come in now?

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: Yes. Just give me the camera, if I can. I don't know if you can see me. Can you see me?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can see you.

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: Okay, great. Sorry, I didn't know I was coming in first. I just wanted to make a slight comment. It's, basically, in the middle, it's not in the introduction. But I would just -- I just had a comment to make about some time ago we did have a DC that was formed and then it was reported in the press. And the way it was reported was as if it was the IGF who had formed this Dynamic Coalition. So, it did bring about some confusion.

And the other thing was that we had people from the press calling us, the IGF Secretariat, for comment. And we had to play some catch-up to find out exactly what was going on.

So, it's just a long way of saying that when we make public statements or when any part of the IGF makes public statements, it's very important to state that it is what they are, it is the Dynamic Coalition, it is not an official position of the IGF. Even when I myself make a comment, I never, ever say I speak for the IGF. I say I speak for the IGF Secretariat, I speak for the UN, and that's it. When the MAG chair speaks, she speaks for the MAG, and she has the commission from the MAG to speak.

So, it's exactly the same way is the way that we should be speaking when we are speaking about Dynamic Coalitions. It is the Dynamic Coalitions and it should be stated in that context.

Now, we had similar thing, I don't want to call it an issue. It's not an issue. It's just the way that we present ourselves because we are all doing good work and there's nothing wrong with the work as such.

But we had a similar situation with the national and regional

initiatives. They are national and regional initiatives and they should be speaking in that context. And they may or may -- they are not endorsed with the whole IGF because, number one, how can something be endorsed with the whole IGF as such? It can be endorsed by the MAG. It can be endorsed by the various parts that can be identified.

So, it's very important to have a sort of disclaimer, if you will, whenever you are making statements. And I think with Markus and Celine, we can come up with the -- we can convert the is disclaimer or the specifier, I won't call it a disclaimer, the specifier that we have for the national and regional initiatives for Dynamic Coalition announcements as such. Because, yes, you are Dynamic Coalitions, you are part of the IGF but you don't represent the whole of the IGF, as I don't represent the whole of the IGF.

I hope that makes it clear. And, sorry, that was what I wanted to say. I didn't think I was going to say it in the beginning, but just sometime in the course of business.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. You're a busy man and you are free to go if you have to go somewhere else but you said what you had to say.

I do recall there was mention and indeed there was quite media coverage on that issue, the IGF decided on this and that. And I checked. We do have a charter of Dynamic Coalitions because it does explain what the Dynamic Coalitions are, but it does not say what they are not. And maybe we ought to revisit it and the charter actually says it can be updated and revisited every year. We agreed on the charter. And maybe we should revisit it to make that clear.

We also had the discussion about the use of the UN emblem in connection with the Dynamic Coalitions and we said they are not entitled to use the UN emblem when they sign off. And maybe we ought to make that a little bit more explicit in the charter.

And I think it also -- you know, the charter says -- emphasizes very much the bottom-up character and independence of the IGFs, but it doesn't clarify the distinction between what is a Dynamic Coalition and what is the IGF. Maybe we ought to be a little bit more precise on that to make it clear.

I wonder if there are any comments from the other participants on this particular issue. I think it was not, you know, any malicious intent or anything --

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: It definitely wasn't, it wasn't.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It was just lack of understanding of the people who picked up the story so whenever the Dynamic Coalition issues a statement, some kind of disclaimer might make sense

as Chengetai just suggested. We could also look at what the NRIs do so we are in sync with all the other components of the broader IGF community.

I wonder if there are any comments or questions in this regard. I think it's -- you know, it is an important -- it's a foundational constitutional issue, so to speak. So, it's important to have sufficient clarity on that and why sometimes diplomatic ambiguity is useful. But here, I think we should be clear and there should be no ambiguity.

If there are no questions or comments, can I take it, then, that we maybe go back to the drawing board, revisit the charter, and come up with some language to submit that to the coordination group to specify and clarify the relationship between Dynamic Coalition and the IGF?

As I see no voice of opposition, I take it, then, that we have an agreement and that we have an action item here and we get back to the coordination group with some concrete language to update the charter and clarify the charter.

And with that, are there other updates from the Secretariat?

>> CHENGETAI MASANGO: Give that to Celine, please, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much. Whether it comes to the updates of the Secretariat, you may know the most important update is the upcoming consultation and MAG meeting taking place on the 27th, from the 27th to the 29th. On the 27th, we will have the open consultation. So, again, we invite you to join and to follow this date.

And we are currently in the process of creating the agenda, which we will share as soon as possible. Hopefully latest by -- so beginning of February. We will have our next MAG meeting on the 6th of February, which, of course, will also be used to discuss the agenda of the upcoming MAG meeting and open consultation.

Also, perhaps, an update as of the 5th of February, this is really just for your information, we will also do a call for intersessional work so, basically, we still have three slots left, which is for either policy networks or Best Practice Forums, as during the last call, during the last MAG call, we have already agreed on the continuation of the PNAI, so the Policy Network on Artificial Intelligence. And this call will last from the 5th of February to the 16th of February.

Why as of the 5th? Because today is, actually, the deadline for the IGF call for input. The Secretariat will do a short analysis and the MAG will then use this analysis and the results of the call for input to come up with some intersessional work proposals.

So, that would be from my side. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry. Can those who are not speaking mute their microphones?

Thank you, Celine. I thank you for this update.

Oh. I think you put it as another separate agenda item, that we have a new Dynamic Coalition. We could -- have got the order of the agenda, you have proposed, but I think it would flow very nicely if you have that right now as after the update from the Secretariat.

>> CELINE BAL: Do you mean that the new DC can introduce themselves now?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, yes, that will make sense.

>> CELINE BAL: I gave it before any other business. I see Reyansh who is already online so if you would like you can also introduce your new DC for gaming on purpose. Please go ahead.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: I'm Reyansh Gupta from India, pursuing an undergraduate degree in computer engineering, and as the founder of leading Gaming4Purpose.org, my journey began with childhood passion for gaming. Myself in virtual roles. And during the COVID lockdown, I helped the startup as the CEO for creating an online Gaming for Purpose in the rural parts of India and this is where my interest in gamification and technology started. And my Stanford University last summer was very inspirational and that led to the formation of this Dynamic Coalition on Gaming for Purpose.

And along with that, I also completed the course on designing creativity for business from NCR trends. And that has broadened my perspective a lot. The gaming world to me has always been more than just entertainment. It's a reality and this concept got a whole new meaning when the (?) classified gaming as a mental disorder followed the FDA recognizing as therapeutic tool for ADHD, and this highlighted how gaming just (?) and every coin has two sides, and gaming has both: Fun and purpose.

So, even exploring the side of purpose-driven games. And the Dynamic Coalition on Gaming for Purpose is about harnessing this potential. These aren't just games for fun. They are games with a deeper impact. They certainly influence (?) often without their immediate awareness. And one big example would be (?) use of gamification has affect made people learn languages daily on a daily basis on streets. And if you imagine applying this concept to sectors like healthcare and environmental science, agriculture, the possibilities are limitless. (?)

transformation power of giving along with conferences, hackathons and seminars, engaging various stakeholders, and we aim to compile a comprehensive report at the end of the year, so everyone can look at how purpose of games are changing the

world and how new things are coming up daily.

And we are collaborating with industry leaders in our coalition, and we are bringing diverse perspective for everyone. And our goal is to revolutionize the gaming industry, creating games that are not just immensely enjoyable, but also meaningful. And so I am looking for collaboration and insightful discussions. And thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And thank you for the presentation. Welcome to the family of Dynamic Coalitions and the Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group.

With that, I think we can then go to our main agenda item. That will be the work plan the Secretariat has prepared. And thank you very much, Celine, for doing that.

And I would hand it back to you. Can you walk us through the document you have actually shared with the group and explain and then we can have a discussion on that? Please, over to you, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you so much, Markus. You have probably had a chance or hopefully had a chance to go through the Dynamic Coalitions 2024 work plan and timeline.

Let me share the link again with you in the chat.

The idea came, actually, from last year where we really wanted to have a timeline not only for IGF-related initiatives, but also in general IG related processes, for example GDC or WSIS plus 20 and how Dynamic Coalitions can feed in their work.

So, here we came up with some strategic objectives. First one is IGF related. So, at the bottom you can already scroll down just for you to know how it's going to -- I hope you can see it. Yes, here it is.

Here's just for review and IGF-related process timeline plus our Internet Governance-related processes timeline, so showing the most important days, for example, GDC informal consultations or the NetMundial+10, which is going to take place soon, Summit of the Future, and Internet Governance-related processes.

I'm going to go back to the top. The first strategic objective that we suggest is to, of course, continue share expertise and create synergies amongst the broader IGF intersessional community.

And here we always have few suggested action items. If you have other suggested action items, you can always leave in the document a comment.

And it's always supported by key milestones. So in case there are some important dates or something that the DCs have to take care of, it will be written here.

The fact that we will share expertise and create synergies

is, of course, here is something ongoing, this is our working throughout the year.

When it comes now to the second strategic objective, we would like to contribute furthermore to the development of but also substantive input to the IGF 2024 programme. This was something that was already important to you in the past. Also in 2023, you may remember the initiative that we had with an intersessional event. So, here also you can see the various suggested items. For example, the potential organization of another intersessional event. Of course, the activity participation of DC members in MAG working groups. So, we now have already three official MAG working groups that have been launched a couple of weeks ago by the MAG. And it is open to everyone. So, basically, you can, in case of interest and time, of course, you can also decide to join them and actively participate in the discussions.

The same goes, for example, for the MAG groups that organize main sessions later in the year. Last year, for example, the MAG decided to open it to observers. So, this would also be, of course, an opportunity for DCs to contribute to the IGF programme but also substantively good.

The third strategic objective is to develop a proposal for DC's integration in the IGF 2024 programme. So, for those who have been in the DC call in December last year, we have already had discussions with the MAG chair on how we could potentially integrate Dynamic Coalitions in the IGF 2024 programme. As you may know, we have a growing number of DCs. How do you say it? The programme of the IGF has limited slots and we would like to figure out with you how DCs would like to actually be integrated best.

The DCs also have various purposes. So, you have DCs that would like to meet, let's say, annually as a kind of annual in-person meeting. Others would like to really reach out to external. So, depending on the dynamics of the DCs, it would be great to, again, develop a proposal for DCs integration.

Here you may see the suggested milestone or key deadline, let's say, is 23rd of February. Why is that? Because we do have the MAG -- the in-person MAG meeting and open consultation coming up. So, that could be a great initiative to hand over a proposal to the MAG so that they can discuss this in Riyadh when discussing the overall IGF programme and structure.

The fourth suggested objective is to advocate for DCs and increase DCs' visibility and reputation. Of course, this is also something ongoing. But here as a key milestone would suggest to align that with the IGF communication activities so you can reach out to us, the Secretariat, and also to Alonra, who is

our communications expert here within the team.

But here again, you can see a few action items that we suggested. So, so, the fifth strategic objective here is to develop a set of KPIs to report back to the MAG.

You may recall also the MAG chair during last meeting who was very interested in having some measurable success -- sorry, some measurable success and she proposed to develop a set of KPIs. I know that Dynamic Coalitions are very diverse as such. They will be very interesting to have a set of measures that where we can really measure the success of the various DCs.

Again, this is just a proposition. Good.

Now coming to the IGF Internet Governance-related subjects. One related to the Global Digital Compact is to participate in and follow the development, of course, of the GDC consultations leading to the Pact of the Future, which will be agreed at the Summit of the Future now in New York on the 22nd and 23rd of September. Here we included a timeline, which is official. It has been shared by the co-facilitators dealing with Global Digital Compact, and you can see here some round of informal consultations with relevant stakeholders. So, perhaps, you may think of you may want to provide some input from the DCs during these informal rounds of consultations. Good.

And here on the 8th of March, there is a deadline for written inputs from Member States, observers, but also stakeholders to inform the preparation of the zero draft of the GDC. Good.

One other Internet Governance-related process would be the net Mundial-plus 10 which is now taking place from the 29th of April to 1st May 2024. There is going to be a call for input. We do not know the dates yet but of course this is also a possibility for DCs to take part in and also to participate in general in the NetMundial+10 events.

Last, but not least, the WSIS+20 review process. As you know, the General Assembly will meet in 2025 and they have already had some informal consultation. So, CSTD is now until the 29th of February, having this online questionnaire. You may have already received the email from Mark Carvell. For your information, the MAG and the working group on Strategy is currently working on MAG response to this questionnaire, and Mark suggested to us to make sure that the DCs have -- are represented, let's say, in that response.

So, this would then lead again as a better overview to that timeline with suggested actions.

And I just -- and here. And here you can see it's because of the group doc you can't properly see but once you download the document, here's a more comprehensive timeline of DC

activities for 2024.

I will stop for now. If you have questions, you can ask them, of course, already now. I see that one of you had their hands up.

Or I would also suggest that we give you some time to also provide your own comments directly in the document. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: well, thank you, Celine, very much for this. This is a very comprehensive document and I think it needs some time to -- for each one of us to look through it and reflect on it and look at it in detail. It's a very rich menu. But I think my initial comment is, as I see it, there are two categories. There are some action items that would relate to each individual DC, come forward and say I am interested in this or in that activity. And I would like to join this activity.

And then there are the other which will be more collective action items for coordination group where we all agree as a group on some issue and some tasks to look at. And I would like to recall that we have been doing that for quite a while now. We have the document we prepared that was two or three years back, which still has some open questions and we have been going through it. And I think that is also integrated part in this work plan, especially where you relate to internal DC governance methods. And what we just discussed, the point raised by Chengetai at the beginning on what are, sort of, the lines DCs should not cross which we need to update in the charter, that it also be part of a collective -- of the collective work plan.

But these, I welcome any initial comment on that. And who has hands up? Hang on. Because I shared the screen, I cannot -- I have to go in the other -- is there any -- I can't see any hands up right now.

But who would like to take the floor for initial comments or be helpful? Maarten, yes.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: In general recapping what I thought was most important when we talked about in December is depends a little bit on your strategy, and I know we all have different DCs, but for me, it makes a little sense if we do have that any opportunity, because it helps to keep the community together and focused on a certain point. At the same time, make sure you are at least in two or three of the -- in the regional events, I would say. So you can truly bring in a global perspective than only that of the happy few that happen to respond to your mail list.

So, I think whether we want to capture that as guidance or whether we just agree that that makes sense, that is a good one.

But also highlighting the importance of the annual IGF for DCs as a focal point.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Judith.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, yes, it is Judith Hellerstein. I thought it was good. Besides my question to making sure that this chart or the graph when you used the pictures is accessible with the alternative text, I am thinking, does that mean that -- I agree with Maarten, a lot of our DCs, we plan around this meeting to bring in -- update the community, bring in other points. So, having our own session is very important to us.

So I wouldn't like to see this go away. I don't mind having more other sessions. But we should still have our own session so that we could focus ourselves and update everyone and just sort of have an in-person meeting or other meeting if everyone is there, meeting new people and others. So, I think that's very important and I would not like to lose that.

But I do see the issues and, yes, and the NRIs also having the same issue. But I can understand the point they make. But we are a lot smaller, so I was hoping we could still maintain our individual meetings.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. But I think that is -- reflects very much a common understanding and a common priority of all DCs, that it's important for them to have their meeting.

The question will be, then, rather they could be sort of two tier system, they are meeting set them a part of the programme and others are sort of I'd meetings. It's easier to give maybe a small room to a DC. But you don't really expect many nonmembers joining, but where the DCs can meet among themselves. But this is something that obviously needs to be taken up with the MAG and that depends every year a little bit on the availability of meeting rooms and meeting slots.

Any other comments?

>> CELINE BAL: Perhaps if I may add something regarding that. I think that the MAG last year was pretty critical on the number of individual DC sessions just because the number of DCs is growing. So, this is, actually, really an attempt to discuss with the MAG before they take their own decision on how we can actually integrate DCs better.

So, they are going to meet now on the first open consultation and MAG meeting end of February. And I think that you can, perhaps, come up with a suggestion that fits you better, you all better as DCs before the MAG takes, you know to present ideas to the MAG instead of the MAG taking decisions to you that might not fit you as Dynamic Coalitions at all.

Again, I would suggest you go over the various suggested

items, perhaps we can find a volunteer here who would like to start with a proposal that we can really give to the MAG by 23rd February, so before the meeting starts for their consideration. And I think that would be a very fruitful way to go further with that DC integration in the IGF 2024 programme. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Celine. And Amali has her hand up. Please.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Thank you, Markus. This is Amali. I think the DCs should have a place at the IGF meetings. A number of conferences are putting on this Zero Day event and all DCs should have that opportunity at least to have Zero Day event so they can engage with the international public. There's no other place that we can. And I know we have had excellent participation at our events.

So, we really appreciated that at least we are given sort of a Zero Day event, please. Thank you. And also we would like to have it virtual. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. That is a very concrete proposal that put all the DC meetings to day zero could be an option. Other comments?

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: . Ragendra, please.

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP: My experience as the IGF is sidelining this to day 0 would be undermining the contribution. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Amy?

>> AMY CROCKER: Thanks, Markus. Hi. Yeah, I mean, just from the DC child rights perspective, I mean, I need to look in more detail at the options, but one of the things that I think we could potentially find very valuable is having a physical space to bring together all of the sessions that relate to child rights, because what we typically see is particularly last year on the agenda, we had many, many, which is very positive, events that touched upon youth, advocacy, child rights, et cetera, but we didn't have prior to the event, you know, contact with them. So, actually, as a space to not -- it could be to bring in new members to your coalition or it could just be to, sort of, highlight the role of the DC in coordinating a particular issue at the IGF.

So, whatever that would look like would be something valuable for us at least.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, this is very much, I think which is part of the document that will be, sort of, mainstreaming what DCs do, not necessarily keep them in their silo, but integrate them in the thematic mainstream of issues you are interested in and as you just said, there are many events on similar issues

you are involved in and that the DCs are part of coordinating these events and that the DCs would then work with the MAG to make sure that there's a coherent approach to this particular thematic issue.

Is that fair enough summary of what you just said? And I think that would also go a long way of what is felt a bit missing that the DCs are a bit in a silo, they have a lot to offer but they are not integrated into the thematic issues that relate to these particular issues the DCs are dealing with.

I see Wout and Avri have their hands up. Wout, please, first, and then Avri.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus and sorry for coming in late so maybe I have missed something you have discussed before but I could not join earlier when it was rescheduled.

I think I suggested last time as well is to have a specific slot for the DCs that would not compete with the rest of the programme, so that the DCs can have more of a spotlight in the programme. So let's say three hours or four hours, the morning or an afternoon slot where all the DCs that have a session will have their sessions and that there will be no others. It also frees up the rest of the programme because there are no DC sessions in their -- the other way around.

But that way there's no competition and the focus is on the work of the DCs. So, would that be a way to promote our work better from the IGF's point of view in I think that is one.

The other one, the integration of DCs into the programme, I think that's tremendously important because that's how we get better known. And so, I would definitely stress to propose that to the MAG in -- next month, end of next month. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. As to your concrete proposal, I mean, scheduling the IGF programme is a nightmare in best of cases. So I don't know how feasible that is. And I would -- I don't know whether Celine is able to comment on that. But how feasible that is, I cannot comment on that. And that definitely something that would need to be discussed with the Secretariat.

>> CELINE BAL: , actually, I have -- sorry, I have a follow-up question. Do you mean that DC slots should not be scheduled to compete with other major IGF sessions, or do you want to have -- or are you suggesting to have DC slots all in parallel?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: No. They are all in parallel and there are no other sessions going on. Perhaps the main session, they go on the whole week, of course, but that there is no other kind of workshops and that there are three hours or four hours only to the DCs and that means that people who would normally go to any of the other 10 sessions going on at the same time, would

now be forced to go into one of the Dynamic Coalitions and then they will select the one that -- or the two that's of most interest to their own. And then they learn more and probably will become involved easier if they hear about what is going on.

So, that is the idea about the noncompetition with others.

>> CELINE BAL: And you still suggest to have individual DC sessions?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: That, the sum will have individual ones, the ones that really present reports or they present an outcome or a concrete policy suggestion, that they should have the floor to do so. And that is making an inventory of friends DC have something to present. So that completely clear in the programme there's a policy suggestion or the report or that is going to be published.

>> CELINE BAL: I see there's a comment from Maarten following that, there are multiple people working in several DCs. So, it might be challenging for some to have parallel sessions of DCs.

>> WOUT DENATRIS: That's always the case. But I had conflicts the whole IGF last year with non-DCs and DCs. So I had to split myself in three at some points last year. But that will always be the case, of course. But then you have a main one or schedule that you can go from the one to the other. That's always flexibility involved.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yep. Thank you. I mean, you are confirming what I said, scheduling is a nightmare.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: It is. But it's also with other sessions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, yes. No, I mean, okay, but there's something that's been looked at. But we have Avri and Sivas and Ragendra you have your hand. But Avri first.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I was speaking. I am a little concerned in this conversation that one, we are getting ourselves in a thing where we are going to be asking or expecting the MAG to pick the one type of suggestion that works for us all.

So, you know, I think as we have more and more DCs, as we have more and more different ways for a DC. Some of them may like the sessionals some may find value if you put them in a zero. But if you put them all in zero, what about the other zero events? The idea of scheduling for PCs worries me, and saying if you don't go to a PC then you have got nothing to do because we want you to pay attention to the DCs. That worries me in terms of what it forces upon participants and takes away their variety, their freedom of choice. I don't really see any problem with, you know, having DCs striped along a certain part of the schedule, but not necessarily sole ownership of a piece of schedule. But really I worry about if we, sort of, say they all need to be

this way. They all -- and I do also worry about the whole notion of setting up competition between DCs for slots. That notion is -- you know, there's certainly, there may be a limited number of the slots as such, this slot and there's first comes, first serves or whatever, but to get competitive, to get with people choosing the winners of beauty contests, I think, you know, that would be problematic.

So, it's really cool that we got lots of ideas. But let's look at them, sort of, as a basket of, you know, here's a bunch of cool things that you can do. Which one fits what your DC wants to do this year, or something like that and get a variety of modalities. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Thank you for your words of wisdom, Avri. It's very much in line with what we, actually, say in the charter. It's no one size fits all for the DCs. And they are -- all are individual and diverse, and the diversity of the DCs needs to be reflected in whatever the programme comes up with.

Sivas and then Maarten.

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: On the idea of integrating the working of the DCs, into the main theme and into the overall work of the IGF, is it possible that IGF could officially host the DCs to have an intersessional physical meeting, maybe coinciding with another international events in which there are five or six participants are expected to be there and when they are funding for the nonparticipants of that event to come together physically face to face and try and find how many between their themes and work? It's more like on the scale of national NRA. That's just a thought for you to relate and discuss. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, we did have a first attempt at an intersessional that was last year during the second MAG meeting open consultations. I think it was in July in Geneva. But it was maybe not of the scale you would have suggested just now.

And, again, there is a question of feasibility. It was difficult enough, I think, to reserve. It was of an afternoon session. But it went well and it was well received also by MAG members who learned a lot about the DCs then, the substantive contribution of DCs. But that definitely -- I think the intersessional is also part of the document Celine has just submitted. But I don't know.

Celine, would you like to comment on that?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. So, I think that the idea or in general the intersessional event that we had last year was well received. It was our first attempt. And there is definitely

room for improvement. But I think that this is first already a nice way to, let's say, feed in the work and the outcomes, also the expertise into the development of the IGF programme. So, this is definitely something that we can organize again this year.

And another idea that we already had, I think last time during the call, and this is the first suggested action item here, actually, it's the potential organization of a virtual IGF 2024 Dynamic Coalition event day which would either be ahead of the annual IGF or, perhaps, probably ahead, and we wouldn't have the capacity within the Secretariat to organize a physical event, let it be resources or also financial resources, but that would have been a suggestion to have already individual DC sessions ahead of the IGF, and then we do not have the pressure during the IGF to secure some DC -- or 59 DC slots for there be 29 DCs who would like to have individual sessions.

So, perhaps, this could also be an idea that you may want to think of. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I think, again, it's always worthwhile considering what are the capacities of the Secretariat and also the finances involved as necessary. I mean, the physical meeting always involves some kind of finances one way or another. I mean, it's -- the easiest way is that it can be integrated in part of the MAG open consultations, I think. But if it's outside, then it gets more complex.

I see two hands up. And I am not sure whether they are old hands or new ones. Sivas and Maarten, are they old hands or new hands.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sivas just spoke so I guess it's my new one.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Maarten, over to you.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Unless I'm wrong, Sivas. Yeah, no, I appreciate the discussion. I have seen the struggle in particular in Japan to get everything on the schedule. So I fully appreciate that. At the same time, I re-emphasize, it is a focal point also for the community that you are trying to induce to think with you and to work with you.

The exit point I would like to make is if the IGF would be the global IGF, IGF would be in terrible trouble. I think the IGF is so strong because it does build on the national and the regional initiatives and it does build on the continuous work that some DCs more than other display.

So, somewhere in the document or in the message to the MAG, in particular because the MAG renews all the time as well, I would like to emphasize that the IGF is building upon a bottom-up

movement of regional IGFs all around the world and DC work that is sometimes really truly continuous, including real work and real research. So, let's make that point clear and let's keep us mainstream rationalized.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I do agree one thing that you say, maybe we don't need 200 people rooms for every DC. So I think that's a good caveat. At the same time, I think nowadays, and I have seen that at some of the regional IGFs where the funding may have been lower, but it is also important to make sure that all the meetings can be hybrid, in particular for also in the smaller rooms. That's an extra message I wanted to give.

Because not everybody will travel to Saudi Arabia for whatever reason, ranging from south, south, hybrid, yes, rooms at measure and keep them mainstream because of what I just said, please.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think the hybrid is -- that is now standard, I think. And correct me, Celine, if that's not true. But I think all the IGF meetings, at least my understanding, will be hybrid and have been now since the COVID crisis, I think. So, that's a given.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct.

>> CELINE BAL: Sorry, yes, this is correct that all the IGF meetings are indeed hybrid. So, last year the only nonhybrid meetings were the lightning talks which were not really. So, the format was not supposed to be a hybrid. Just spontaneous, short talks at the facility itself.

But we have received several requests to also organize again fully virtual events. This is part of the IGF 2023/2024 so stocktaking and improvements for 2024, and we are considering it again, just because we know it is quite a lot of community members asked for it.

And last year we didn't have fully virtual events just because we wanted to have, again, this in-person component after COVID. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I see Avri's hand is up.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thanks. Just a quick comment. Even on lightning events, I really think we need to find a way to make them work as hybrid, and someone, you know, that's just online can certainly do one, too. So, I really want to as much as possible, figuring out the way to integrate things. Because it's not just there is an online, there is an offline, there's an on site, online. We need to do more thinking about how we actually merge them. We are doing good at having patches. But

we really haven't done a lot of thought of how to weave those two in so that the hybrid nature is really a woven nature of onsite and online people.

And you know, yeah, where we are going this year may be an incentive to think about it harder. But our whole notion is this global outreach and bring more people in and get more people involved. And we will never do that with all traveling to the same place. You know, I mean, it can't happen. We can't get that many people to travel to one place, plus it's not good for us anyway.

So, you know, I really think we have to think more of the hybrid. And we are doing better. But let's not think that we have reached the end, yeah, we have got a hybrid that works. Because I think we are still early in figuring out how to weave the two together. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, it's -- what you said is very true. We have improved a lot. But we are not there yet. And I think that could also be a message from the DC coordination group to the MAG that, let's really make sure that we are as inclusive as possible and that we look at the boundaries of what can be done with hybrid meetings. And the fact that the lightning talks were not hybrid, let's look and make that possible, I think that will also be very valid message we can pass on to the MAG.

Are there other comments? And, obviously, the action plan Celine submitted is a rich menu and I think it needs some more time to digest. But we need to come to some kind of conclusion as well. There are some deadlines, and I think Celine has already mentioned a few. And please repeat again, correct me. There's a deadline for contribution to the CSTD and there is already some work underway in the strategy group. And we have a volunteer, that is Mark Carvell who volunteered to make an input, but also the Dynamic Coalitions are reflected in that. That will be definitely one deadline. And then there's the other deadline of the MAG meeting on the 23rd, I think that is where we should make some input for the MAG meeting in person and the open consultations.

And I see Wout's hand is up. Wout, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yeah, thank you, Markus. Not to interrupt you. So if you have finished, then I will make my comment.

As I said, I was not there at the beginning, so I don't know what was discussed in the first 30 minutes. We have discussed extensively recognition of DC reports of DCs that strive to have more impact of their reports and outcomes.

I saw in the previous meeting which I could not attend that have been discussed with Carol and also know that some MAG members

have expressed interest to pursue the topic. Are we going to bring this up again at the upper consultation? Because it looks like it may be a little bit more fertile ground this year than there was last year. And what would be the best way to go about it?

So, thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, the -- we had a presentation, this paper before us, it's quite a comprehensive paper. That's a work plan for the year. And that's, obviously, something we cannot just deal with in one short discussion. But I am trying to break it down what is now the next phase and where are the deadlines. And maybe Celine can help us again. There are, sort of, next deadlines that come up. And I clearly remember the deadline that Mark has signaled with his input to the CSTD questionnaire which is on the way through the IGF strategy group and Mark has volunteered to make an input with the Dynamic Coalition perspective.

And then there is, what do we present to the MAG for the first physical meeting end of February. But, Celine, can you maybe be more granular, more specific on what are the tasks ahead of us for the DC coordination group?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. So, the first one would indeed be the CSTD input. Perhaps Mark can then, because you already belong to you, perhaps Mark can liaise with credit who is a co-facilitator with the working Group on Strategy to more or less when they intend to submit their contribution so we know what our DC deadline would be, let's say, to contribute to their response.

Then a suggestion is the one that is written here, latest, so to submit a proposal regarding the DC integration into the programme to the MAG by the 23rd of February, so that this can be discussed during the first MAG meeting and open consultation, because begin the first MAG meeting and open consultation is there to already shape the IGF programme and structure. So that would be a good idea to already come up with a proposal on how DCs would like to be integrated this year.

And, perhaps, also what can be discussed during that open consultation is to ask the MAG to have a MAG liaison to the DC again, because we do not have Adam Peake anymore and while the MAG chair is very keen on attending several times the DC meetings, I think it will be beneficial to us to also have an official MAG liaison. So, this is something that we can also come up.

But, again, it's up to you, the DCs, as a collective activity, let's say, to discuss also if there is anything else that you would like to discuss during the open consultation and MAG meeting.

Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Well, there is, again, the paper you submitted makes it clear, there are things DCs can do individually in any case. And the IGF strategy group is one of them. It's open-ended, and any DC can actually join. And I think some DC -- some mechanics of the DC coordination group do join that group. But it is open. And others can join.

And the same goes for I think what has not happened in the past is the DCs have actually been proactively involved in the discussion and saying, hey, and that was, I think, Amy, one of the points made, look, there are so many sessions dealing with children's rights and we as a DC dealing with that could be part of that discussion. And there, that is something which we don't need to do as a group, but which is something each DC can actually join the discussion, the programmatic discussion but that we can signal that the DCs like to be involved in the discussions on thematic issues. But then when it comes to it, it's up to each DC to stand up and to claim the space.

And what I sense is the DCs, there's little appetite for change. You would like to keep a space in the annual programme, but, yes, you are cognizant of the fact that it gets more and more difficult. The more DCs there are, the more space can be limited. And I think we went, moved towards making it dependent whether or not a DC would have a slot in the main programme on whether you actually had done some work to be presented, but it's not, in that sense, a duty context but just to see there's something new coming.

But if not, that you still would have a room at the annual meeting where you could meet and, again, what I hear is a strong desire that any meeting would be hybrid. So, even if it's a very small meeting room you will get, that it will be with all the possibilities for hybrid participation.

Is that a kind of fair summary? Have I missed much or -- but we will have to, obviously -- if there's a deadline of the 23rd of February, we would need to have another meeting before that, another call before then.

But I see there are hands up. Amy and Wout. Amy first.

>> AMY CROCKER: Hi. Very briefly, thank you, Markus. I was writing it in the chat. Just to clarify, yes, it's the responsibility of the individual DCs to make themselves known. But as you know, it's an incredibly complex programme and agenda. And what I am, actually -- what I was saying before is that if there's -- if we move towards a situation where the DCs have more input into the design of the programme that relates to their areas, then that establishes a sort of coordination point and

a point of reference for the DC on that theme, so that when we get to the actual IGF, we have that connection and we have an oversight and we can engage in a much richer way with the different events that relate to us.

So, I hope that's clearer. Because I think, yes, it's our responsibility, but structurally right now it's actually very difficult to do that, given the number of participants and the number of sessions. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. Thank you for this point. And I think it's a good clarification. And maybe I was a bit oversimplifying. But, you know, it's also clear that whenever the MAG looks at the programme, that we actually point out, by the way, there is a DC dealing with these issues. And let's connect with this particular DC. You know, any new issue, is there actually existing DC dealing with and we connect so that it doesn't -- you know, the programme the MAG is developing is not totally separate from the DC so that we get the various components out of their silos. But that, I think, is a very valid point. That we can make that point, look, MAG, programme aspect, can you actually check the list of the DCs, see is there a DC already dealing with it and if so, let's connect and let's bring in this one or two or three DCs dealing with similar related aspects.

Is that a better summary, Amy?

>> CELINE BAL: Perhaps if I may add to that. Perhaps you it might also be interesting for a couple of DC members to also take part in the workshop process working group. You wouldn't be part of the ones evaluating the workshops because this is only for MAG members. But, again, this working group is open to everyone and I think it would also give you a good overview of the kind of proposals that are being submitted or how they will proceed with a selection of proposals, and you might then be also a link, let's say, between our proposals of a certain category, let's say, for example, human rights and you as a DC on children's rights, so that you have, perhaps, a better overview of all the workshops, actually, that have been selected and are on a certain topic.

So, again, this is, of course, on a volunteer basis but, perhaps, a good opportunity for some DC members to take part in that. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. That's very helpful comment. Yes. Obviously, there are the workshops and that's a huge bulk of the programme.

But I see there was a thumbs up from Amy. And Wout has a hand up. Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. I think your summary

is quite accurate. It also shows that there is a conflict of interest, perhaps, between DCs because you as I think Avri mentioned, this is the only opportunity you have to meet physically with people, perhaps, from many of the Dynamic Coalitions which is at the IGF.

The other conflict is that the number of spaces are limited and there are more and more and more DCs and, yes, do they all need a spot in the programme, and would a side room be enough for them? But that's something I can't decide on.

I think looking at my own Dynamic Coalition, Internet standards, I'm not sealing away my spot already in the programme, but let's, for the sake of argument, we would be integrated in the programme and would have all the opportunity to share our outcomes in sessions that are organized and are thematically identical, then the need for our own workshop would diminish, except when Dynamic Coalition has a specific report to present or a policy, whatever we call it, a recommendation, that there is somewhere in the programme, that a lot of attention is devoted to promoting these outcomes as part of the IGF intersessional process. Because that is I think something different than have your own session to discuss among each other.

So if we could make that distinction, then perhaps for a lot of these things it will be easier to say, okay, then we don't need the two-hour or 1 1/2-hour slots if we have a chance to promote and to really present on the centre stage or something.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry. I had lost you in the middle, wout. Could you repeat the distinction between to categories you were referring to?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. The category that if you are a part of integrated into the programme, that means that you can share your outcomes in different sessions and you, perhaps, don't need 1 1/2-hour, two-hour session yourself. And if there's a specific report of a true outcome of a research, that you have the opportunity to present it as plenary as possible. So that there's attention on the specific intersessional outcomes of the IGF process.

And that would diminish the need to have the 1 1/2-hour session as well. And then a lot of DCs, perhaps, would say, then I don't need my session. But if that is not the case, this is your only opportunity to have your own session, right?

So, if we could make that distinction and explain that to the MAG, perhaps that would make the more tempted to change with us.

But this is just my thinking out loud. I'm not speaking for other Dynamic Coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. I mean, well, the idea to think out of the box is always very helpful. And I think if a Dynamic Coalition has really some good outcome to present, to do that in a main session may have more impact if you give a slot as a Dynamic Coalition. Just a thought. You know, just let's, you know, try and think a little bit in a flexible way and what is actually the best possible outcome also for Dynamic Coalitions, which may not be necessarily you have your individual sessions. So, but that's, again, just to pick up on Wout's thought.

Are there other comments?

I am trying to see how we can operationalize all of that. We had a first, I think, operational outcome that will be giving mandate to Mark to put things together and to liaise with Chris parkridge who heads the efforts from the strategy group to give her input into the C STDs and we need to give our input, this deadline of 23rd of February. I don't know how we want to do that. I don't know, Celine, what are your capacities? would you be able to present a draft based on today's discussion? Do we need another call?

>> CELINE BAL: I would rather suggest, if there is a volunteer in the DC that could make a draft suggestion based on these suggested action items, developing few ideas so that it would fit also the various DCs and also DCs' needs, that would be perfect. And then we can also arrange another call so that everyone can then contribute to this first draft and discuss what will then be proposed to the MAG later.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, but you will, as always, make a very competent summary of the discussion we had so --

>> CELINE BAL: Of today's discussion, yes, uh-huh.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. I think that will be a very helpful first step for the next steps to take. And I think, you know, we have already, I think, some convergence of views. I mean, you know, one element is, again, reemphasizing the diversity of the Dynamic Coalitions. There's no one size fits all, and they are all very diverse. So, that makes it difficult to put them all into the same basket. But having said that, I think I do recognize at least there is some appetite for being more integrated into the main programme.

And I think, you know, Amy's suggestion of having the DCs to be thematically integrated, I think that's a, I would say, a relatively low-hanging fruit. That doesn't cost much just to say to the MAG, whenever you look at thematic discussion, have the checklist, go through the list of Dynamic Coalitions, check is there any Dynamic Coalition dealing with one particular issue

or not. And if so, bring in this particular Dynamic Coalition, maybe one, maybe two, maybe three. You know, human rights issues is one of the issues, children's rights is one of these issues. And that they are part of the core group dealing with this programmatic issue. I think that's at least where I sense, there's no disagreement among Dynamic Coalitions.

Then there's the question of sessions that gets a little bit more complicated. But, again, Dynamic Coalitions very much feel strongly attached to the need to have a physical and virtual meeting at the annual meeting, as it's the one time of the year where they actually get together. And, again, the need for hybrid meetings throughout and so that we need to work better on hybrid meetings, I think that's a point that was made and that should also go for other meetings, such as lightning talks. And I think that's a legitimate desire express Dynamic Coalitions that we have made huge progress in going online in hybrid, but more can be done. So, that's also, I think, something we can convey to the MAG as a collective desire of the MAG meetings.

And I think there is also, Judith hasn't made the point here, but I think the need for accessibility throughout, I think, cannot be overemphasized and, again, a lot of progress has been made. But we are not there yet. And it should remain a priority. So, these are sort of baseline, I think, points. I think we should be able to agree on.

As I said the question of whether or not of each Dynamic Coalition should be given a session gets more complicated, but also a point was made, we should maybe be more flexible at looking at that and looking what gives most impact to Dynamic Coalitions. Maybe if they have one way of presenting their findings in a different format, there may be not need for Dynamic Coalitions. But having said that, I think all Dynamic Coalitions really want to maintain their individual session.

Maybe in a smaller format, maybe in a day zero, but, again, no one size fits all. There's clearly not an agreement among all Dynamic Coalitions, let's all move to day zero or something. But I think we can signal some flexibility there. And I think it's always better to go into a process by saying, we don't have a hard baseline and we are not flexible. But, no, we are constructive, we are flexible, and we have part of the effort to make the IGF stronger and to enhance the role of the IGF.

As a, sort of, summary of the discussions, did I leave out anything significant, or did I make gross misrepresentation of the discussion? Please shout now. Maarten?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just the addition of adding particularly for new MAG members that the IGF is founded on the

grassroots foundations, including from the DCs.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Valid point. Yes. And IGF is the strength of all its components. The DCs are one of the components and the grassroots element is extremely important. Thank you for that.

Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. I think you called for a volunteer four times by now. I don't hear anybody stepping up. As IS3C we have taken the lead many times in the past two years. At this moment we are totally stretched. Markus is also volunteering for the CSTD who who steps up because we need to come up with a piece of paper and we ask Celine to do everything for us.

So, I am willing to assist but not like last time when I said, okay, I will assist you and everything that was done was open a Google doc and that we made empty until I filled it.

So, I think that it's time that others should have serious interest in this topic, step up as well. And I think that's my call, please, volunteer for this.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I tried to sum up a little bit the discussion. And Celine will prepare the summary record of the session and let's see how we can actually, based on the summary record, can take it a step further.

But it may -- you know, we don't want to -- Celine did tremendous work with all this action plan. But let's see whether the summary record may actually be already quite helpful input in what is needed.

But I think we do need another call. And question is, 23rd of February is --

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Friday.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's the deadline, yeah. So, could we maybe have Tuesday that week? Would that be, what, 20th or something? Have a call.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Fine for me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Can we agree on the date now or do we need to set out a Doodle poll?

>> CELINE BAL: I think that a Doodle poll is better to us integrate those who were not able to attend today. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. But with the aim roughly of having a call on Tuesday that week, before, that will be 23rd is February. 22nd. That will be 20th. Yeah. 20th, 21st.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: If I can intervene, Markus. It's a school holiday here. And I am not sure if I am available that week. But that depends on my partner's, who desire to go. So if you could have it on Thursday or Friday before the deadline, that

will be ideal so my side. But that's personal.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That will be 22nd.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: No. The week -- the week before the 23rd. So, that would be 615 and 616.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Then that doesn't work for me, so --

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Okay. Okay. Do the Doodle poll and we will see what comes up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Mark will be there as well. I will be in Riyadh so I can volunteer to present and I will see what comes up and then Mark and I will look at the text.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Well, with that, I think, can we close the discussion on this agenda item and would we then move to any other business? And I know that the -- does anyone wish to make a contribution under any other business?

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: Yes, if I may.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: Yeah. I was recently accidentally part of, in zero, part of a group of dedicated individuals engaged in conflict resolutions. Resolution of almost impossible conflicts and development and so on. Just occurred to me, they have been doing work for 75 years and ask for the U.S., Switzerland and all that and have facilities in India and the name is not important. The work is not important. This is just an example that I am mentioning. There's a lot of quiet work that happens around the world on the offline space. And some of these organizations are very effective. Some are suboptimal, some need a lot of help. And all that could happen by helping them connect to an element without IGF getting into geopolitics, without IGF changing the character of its work, just to get a group of individuals from DCs, from the lead IGF participants, maybe even from the high-level panel, to get involved, get connected to some of these organizations that do very good work of a very high scale, like in the past they have brought together Germany and France, and they have done a lot of work and helped with the issues for Japan and so on.

So, I am sure that such work must be happening in other organizations and many places quietly, and the purpose is not to make it loud. It's not to make it loud, not to surface quiet work. Quiet work needs to be coordinated quietly and what other -- (no audio)

(Audio difficulty).

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We are losing you, Sivas. I can't hear you. Have we lost you?

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: Sorry. I have had a document, please

take a look at that document and if necessary, I will elaborate on that by email or whatever. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Sivas, we lost you in the middle. But it seems very thoughtful document. And I encourage --

>> SIVASUBRAMANIAN: what I particularly mentioned this would not change the nature of IGF, not get IGF into geopolitics or something, not alter anything. Just a group of people who are experts from the Internet, Internet Governance to connect, to help these significant initiatives to connect to one another in a certain way. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for that.

And let's take a step back and look at the document and maybe come back to it at another meeting.

We are quietly moving towards the end of our allotted time. Is there anything else under any other business? Celine, would you have anything to add?

>> CELINE BAL: No, nothing from my side. But I see that Wout has his hand up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Wout, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. Just to inform everybody that we as IS3C are working on a concept of the hub, which would be some sort of a policy incubator concept for the IGF and we will submit a concrete proposal at the MAG meeting, which we are working on at this moment and it would involve educational skills in the cybersecurity gap between tertiary education and the demand for ministry. And it will be a new concept but it's something that we have found is the almost the only way possible to bring people together at this level to tackle this problem which apparently the world is incapable of, of solving.

So, just to inform you that nothing to do with DCs as such. But it is a concept that anybody could use under the IGF, if we were allowed to start a pilot from 2025 onwards to use and to try and come up with as a policy incubator with speed up outcomes.

So, that's what we will be preparing for Riyadh. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: well, thank you. We look forward to this, then, to hearing more about it.

Anything else?

If not, then I thank you all for your participation. And let's meet again towards the end of this month, around the 20th, and see how it goes. Thank you, and take care. Bye-bye. Bye-bye, everyone.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much. Bye.

(Session was concluded at 2:29 p.m. UTC)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.