

RAW FILE

Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group Meeting #82
Wednesday, February 21, 2024
11:00 a.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.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, Markus here. Can you hear me?

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Yes, we can hear you. Still a few more minutes. Let's wait to see who is joining us.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, everyone. It's Markus here. It's 12 past the hour, and we already have, let's see, 11 participants locked in. But maybe let's wait another minute or two to see whether more are joining us.

Celine has already posted the agenda of our meeting in the chat SPEAKER,.

Hello, my suggestion is we get started and people may be joining us as we move on.

First agenda item is, as always, the adoption of the agenda. You see the agenda in the chat. Is there any addition, any comments, or can we adopt it as proposed?

As I can't see any objection or addition, so I presume we can adopt it as proposed. Let's see some thumbs up in the chat.

Yes, it would be good to record it. (audio fading in and out). The Secretariat will make the transcript available after the meeting.

So, with that; then, without further ado, I pass it back to Celine. She will give us the update from the Secretariat. Over to you, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much, Markus. From the Secretariat, this is just to let you know that we are having our open consultations meeting and MAG meeting next week in

Riyadh as we announced in the past, it's going to take place on the 27th of February. That is going to be the open consultations day, as always, and on the 28th and 29th it's going to be the MAG meeting which is also open for observers.

So, for you to know the registration deadline passed already, it was on the 17th, but that was rather for in-person attendance.

For those who did not register but intend to participate online, this is just for you to know that the Zoom link will be made available on the event web page on the first open consultations and MAG meeting. I just posted it in the chat.

There have been over 380 registrations so far, which is pretty, pretty high. Both online and on site. At the end we are going to see how many will be joining us on site in Riyadh.

Also, in the link that I shared, you can see our draft agenda of the open consultations and MAG meeting and I would say this is it from the Secretariat's side, please. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there any questions to Celine?

Doesn't -- oh, yes, Mark, please. You have a hand up.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. And thank you, Celine, for that update.

And hello, everybody. I just wanted to double-check that following the MAG meeting yesterday, decisions on BPS and policy networks will now be taken in Riyadh. Is that the situation? Because there was no conclusion yesterday about new proposals. Is that right, Celine? Thanks.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, this is correct. Yesterday the meeting was not long enough to take a decision on the final section of the BPFs and politician networks, so we decided to have the selection, the final selection in person in Riyadh.

So, the Secretariat will look for an appropriate space in the agenda. And we will then update the agenda whenever we find consensus also with the MAG chair and with the MAG.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: With that, can we then move to the next agenda item? That is essentially how we fit into the main programme, DCs integration into the IGF '24 programme.

And we had a good discussion at the last call, and I think the summary record that Celine has circulated reflects that well. There are things, issues we collectively can agree on. Whereas others are a little bit more difficult. But I think -- and those who attended the MAG call yesterday could hear this again. This ongoing discussion that the MAG feels a bit, shall I put it that way, lowest out of some parts of the programme because I think only of all the many sessions at the

IGF meeting, the MAG has not the oversight over all of them.

So, there is a continuous discussion whether or not the MAG should also be able to approve the open forums and also some set of quality control of the DC session. So, this is, in that sense, nothing new. It's an ongoing discussion. And we also had that discussion. And I think bottom line for the DCs, they all want to have the opportunity to meet at the annual meeting and be that just like an annual general meeting, that's the once-a-year time where you actually physically get together and you would not like to miss this opportunity.

Whereas, others may be more ambitious and to have something substantive to announce to the big world out there, and that's, obviously, a different kind of session. And it's also, and there, I turn back to Celine, as you have launched that discussion.

There is a new idea coming up that several DCs may pull together to have a session. But, Celine, can you maybe explain a bit more in detail how that came about?

>> CELINE BAL: Of course. Thank you, Markus.

So, just for to share the summary record from last Dynamic Coalition group coordination meeting for information, this is where Markus and I summarized the discussions and that will be the basis of what Markus would hopefully present at the in-person meeting in Riyadh next week.

In addition to that, we are thinking that, perhaps, it might be beneficial if we actually sent out a survey amongst all Dynamic Coalitions to really see what their individual needs is. And I circulated this survey last week. Just for you to know we have only received so far nine responses. So later -- I just shared the link to the -- yes, this is the (?). I'm going to circulate again a reminder to all the Dynamic Coalitions. And one outcome of that survey is that quite a lot of DCs would have agreed to organize instead of having only individual sessions for each DC, to have joint DC sessions with Dynamic Coalitions that are thematically similar to one another.

In that sense there would be an opportunity for DCs to keep on having sessions in the programme, but just not 29, like the number of DCs that we currently have. But join efforts and organize sessions together.

And also, in addition to that, quite a high number of DCs expressed their interest to organize a day zero event. That is the second preference so far. The only thing is when it comes to day zero events, last year we realized that the number of requests increased dramatically that, that we did not even manage to allocate all the day zero event day requests that we

have received for the IGF 2023, and as the third preference, there would be also bilateral meeting rooms located inequity to Dynamic Coalitions that would like to meet. That is of course of the programme but we are thinking of the idea of having an actual meeting room with hybrid capacity to also allow Dynamic Coalition members to log in virtually to have such a meeting room for 1 1/2 hours or so to meet in person at least once a year.

So, again, I am going to send a reminder for the Dynamic Coalitions to respond to that survey and hopefully we will get some more responses and insights from other Dynamic Coalitions who have not taken part in the survey yet. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Celine, for that.

And so essentially to sum it all up, I mean, there is clearly a big appetite for Dynamic Coalitions to be part of the thematic discussion at the IGF and that could be -- and then also came across last meeting we had, be part also of maybe the main sessions and that could be part of also these joint DC sessions of various Dynamic Coalitions together join force to organize a session.

And then there is, on the other hand, there is just the annual get-together for Dynamic Coalition, which is a very legitimate request, but there will be then, as Celine said, maybe a little bit outside the main programme. They would just have a room where you can meet. But that would not be in the same way a substantive session that is part of the thematic programme of the IGF. And that's, I think, more or less what I see where we can agree.

And also, I think one strong request that came out of last -- our last call was that the DCs should be part of the programme shaping when they have a thematic link to the theme under discussion. So, that is essentially, should not be that easy, but it not be that difficult, but the devil is always in the detail, and the MAG should also look at the list of the DCs to get inspiration when it comes to a thematic issue and the DCs have a lot to offer in terms of substance.

But at the other hand, it's also a little bit up to the DCs to say, hey, here we are when you discuss this and we have something to contribute. So, it goes both ways.

But that is, as I understand it, more or less the status of our discussion. And I am open to listen to you and to get your input. And I see Mark's hand is up. And Wout's hand is up. Mark first.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes thank you, Markus. I noted yesterday on the MAG call there was even a suggestion that DC proposals

for open forums would fall within the purview of the MAG in terms of assessing them and agreeing to accommodate them. That was a bit of a jolt to me, I think, to hear that.

But I just got back to the time of the stocktaking last year, and the discussion we had at that time when we recognized, I think it was Uta in particular that emphasized this point that it's not sustainable for the prospect of what are we now, 29 coalitions? All having the opportunity and the right to have an open forum. That would mean, you know --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correction. We never called that open forum.

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, session then, DC session. Sorry.

So, further diminishing the, as Chris Buckridge described this yesterday, the real estate of the IGF programme. It's a valid point. It not sustainable, obviously. And if a large number of DCs want to take advantage of that right.

So, when we discussed this at the time of stocktaking, we -- there was some agreement which I captured in the draft into the input of stocktaking, that the DCs consolidate their participation in the IGF in an extended session, like a three-hour session within the main programme.

So, that would provide the opportunity for those DCs that want to broadcast their results of their hard work to the broad IGF community, and then also to, for all the DCs participating in that consolidated session, to agree the messages and how the DCs' contribution to the IGF should be articulated in the reporting of the IGF, which we in the past we have always had consent about that there hasn't been very effective reporting, and this dovetails into the whole sort of integration argument of DC outputs being much more effective.

So, that was captured in the response to the stocktaking that we agreed to submit. And that -- the preparation for the consolidated DC sessions would be undertaken in an intersessional event like the one we had last year, so that the DCs would come together in midyear, June, July, and explain what they anticipate to deliver to the IGF and how we all should then agree to put all that -- all those DC, various DC inputs into a consolidated session programme with the objective of creating awareness and getting outputs recognized and the Leadership Panel picking them up for advocacy and so on. So, that was the thinking at that time of the stocktaking.

You mentioned, Markus, some kind of event outside the main programme. I think that would not be very desirable because it would mean we would lose that visibility in the IGF programme if we had a session outside. I think our combined ambitions

should be to increase and strengthen our visibility in the IGF programme, rather than the current sort of scattered approach and one thematic session.

It's what the DCs are actually producing as concrete, tangible results that need to be centre stage. And, you know, so many stakeholders completely unaware, especially newcomers to the IGF are completely unaware what's going the hard work that colleagues on this call and others in the coalitions are doing.

So, those are my points. If you want to go back to the stocktaking input, I think it's on the list on the IGF website from the DCCG back in November, as an additional formulation of what we should do to protect our visibility and independence, but also our ambition to integrate more effectively and cross fertilize across the whole community. I will stop there for now. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Again, circling back to some of the comments you made, what I suggested that the D -- I totally agree with you that the aim should be to give the DCs more visibility. But at the same time, you also said it's not sustainable that, you know, more and more DCs are here and they all get the same slot automatically. And I first heard a thing about prime real estate. I think that was almost 10 years ago, I think, was one MAG member said there's prime real estate here and if you present the workshop, you go through a very lengthy process of scrutiny and here as a DC you get automatically a slot in the programme. And I think that, we have to recognize that what you said is not sustainable.

But the point I try to make was that it's still legitimate for the DCs to get the room where they can actually meet, like kind of annual general meeting, which is maybe not of great interest to the world outside the DC, but for the DCs, it's important, as they don't have any other opportunity to meet once a year.

So, if they want a room, they should be given the room. But that will be not a substantive session. And if they want a substantive session which gives them visibility, we have to be more solid in our approach and what you said was a result of last year's stocktaking, that is definitely one possible avenue.

Have I clarified what I said, or are there still lingering doubts?

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you for the clarification. Very helpful. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Now, we have Wout and then Ragendra, and

Celine would also like to comment, maybe, as you have a clarification, presumably you want to come in first, Celine?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, perfect. Thank you so much. Just to answer Mark's comment just before, this is really just for the Dynamic Coalition stocktaking that was submitted to the Secretariat has been taken into consideration in the overall summary of the IGF stocktaking summary that will also be presented at the in person meeting in Riyadh.

But, of course, it is more high level, let's say and now what we are presenting the integration into the IGF 24 that will be more detailed. This is where we can present some concrete proposals such as the extended session three hours within the IGF programme to bring all the Dynamic Coalitions together as a suggestion. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.
Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yeah, thank you, Markus. And good afternoon, morning, evening, colleagues.

I was in the session as well yesterday as some may have noticed, that what I heard Chris Buckridge also say is that Dynamic Coalitions have to put in a workshop proposal. So, that could become an outcome next week. And so let's say that the MAG agrees to do this, it has implications for all Dynamic Coalitions and that we need to have a position on it.

Now, I am not adverse on principle against it, but we will have, I understand, something like 70 to 80 workshop proposals, and I think that I know what is going to happen with Dynamic Coalition proposals, that they will probably be put aside because of the Dynamic Coalitions.

I have had that experience a few times. I have tried as a Dynamic Coalition to get a workshop on very tangible topic with experts and everything from the whole world, and they were rejected, and not merged with similar proposals in any way. We are not invited to participate.

So, I'm afraid that if this comes through, we will be marginalized even a bit more than we are now, because then we don't get a slot at all.

That said, I think that we have, that Markus voiced that already, and your voice had some very good proposals on how we could more minimize the overall time DCs are asking for. But in my opinion, what then becomes very important, that when the Dynamic Coalition has reports or policy advice or whatever, that we do get a slot where people are able to hear what we are doing and not in a side room. Your comment on having a meeting, a general meeting on the side of the IGF, that is brilliant,

because you don't need a session to do that, except when we do present outcomes. And when we present outcomes, I think that that is the moment that the IGF is going to profit from the work Dynamic Coalitions do in the intersessional period and should be given the floor on the main stage to present the outcome. And then I don't need a DC slot. Just then we can send the message that we need to send. 15 minutes is probably enough.

But I think that that is something that we need to discuss with the MAG and with the Secretariat, because the Secretariat will be deciding on these 15 minutes or the 20 minutes that the DCs can get to present their outcome.

Summing up, I think we have to be very careful if the proposal from the MAG comes that we have to propose workshops, because then we are dropped from the programme.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I'm not sure whether that was not a misunderstanding that when Chris said that, that he meant, you know, he called the usual DC sessions called them a workshop. But I think his idea was that the MAG should assess whether or not they were good enough to be part of the programme. And that's also Mark alluded to that at the beginning. I think you said it made you jolt when you heard that.

You know, if you put yourselves in the shoes of the MAG, especially the new MAG members, okay, they are told, you are now responsible for the programme, and then they learn there are sessions that are outside their purview, obviously, you feel a bit, well, I don't have any say over this. So, that is an understandable reaction.

But I think we can anticipate that also and I see also in the chat says the DC Coordination Group asked for proposals for DC sessions and short list five or seven sessions to move away from automatic slots just as the MAG asked for workshop proposals, so we could be more proactive in actually -- and that would be slightly different from the stocktaking idea of having one consolidated DC session, but maybe have more thematic session.

Another point was made, I think at last call, was that if the DCs have something to contribute and that is very much along the lines Wout said if you have tangible output which relates to a main session, do that in the main session, in the relative main session. You know, that would also be an integration rather than creating a separate, sort of, of ghetto of the DC sessions.

Sorry. I am talking too much. And I also want to listen to what Rajendra has been very patient. He has had his hand up for quite a while.

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: As DCs, we do get multiple opportunities, I will not deny that. We have opportunities to be applying for proposals, but primarily what I would always look at the way we work as DCs, some of us are very committed. I see those -- we all speak, some of them work, they don't -- they are not as vocal. But we would not like our work to be undermined as some side workshop in an upscale thing. But I understand the real estate issue.

I would still believe that as DCs, there should be something main stage and you could be absolutely competitive to select which DCs you want based on the work they have done in a year to be a part of a session like you had in the plenary.

And DC sessions are important because that encourages them to present before the world the work they are doing. Those who don't do work, they don't present. My view would be make it competitive, select five, seven, three, two, whatever you want. But Just make sure that they are not sidelined because outcome last few years have been great encouragement for us, we have done great work and I would appreciate that continues.

Because once you take it off, it will be very difficult to get back their enthusiasms. I would tell one that we should have one main session, figure out who is working, take a view based on the reports people submitted the work they do.

And of course we always get sessions on the, you know, the other side sessions that we have and we are happy with it. I don't think that's a complaint. But DCs are like a ground sub movement so we should continue with the same session. It's a submission from my side.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Steve also made the same point in the chat that his proposal was in addition to the DC main session. I think that's another baseline that we would like to maintain a DC main session and that could then be what Mark outlined based on the stocktaking on the Kyoto main session.

Celine, please.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. Add a few comments here and most of them are really just my personal opinion. I think it is important to keep a DC main session because the NRI or also the BPF and policy networks do have their main sessions. So why not the Dynamic Coalitions in the main hall.

And now when it comes also to Sivas' comment, I think in general that it would be very important next week to present really concrete proposals to the MAG to show that the DCs are willing to find an agreement, also an agreement that fits the DCs better than, for example, the MAG taking the decision to

have DCs submitting workshop proposals.

And one option, and I have to say personally I very much like Sivas' proposal not to put it automatically on a competitive basis because that has been rejected by the Dynamic Coalition during last call or was not well received, but, rather, we do ask DCs to submit individual DC sessions to the Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group and then you decide on how to better merge.

And then we can come to the MAG and let them know, hey, how about you give us 10 slots of 90 minutes and we bring on 10 proposals of Dynamic Coalitions that are working together on 10 different themes.

So, that could be another alternative. So, instead of letting the MAG choose what Dynamic Coalitions should do or how they should best integrate it in the IGF programme, that we come with some concrete proposals that might be also interesting to the MAG.

Because I do not think that MAG members, first of all, definitely not all, that MAG members think so much in detail about how DCs could be integrated in the DC -- in the IGF programme. That is, again, just my personal opinion. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think there are definitely some common points we agree on, that you do need a place to meet. We do want the DC main session and we are also willing to reduce the overall number of DC sessions in one way or another. However we really emphasize and we say that at the last call, the bottom-up grassroots character of the DCs. How shall I put that? we don't look favorably of going through a scrutiny by the MAG. But we are, I think, willing to work with the MAG. That's to put it into programmatic terms.

And I see Amado and Avri have their hands up. Amado, please.

>> AMADO ESPINOSA: Thanks, Michael. Hi, everybody. Maybe another option, Markus, would be, besides having four or three main sessions, that this is the opportunity to have something like a meeting point where in an informal basis, we can meet with another people who are interested in the same topic, encouraging them to join the DC. That was at least my perception during the last three IGFs. And I think that will add some value to the DC and will open the opportunity to the IGF to have another stakeholders participating in specific topics. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Could you maybe elaborate a bit more? How do you see this? would that be a kind of booth in the village

or --

>> AMADO ESPINOSA: Yes, well, within the village or -- yes, within the village will be a good suggestion, Markus. I think the most important issue here is to have it in schedule and to have a point where we can meet with other people interested on the topics.

For example, for -- specifically for mental health data in the health, I think there are several people interested in these topics. And when I ask Amia how to develop this area, she said immediately the DCs are the solution or the best option to participate into the forum.

Then what I am suggesting to you is we do have the opportunity or if we do have the opportunity to meet interested in this topic would be great. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.
Now Avri, please.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Markus. Yeah, I am repeating one thing that I think I said last time. I think having a big selection of things that the DCs can pick to do is a good thing and that will automatically lessen it a bit.

I think the idea of, you know, the MAG, and I think it will take a certain negotiation of how many slots. If we say we are going to somehow fill a number of slots, then we have to negotiate how many slots. And I'm not sure how that will go.

I think the idea of a competition can be good or a judging. But I don't think it could be done by the same people that are applying for slots.

And just quickly, so if we have a large selection of slots and a bunch of say, oh, yeah, yeah, I'm happy doing the interim one. I'm happy doing a bilateral room. Those people take themselves out of the competition and then they can, perhaps, be a selection committee with Markus and Celine and whomever.

But to have all of us who are competing for them being the judges might be awkward. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Good point. Thank you.

And also in the chat, I think Wout and Mark made the point not every Dynamic Coalition may have something to present at the end of the year. So, I think there the Intersessional Meeting would indeed be very handy where you could assess which Dynamic Coalition will be in a position to present the outcome of some work which defector the main stage.

Any other ideas?

Do I see that we have a convergence to the idea that we then have maybe two groups of Dynamic Coalitions, those that want

to be part of the main stage because have something to present, and those that, as Avri said, take themselves out because they are maybe not ready yet or maybe they say it's not this year, but next year we will be ready to present, and they will then be part of the selection committee, the jury who picks the slots that we think are worth promoting?

Could this be a sort of sense of the temperature in the room?

And again, I don't think that -- wout also made in the chat, I don't think we will be able to have a substantive proposal by next week. But I think we can, sort of, sketch our thinking and that we can elaborate that.

But, Dino, please, you have your hand up.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you. Thank you, Markus. Yes, just to confirm that I think your summary reflected adequately the conversation of dynamic flavor.

I want to add the comment from my perspective and also to premise the fact that although I have been participating now for two, almost three years, I am still relatively new.

I think that it also, it's incumbent upon us as the representatives of the Dynamic Coalition to be accountable. What I mean by this is that by reading the terms of reference of diagnosis, it seems that in order to meet the expectation, the bar is very low, meaning we need to present an end of the session report immediately, within 48 hours after our session take place and also to meet the annual report.

I think, instead, with this proposal, to really -- I don't want to say, of course, not to make it mandatory, but a list to request Dynamic Coalition to intervene in those themes, in those sessions, in those workshops where there is an alignment, that there is a consistency with the mission, with the mandate, with the focus of Dynamic Coalition. It also should force diagnosis to really be accountable, to really have an active role in the work of the IGF.

So, I welcome any mechanism that will somehow create both an opportunity for the Dynamic Coalition to be present, to be seen, to be consulted, but at the same time, if you will, an invitation for us, for the Dynamic Coalition to really be accountable and play an active role. And I understand in some cases, maybe a newly created Dynamic Coalition will not be ready, but at least make that term clear, that there is an expectation of being an active participant in this process. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this. And we, actually, we produced a paper and we always circle back to it. It was, celine was holding the pen, two or three years back now,

and it asked questions, issues could be explored, and they all go towards more accountability of Dynamic Coalitions, and it was -- we have, actually, come a long way. To begin with, it was really, we always keep saying, the bottom-up character. It's very grassroots the Dynamic Coalitions. Anyone can have one. And to begin with, there were hardly any obligations. They automatically got the room.

But then we realized we have to tighten it up a little bit. I mean, if you get prime real estate, you have also to pay for it. And the payment is very low. The bar is very low, as you said. It's an annual report. It's a session report. That's not very much.

But now I think we are making another step, as you very eloquently said, towards more accountability, and also to see that as an obligation for Dynamic Coalitions to be proactively involved in the thematic discussion, if we have a, just thinking, the Internet we want is a big theme, the Leadership Panel, and we have a Dynamic Coalition on the core values of the Internet and looking toward Sivas, they have been working on that for many years by now. Obviously, and I know you are in touch already with Leadership Panel on that. There's been those very interested in your Dynamic Coalition. It's a two-way street. I think Dynamic Coalition should also proactively engage in thematic discussions with the MAG.

Avri.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah, just a quick point on that participation. I really do think it depends somewhat on the kind of, and this is a theme I have come up with over the years, the kind of Dynamic Coalition. Is it a one that's working like on education that's never thematic? Or access.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right.

>> AVRI DORIA: Disability access that's never really thematic in the Internet we want. It either never is or always is, depending on how you look at it. And that there has to be a consideration of those, sort of, longitudinal themes that don't change on an annual basis according to a theme. That would have to be somehow included. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. No, and that's also, I think, one of the main messages coming out of our meetings, that there's no one size fits all of Dynamic Coalitions. There are those that are closely linked to the thematic main themes and there are others who have a more horizontal activity. I mean, the accessibility have been one of the first Dynamic Coalitions, they have been very instrumental in improving the accessibility of IGF meetings.

But we are not there yet. And that's also one of the messages that accessibility should remain a priority.

Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Markus, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I want to say something that shocks people. It probably won't actually. This is the Internet Governance Forum which has the certainly world called Internet and this is the thing that I should bring all the Dynamic Coalitions together. It's the common denominator why we are all here. When you say the Internet we want might be a theme that some Dynamic Coalitions don't really relate to, I'm really sorry, but we all have to relate to this, otherwise we have nothing to do in the Internet Governance Forum.

And this is one thing we is bothering me when people tell me, well, we are not going to participate in this consultation that is taking place at the moment.

I would say if we believe the IGF is the future of Internet Governance and how we want the Internet to continue working, then we really need to make an effort as Dynamic Coalitions and come up with at least some responses that, if at all, just supporting the process that is taking place at the moment.

My grave concern about this is we are seeing everyone looking at their own patch of grass but the overall IGF in itself is under threat and we need to wake up to that. We need to wake up to the fact that there are other processes taking place in New York at the moment which might actually tell us to go home a couple of years from now and say, you know what? IGF was a nice memory. Dynamic Coalitions were a nice memory. But we don't actually have a house and a common home for all of us.

And that's a real concern for me. So, I would really ask and urge Dynamic Coalitions, even if they don't relate exactly to the theme "the Internet we want," to look at how their perspective on what is the Internet they want that is not reflected in what is currently in that consultation.

You know, we have a luck having one of the world's most esteemed persons leading a Leadership Panel of people who are very knowledgeable and who also are known throughout the world. Let's not waste that opportunity. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Olivier. I see a lot of support in the chat for your statement. Yes. Let's listen and let's follow up on that. Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus, and thank you, Olivier, for this comment. Because I think that what I have experienced yesterday shows exactly where things go wrong, that you come up with ideas that help the world very topics. And

despite all the efforts, they are not even being discussed.

And because the MAG has its own -- that's totally legitimate, has their own plans, then when somebody else comes up with a plan that doesn't fit the mold, then it is rejected before it's discussed. And that's what literally happened yesterday.

So, in other words, if the IGF wants to be relevant and have an influence on the discussions that are going on in New York and elsewhere, we have to show that there are tangible outcomes that make a difference. And with all respect, discussing what sort of, I don't know, processes are going on in the world does not make a difference. It's bringing a solution to an existing problem and present a policy blueprint for an existing problem, that is something that may make a difference and impress people that have to decide on the relevance of the IGF issue.

And I still think that after years of discussing it, that is not on the mind of the MAG and of people who decide how the IGF develops. And I think that is very worrying because we have to show our relevance between now and a year. And that is getting very, very close.

So, but that is my personal concern where the IGF's future is concerned. But I don't know how you think about it. But what you said, Olivier, I think as a Dynamic Coalition we have the opportunity to show this is what the IGF can do. And instead of that, we are being marginalized, instead of being more prominent in the programme, because we as Dynamic Coalitions can deliver solutions that others and certainly workshops can't. How can we voice that in a very nice and friendly way and in a very open offer to the MAG to integrate us better into the programme what we are already discussing.

So, that comes from my personal worry that there won't be an IGF anymore, just like you said, Olivier, after 2025. And then we lose giant opportunity to make this world a little bit better and the (?) certainly a lot better. Thank you for the opportunity, Markus. But I could not resist saying this.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I see Avri in the chat is not that sure that New York can actually kill the IGF, and she points out that the NRI's existence, they would continue. And that might form into a different movement.

But, yes, we do understand we are in a fairly volatile situation right now and the future of the IGF is not decided yet. But, again, the UN is not very good at actually stopping anything. Things go on and on and on. And still have a trusteeship council. There are no colonies left but the trusteeship council still exists. Not sure that the end of the

IGF is a real danger, but it can, of course, be eclipsed if you have, with all this digital cooperation, and there we don't know what's happened, what will happen.

And, yes.

What is the NRIs without the process.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I love to contradict in this way. I have genuine concerns that if we don't have the state actors, you know, the UN involved in the IGF, you know, we are losing an essential part of the multistakeholder models and just be a couple of private sector and just talking to others. And there are plenty of fora around the world that already do this sort of stuff. So, you know, this needs to be part of the WSIS process. This needs to be formalized, otherwise we are putting across over 20 years of advancement in the way that the Internet is run. And that might not be the beginning of the end, but certainly it will definitely be the end of the beginning.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Definitely, yes. That's yet another story. There's the WSIS+20 process. That's yet. And I think for the IGF, it is important that that continues, yes.

Now and Avri, please.

>> AVRI DORIA: Just quickly, I wasn't really trying to start a question of how do we continue the UN -- I mean, how do we continue the -- continuing the UN is another big question. But how do we continue the IGF if the UN becomes against it.

I didn't want to start that one. I was just saying, I was having problems with the doom and gloom that if we don't do this, then we will fall into the ocean. And I just wanted to put in a slight different voice than that. I don't think this is the time to discuss how we will survive the UN saying no.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, it's a good discussion to have. But I agree, maybe it's not the right time and the right place to have that.

And we would like to circle back a little bit, and I think Mark said in the chat somewhere, we ought to have a consolidated proposal to the MAG of where we want to go.

And, again, I think we have the elements there, and I'm not sure that we can go too much into the details. But let me, again, try and sum up what I heard. Okay.

We definitely want to maintain a main session. And that main session might look somewhat different than the main sessions looked in the past years. It might be based on the stocktaking of the all the main session and bring a consolidated outcomes to the floor. And these consolidated outcomes could be decided then in a process, in an Intersessional Meeting where the Dynamic Coalitions could actually report back on where they

are.

In addition, we also would agree to have maybe a number of -- smaller number of, shall I say, less than 10 sessions which are collectively run by the groups of Dynamic Coalitions and that will be based on a selection process run by the Dynamic Coalitions and jury would not be, obviously, the candidates of those who propose sessions. That it be Dynamic Coalitions that say they don't need a session because they don't have a result to present.

And at the same time, we maintain the need for a meeting place for the Dynamic Coalitions where they can just have their annual general meeting and that is not part of the substantive main programme. But they -- it's like a bilateral meeting, that they will be given a room where they can meet and discuss their business, and also do some of their work. But they don't have necessarily an outcome to present to the broader IGF participants.

Does that kind of sum it up?

And there was also the point made that maybe in the IGF village, again, we could try to have a booth where we could actually meet newcomers who are interested in joining Dynamic Coalitions. We did that in Mexico, but it has limited success there. It was a question, it's not always that easy to find volunteers who are willing to be at the booth. But this is something we can also explore.

I mean, the point was that there is a point of entry for newcomers into the Dynamic Coalitions, which is the best way of doing what can be explored.

And has that more or less summed it up? And one of the other points was also that we encourage the Dynamic Coalitions to join thematic discussions, also for main sessions and also for workshops.

And I like the term accountability of the Dynamic Coalitions. That would actually also increase, then, the accountability.

Have I missed out anything?

>> CELINE BAL: Perhaps just in addition, Markus, the idea of organizing again an intersessional event throughout the year.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I did mention the intersessional event, by the way, as the intersessional event would be where we could then actually assess which Dynamic Coalition will be ready to present an outcome of their work.

And Avri is also concerned about the IGF we want, not only the Internet we want, but the IGF we want. Which is fair enough.

Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think your summary, if we captured that, I think it's a good offer to the MAG. I think if you preface that with we recognize the practicalities of programme organization, and, you know, in effect, you know, it's a victim of the IGF's success that there's so much pressure on the slots. And that success is also due to the work of the Dynamic Coalitions. And the model of the Dynamic Coalition is being picked up. You know, we are all at almost 30 DCs now and such an impressive range of areas of specific deep dive focus and so on. And collaboration. You know, the type of DCs that Avri was mentioning, so important as well as those that are trying to fix problems.

So, you know, a bit of a preamble, I think, would resonate well with the MAG. We recognize that they have this challenge. And we are part of that challenge. And we are making a positive effort to meet that challenge, that also strengthens the IGF.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. That was clear. I mean, that's nothing new. But every year, again, the feedback is we have too many sessions. So, that we as Dynamic Coalition also make also an effort in reducing the number of sessions, that this shows that we are good players. We are trying to work with the MAG as good team players.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Markus, the only thing that both he understands me a little here is that when we give away half of our sessions, so let's say we wind up with 15, that there will be 15 more workshops. And then we don't reduce the number of sessions. We just give away our place in the programme. And that's where, I think, should be in the back of our mind as well. And I know that it brings us back to square one. But this is about reducing, less pressure on the programme and not about giving more options to others than Dynamic Coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's not just workshops. You know, there was open forums and also there was lightning sessions and on and on and on, yeah.

But, yes, I mean, the idea is not to give up our sessions for others to move in. We don't try -- we don't trade prime real estate. We just try to reduce, yes, we can hear. The community says we need to make the programme a bit leaner and to reduce the number of sessions.

Amado, please.

>> AMADO ESPINOSA: Probably another option, Markus, at least during nigh experience as a MAG member, when you are evaluating the equality of the workshops, if they do have any relationship with one of the DCs by presenting or introducing

their topics, that they could get some extra points for this effort. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry. I was muted.

I didn't quite get the question. Could you repeat it, maybe in other words?

>> AMADO ESPINOSA: Yes. When you are evaluating the workshops, there are four or five criteria to keep them a punctuation. If they -- well, one of the criteria is that they are representative geographically, institutionally, and so on.

If we can introduce a criteria in which if a workshop proposal has also a relationship with a DC, can get a couple of extra points to be evaluated.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Now I get it. Yeah. Well, that is something, actually, point that could be made. There is a working group on workshop evaluation, correct. That's something -- well, we can bring that in as DC Coordination Group suggestion to this working group on workshop evaluation, that if you make a link to existing other parts of the IGF ecosystem, such as Dynamic Coalitions --

>> AMADO ESPINOSA: Exactly, exactly, that's the point. Exactly.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. I think it's an excellent -- a low hanging fruit that doesn't cost much to add that and would actually be an organic link to Dynamic Coalitions.

There are other comments in the chat. I haven't read them all. But I encourage people make comments in the chat, to put their hand up and to say it aloud.

Avri and Mark had comments. Would you like to say? Yes, Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah. Just to relay what I have said in the chat, it's, you know, we have all said this, that there's still too much duplication. The MAG has to work much more rigorously and sympathetically to reduce duplication. And that's part of the deal, if you like.

And, you know, just make the IGF programme much more easier to work your way through. You know, if you are on a specific area, cybersecurity or access, you know, you can plan your way through the programme more easily.

Times there are clashes of same session, same topic sessions in Kyoto. Persistent problem. The MAG really needs -- I mean, I have been a MAG member. I know it's not easy. But they have got to get, especially as there's so much more interest now, as we saw in Kyoto in the number of proposals, they have really got to get to grips with constructing a programme that is not duplicative and makes sense for somebody

trying to navigate it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think Amado's suggestion goes a long way in that direction, actually, that the workshop, when you make a proposal, that they actually look at what already exists and that could also be a good step forward.

Avri.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah. Thanks. If I understand, yeah, the idea of having workshops be required to indicate what of the ongoing efforts they have related to as among their requirements is, if I'm understanding that isn't good.

I very much agree with Mark, that part of the problem is we are still always thinking in terms of real estate. The MAG is kind of like a real estate broker or assigning, you know, the plots in a new development. And we haven't really thought of it. And, you know, I, too, was once a MAG member a long, long time ago, and it is hard, especially when you are selling real estate and everybody is competing for real estate.

So, maybe in terms -- and attacking the number of slots and real estate plots used in a prime part of town for the DCs becomes a counting issue. And it sounds like we have already, sort of, given up on our notion that if you are a DC, you have got a chance to put on your -- show your wares at the annual. Perhaps we haven't. Perhaps we are accepting that, no, it is a sordid kit of things.

But I think I like the notion that we have to look at it differently. MAG has to look at it differently. That it isn't selling plots in a new development where you get to build your house for the year. But really come up with a concept that does it differently. So, I like the idea of asking the MAG to think seriously about how it does it, as opposed to always taking the easy road. Oh, yeah, we will just get rid of the DCs and get rid of those and we will have a lot more plots to give away and it will be easier. And that happens year after year after year. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And I think it's also good approach. Let's not think of the IGF as real estate, but let's move towards integration and, you know, the point about look at the synergies, and also the point that was made at our last call that, you know, maybe a DC, if you have something to present, you are given a 10-minute slot in the main session which is related to your content and then you don't need your own individual session, if you get even more exposure.

So, to look at it differently, out of the box, take a blue sky approach, as the management guys say and look at it with fresh eyes. The aim is indeed to make the programme more

coherent and easier to navigate and that would be in response to all the comments received,.

With that, can we conclude this agenda item, which is, I think, for us an important agenda item, and move to the next, and that will be the contribution to the CSTD questionnaire. And Mark did some excellent work, so we would hand over to you to present your work.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. And thanks to our colleagues who provided comments and text proposals for the -- for our inputs into the drafting being led by Chris Buckridge and the working Group on Strategy.

Now, he said yesterday when he reported on this progress to the MAG yesterday that by the end of this week, they will finalize it. We have finished our inputs. We undertook to provide that by Monday.

And, basically, if you go -- if you have a look at the CSTD questionnaire, the deadline for this, from the CSTD is the end of this month.

If you look at the questionnaire, there are, what is it? Six questions on substance. And we have provided text contributions for all of them as on behalf of the Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group.

So, if you look at, for example, the question 7 on the WSIS principles and the experience with developing the people-centered inclusive and development oriented Information Society, we have contributed some additional text which gives examples around the Dynamic Coalitions focused area of activities.

I provided some text in respect to that, on the cybersecurity agenda, on behalf of ISGC and Judith Hellerstein came in with some text on behalf of the Dynamic Coalition on accessibility and disability.

So, we have given a couple of examples there and which showcase those. Dynamic Coalitions have been an instrument for focusing on specific challenges in advance of the WSIS principles, following the creation of the IGF and then the IGF agreeing to create the Dynamic Coalition model and sure enough, we have got examples of Dynamic Coalitions that have contributed to that overall objective of people-centered inclusive and development-oriented Information Society.

And then if we turn to question 8, which is mainly focused on development, we have described in some texts how Dynamic Coalitions have been working in the spirit of supporting the Sustainable Development Goals and there are a couple of examples that the Dynamic Coalition on environment and again on access

and disability from Judith.

Question 9 was all about, basically, implementation. And there, we have provided text really explaining how intersessional activities are undertaken in the IGF and why, you know, what contribution they make. And I drafted some text to describe, you know, the work of Dynamic Coalitions.

Without going into too many examples, there is a link at the end of the contribution which goes to the page on the IGF website for the Dynamic Coalitions. So, hopefully people might actually go to that link and they will see the full range of Dynamic Coalitions by looking at the list and then maybe clicking on some of the lists. So, we have got a link into the full breadth of Dynamic Coalition activity in the contribution.

We have provided text as well on questions 10, which is mainly about challenges, and then question 11, again, there's some text describing the role of Dynamic Coalitions.

And then question 12 was, basically, about trends, what's happening. And we have got examples of Dynamic Coalition of the Internet of Things, and also some general text about Dynamic Coalitions working on technologies and so on.

So, I think it's been an opportunity for us to respond to the customization on science and technology and development as leaders on the WSIS process within the UN System to showcase, look, the IGF is not just a discussion forum, there are Dynamic Coalitions working and I have given the numbers and where in the text, how many there are, working on specific issues within the IGF ecosystem and with a very strong commitment to addressing challenges and moving forward with new trends and technology and so on.

I think that's, basically, a summary of what I have done in coordination with other contributors. So, back to you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you very much for that. It's very impressive. Are there questions or comments?

It doesn't seem to be the case. But I think I can sum up on behalf of all participants that we thank you, for the record, for this work and congratulate you for this, which, actually, is in all of our interests, as it shows how actually our hard work and our role in the IGF ecosystem.

And I see, I think, people are nodding in agreement with that. And waving, yes, in the chat.

Okay. The next agenda item, would that be any other business or -- yes, indeed. Is there anything under any other business?

>> CELINE BAL: Perhaps, Markus, apologies, but go ahead.

If I may just add something that I forgot to add, to mention in the IGF Secretariat updates.

Yesterday during the MAG meeting, there was also working group on youth engagements that was officially launched. And I am going to send the link to it here in the chat. In case some of you want to join that MAG working group, that will be working on increasing the engagement of -- the meaningful engagement of young people at the IGF, whether it be in the main session organizations, in the programme in general. And there is, I think, Uma tier in the call who is part of the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance so this MAG working group will be led by MAG members who are interested in increasing the youth engagement. And, of course, of, of course, in the I was in the capacity to manage ma group and will be in close contact with the IGF youth. Please do not hesitate to join this MAG working group in case you have interest. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: which is -- thank you, Celine. which is an open working group, also open for nonMAG members to join. Yes. And I see Sivas and Tino. Sivas, please.

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: In the last meeting I suggested -- we gold through that, we agreed that and if there are any other bit on that or should I leave it just at that?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Celine, can you respond?

>> CELINE BAL: Sivas, if I remember well during last call, you introduced your call for thematic input for the IGF 2024; is that correct?

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: Not necessarily as thematic input but as something that DCs could do, either formally or informally. And the idea is to connect to important nongovernmental organizations doing significant work. That's very vague at this moment. And I sent a paper and was it read or was there any reaction or should I just leave it at that?

>> CELINE BAL: If I remember there was a connection problem during the last meeting. I shared a paper but you can, perhaps, go in more detail with some proposed action items. This is my suggestion.

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: I will do that. I will do that. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Sivas. And Dino.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you. Related to the concept of the integration of the work of the DCE with the work of the IGF in general at the MAG.

I read, I believe it was in the minutes of a previous document, that there is a pending commitment to clarify exactly

how Dynamic Coalition should present themselves, whether the terms United Nations should be included or not included. I specifically got this question because my own Dynamic Coalition that I am co-leading is quite large. We now have 149 members. And I do see that some of the members start putting on their LinkedIn account updates about the work that we are conducting in the Dynamic Coalition, sometimes they use United Nations, sometimes they are not using United Nations. Sometimes they use IGF. I know this is a pending issue, which I believe is in the to-do list, so to speak.

I just wanted to ask whether there is any update about this, about this matter.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. The UN emblem and the reference of UN is out of bounds for Dynamic Coalitions.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Yes, we are very aware of that, yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: With the IGF logo, we can be more flexible but I think the Secretariat is working on guidelines to make that clear. And also that we add a few sentences also in the charter of the Dynamic Coalitions to clarify that.

But I think it's -- the NRIs are working on similar terms, they face the same issue. And I don't know, Celine, yes, you can say where you are on this story.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, thank you. I think, Gino, you were not present during last call, but IGF head of office joined the session to just make it clear the Dynamic Coalitions are not, let's say, part of the UN. And this triggered again a conversation and, as Markus said, we will be working on a kind of specifier, a kind of disclaimer, but specifier that Dynamic Coalitions should use, for example, on publications and whatsoever to clearly indicate the role of Dynamic Coalitions within the IGF ecosystem.

And also as Markus said, we are working within the Secretariat together with Anya, who is the mainly focal person for NRIs to make sure these kind of specifiers are the same because Dynamic Coalitions and NRIs can be used as comparable examples, let's say. Thank you.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you, Celine. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

And Wout, is that a new hand as well? Yes, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus.

I think it goes what Dino describing goes back to something we discussed last year, is when there are tangible outcomes of Dynamic Coalitions, what sort of criteria should they add here to to be accepted as an IGF outcome?

And I think that some people in the MAG are starting to

understand the need for this. Some may still be adverse. But I think it's important to discuss, and that also helps the Secretariat with the baseline that they should be describing. Because we are working on -- as we describe it in IS3C under the aegis of the IGF, not the UN, but the IGF and we are producing outcomes that are a result of processes that go on within the IGF. So, how can we make sure that they are recognized as coming out of this process. And that probably means that you have to have some rules that you have to add here to when you write a report or when you -- so what we do as IS3C we have a governance document and in this governance document is described exactly what you have to do before you can publish the report as IS3C.

And that will probably not be very much different from what happens in a policy network or within a Best Practice Forum, except that there's no MAG oversight. That is probably the only difference.

So, if that is the issue and we know that there's serious work being done within Dynamic Coalitions that they want to present and have on the IGF website, it makes MAG oversight in liaison with the Dynamic Coalition the only obstacle, probably.

If we would bring it in this way, that we are already a part of this whole ecosystem, then why not profit as IGF from these outcomes and show that what we are capable of, instead of pushing it away to the fringes of the website.

So, I will be going back to it again in Riyadh. But I think I need your help, Markus, because you are more of a diplomat than I am. But I am trying to make this as rational as possible, because those rights to the work, just like Dino was saying about accountability. It's the same side of the coin, basically.

So, that's why I am reaching out to you, to see how can we best bring this topic forward so that it is discussed in a neutral way and, perhaps, taking away from my personal person and my personal --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, that's another story altogether. And I tried, when I was head of the IGF Secretariat and was when I chaired the MAG, I thought one very innocent output will be the DCAT, the accessibility guidelines. Can we make them IGF guidelines. But there was -- even there was a strong resistance. And I think it's two sides of the same coin. The Dynamic Coalitions proudly say they are independent bottom-up and grassroots and the policy networks, BPFs, they are chosen and driven by the MAG and supported by the Secretariat. The Secretariat holds the pen. So, there is a different nature.

But it is, yes, a big policy issue, what is an IGF outcome. But, I mean, but without -- we have a decision on how to frame

that, the bottom line is, the DCs are allowed to use the IGF emblem, but we have no way -- no right to use the UN emblem and the term United Nations.

And we had one Dynamic Coalition that produced the outcome with the UN emblem and as a UN IGF, whatever, and that is clearly against the rules. So, but this is yet another discussion to have.

Here Dino's question was just what is the current status. And the current status is clear on that.

I see Sivas, is that an old hand or would you like to come in?

>> SIVAS UBRAMANIAN: It's an old hand. Sorry.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's an old hand. Judith, yes, please.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's Judith Hellerstein for the record.

I thought that we were saying that the Dynamic Coalition's a part of the IGF and the IGF is part of the United Nations.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's not as simple as that.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Because I thought that was the wording we came upon last year.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, it's part of the IGF ecosystem. But it's -- and there is a question of, can you use the emblem of the United Nations, yes, or no? And the answer is no.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. The answer is no but you could use the UN by saying that Dynamic Coalitions are part of the IGF ecosystem, which is part of the UN.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: In a round about way, yes, as long as you don't use the emblem.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you for clarifying, Markus, apologies. Indeed my question was the terms of the United Nations. I am totally aware that the emblem, it's privileged, it's protected. It cannot be used outside of the official business of the UN.

The question was specifically whether United Nations can be put in front of IGF Dynamic Coalition. That was the specific question.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And the answer is no.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Okay. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: So to be clear, in Dynamic Coalition report, there cannot even be a mention of it being a part of the UN System or the UN whatever you call it. So, the United Nations could not be mentioned in any way when you write what the report is about and where it comes from?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think you can in a round about way, as Judith said. We did have legal opinions is the IGF part

of the United Nations yes or not. And there was one of legal advice that said, no, it's not, because the UN is part for Member States and the IGF is multistakeholder. The UN has begun to like the IGF and the UN emblem is over it, but it's not as easy as that. And the UN is defined by international law, and clearly there's no room for a Dynamic Coalition under the UN flag, because UN does not -- the membership of the UN are Member States and not grassroot movements.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: We totally agree there, Markus. It's not about the emblem being on the report, but about IGF recognition. And I think that is something different than UN --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's yet another story. I mean, the recognition is there -- you know, we can flag that something to consider would be to create a procedure where the outcome of Dynamic Coalition is approved. But I think that would have to go through the MAG. Can you actually scrutinize and say we agree and give our blessing to that? But that's another story.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Right. And I think that if we can have that discussion, so not the UN discussion, but IGF recognition discussion is a different discussion. And then what I tried to do yesterday, then I don't need to try to become a BPF or policy network to have some sort of recognition of the work that we do. Because then we are being recognized, it's the IGF Secretariat says we have these reports this year, and that's different from the UN, when the UN consultants reports, because they are the UN report.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's correct.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: We would be at IGF report. If you can make that distinction, perhaps the discussion becomes a lot easier.

I see some plus ones in the chat. So, the more people that are interested to have this discussion, I think. And just asking, since, Celine, you are working with the Secretariat, would this distinction make it easier, that we would be talking about an IGF recognized work as Dynamic Coalitions that has the approval of whatever we call it, but without the UN emblem, without UN interference, but purely as an IGF grassroot result that has a contribution to the security or the way the Internet works and all the Dynamic Coalitions are doing?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Wout. I wanted to raise my hand just before. So, how we actually until now always referred to the Dynamic Coalitions but also to NRIs and this is one of the reasons why, for example, we asked Dynamic Coalitions to first send a proposal to the Secretariat, is that they would then be

recognized, Dynamic Coalitions are recognized NRIs by the IGF secretariat and such.

As Markus said, yes, there can be debate whether the IGF is now part of the UN System or not. I mean, the IGF Secretariat is definitely under UN DESA, which is a UN department and organization. When it comes to Dynamic Coalitions and NRIs we do recognize them as IGF Dynamic Coalitions. So, yes, until now, there has always been a difference between UN versus the IGF. But one thing is clear, that NRIs and Dynamic Coalitions are definitely recognized by the IGF Secretariat.

Now I would say that this is, unfortunately, really not depending on the IGF Secretariat. But right on the MAG, whether and how there can be, for example, a mechanism that the MAG could come up with in order to recognize outcomes of Dynamic Coalitions as IGF outcomes. This is something that can definitely be touched upon or discussed, for example, at the in-person meeting next week.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: This is complex questions and 10 years ago or 20 years or 15 years ago, the UN would have said, no, you cannot say the UN IGF because it's not part of the UN System as such. It's -- and if you do recall, the wording, the mandate is given to the Secretary General to convene a forum for dialogue. It's not a mandate given to the UN, but, okay, Secretary General is the head of the UN, but it's fairly complex and, yes, also the UN signals more openness towards multistakeholder, but with the UN in the end, it is the Member States. And we see that now in the GDC discussion, it's the Member States negotiate and we can see how nongovernmental stakeholders make their way in.

Again, it's complex legal issues and in a round-about way, as was also said in a chat, you can also, sort of, go around it, but, basically, important thing is that we don't on the wrong sides of the law and the UN emblem is a protection by national law, and therefore we are not entitled to use it. But we can signal the desire of also Dynamic Coalitions, if they do have some tangible output, that it be brought -- that we actually would then have to devise a process where it is being recognized as an IGF output. But that's something we can flag and that's really, then, also up to the MAG to decide.

With that, can we conclude our call? Thank you very much for your active participation and for all the good points. And we will make these points in Riyadh. But, again, in a constructive way. We are not here one to, sort of, defend what we have and one not. To move to contribute to a better annual

programme and Dynamic Coalitions, I think, feel they can positively contribute to a better programme and that we also would like to enhance the synergies between the various components of the programme.

Do we need to discuss when to have our next call? Roughly a month from now?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, but not at 1200 UTC. I mean, not 1100 UTC.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah. I think then the Secretariat will send out a Doodle poll and we will try to affix a slot that meets everybody's needs and interests.

Okay. With that, I thank you all. And wish you a nice rest of the day. Bye-bye. Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Bye-bye. See you next week.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Bye, all.

>> Thank you.

(Session was concluded at 12:36 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.