UNEDITED COPY

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION
DYNAMIC COALITIONS COORDINATION GROUP
APRIL COORDINATION MEETING
TUESDAY, 18 APRIL 2023
1300 UTC

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
001-719-481-9835
www.captionfirst.com

    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, everyone. Five minutes early.
    We have quite a few colleagues on the call. Good to see
you.
    (Pause.)
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: I see that Phyo introduced himself in the
chat. That is very helpful.
    I would encourage all the other participants -- I mean, it
just helps the Secretariat when he prepares the summary record
of the meeting, but he is sure who is representing which DC.
    So that is very helpful.
    (Standing by.)

    (Please stand by for the meeting to begin.)
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: There is one minute left to the top of
the hour.
    >> MARK: I had to go out and, I'm sorry I couldn't join the
prep meeting.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Good thing you are on this one.
    >> MARK: Normally I don't have any problems.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: These things happen. It is technology.
    Okay. It is top of the hour. We have quite a full agenda.
I think I prefer starting without further ado.
    Ryan, can you share the agenda on the screen so that
everybody has it in front of them?

>> RYAN: Yes, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, there are some --

>> RYAN: Can everybody see?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can see it. Starting with the agenda, there are some administrativeia.

Bad news first. I think it is the last time we have Ryan on the call with us. His internship will end this week. So unfortunately he will no longer be here to support us, but he said he would be willing to do so on a freelance basis even if he is not with the Secretariat anymore. Officially there will be a replacement, but there seems to be as part of the junior professional programme the UN has, it is a young woman from Germany. But the paperwork seems to be delayed. And unfortunately she will not assure a seamless transition from Ryan to her. That is the bad news.

We also have some good news. We have a new Dynamic Coalition that has been approved and Ryan can hand over to you. Can you introduce the new Dynamic Coalition?

>> RYAN: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I apologize if you can hear some background noise going on here. The people outside of my office.

But we have a new DC joining called the DC on open educational resources. And they were first adopted at the UNesco in the ministerial proposal at the UNESCO open educational resources meeting.

And the objective is to maintain educational resources around the world open and have inclusive information and universal access to information.

So they have been operating since 2020 and supporting Member States with this objective.

And I believe there are one or two members from the OER today joining us. So if you would like to also introduce yourself, that would be great. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Ryan. Is there anyone from this Dynamic Coalition on the call? Who would like to say a few words?

>> Yes, I'm here with one colleague and then another will join us shortly. Thank you very much for having us and thank you very much for accepting us in the Dynamic Coalition of IGF. My name is Zeynep, I'm a programme specialist in the couples sector working on open educational resources.

And this Dynamic Coalition we actually have been calling ourselves a Dynamic Coalition since the ministerial of 2018 and our work is centred around UNESCO open education resources the first normative instrument in education that was adopted in 2019. It is around five areas of action, capacity, policy, sustainability and inclusiveness and international cooperation.

We have about 500 members from all over the world working in these five areas. And we are very honoured to be here. Thank you again for accepting us.

I am joined by my colleague Eleni and another colleague who had to stepped out for another reason. Amy is here, she is right there.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. It is a great honour for us to have such a high powered Dynamic Coalition.

Yes, please, Elen.

>> i I wanted to say hello and thank you for this honour. I'm very looking forward to working with you all.

>> MARCUS: Well, thank you. And it is, the pleasure is mutual, I think. We are very pleased to have you as a Dynamic Coalition here. I think that strengthens the network of the Dynamic Coalitions. I'm sure I speak on behalf of all the other participants on this call when I say we are happy to have you among our midst.

With that can we go back to the agenda? Is the agenda as proposed agreeable to everyone? Can we consider it to be approved?

>> June: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Not hearing any objection and hearing one positive voice, I assume we can move on on that basis and have the agenda approved as it was proposed.

So the first Agenda Item would then be the feedback on the draft charter that we have circulated. When was it, end of March?

And I will -- Ryan, can you show it on the shared screen that we have it in front of us?

>> RYAN: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We will recall that it had three elements in this charter. There was, it was highlighted with different fonts. The normal font was essentially the history of Dynamic Coalitions, with some descriptive text and that was also taken to a large extent from the paper we had collectively produced. Was it two years ago?

Then in bold there were the agreed principles that we already have had. And they were generally agreed.

Then we had a third element that was in italics. These were essentially elements for discussion again they were not totally new. They were also taken from that paper and for those who don't remember the paper too well, I can't recommend highly enough to go on the IGF website and look it up because it gives a lot of elements on the history and also what was discussed.

Are there any comments overall to this paper that we have circulated? Obviously the aim would be to have an agreed document. It is not the prescriptive document, but it will be a

charter as a model charter that Dynamic Coalitions could use.
There are some elements that strengthen, shall we say, the
discipline of Dynamic Coalitions that we have a strong cohesion.

So in normal font and in bold that should not be
controversial as it is a purely descriptive and historical or
then reflects what we already have as agreed elements.

And the more elements that are open for discussions are then
the art of draft that have been printed in ital licks. Here we
see the first section, attendance of Dynamic Coalition
coordination group meetings and broader events. There should
be, shall we say, an encouragement to attend the calls of the
coordination group and other events relevant to their interest.

And also I think not all the Dynamic Coalitions always need
to be represented by the same person. You can also among
yourself if you have an impediment look for someone else to
represent the Dynamic Coalitions.

Then we have other requirements, a little bit further down.
And also then a new element that is, that we introduce full
members and observers, whether we want to go that way, that
really will be open to you.

And also that we have really review. Can you go further
down, scroll further down? Yes.

And also the mission and vision I think is an important
element. There is a part that has been agreed on. And then
also we look a bit forward, given the fact that Dynamic
Coalitions are getting more important. And we look forward also
with creating partnerships with other components of the IGF
broader family.

And lastly, again there is records and archives. There is
some elements that have been agreed on that we have online
mailing lists and the archives should be open.

And lastly, there is a clause on charter review and
modifications, that it makes clear that it is not cast in stone
but it is open for review and can be revisited.

Now, are there any overall comments or comments to some of
the details? I mean, it is not my objection to gavel it down
and say it is approved as it is on this call, but it is rather
to launch the process that we go through it and also gather your
comments and reflexes on this. Who would like to comment?
        >> RYAN: I think Mark has his hand raised, Markus.
        >> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Mark, please.
        >> MARK: Thank you, Markus. I think I wanted to underline
that this is an important document that links in to the shift in
the position of Dynamic Coalitions within the IGF ecosystem.

It underlines that there is an approach to governance to our
work which underpins the missions of the Dynamic Coalitions and
for those Dynamic Coalitions that are aiming to produce policy

recommendations or guidelines or toolkits, it is important for anybody questioning, you know, what is a Dynamic Coalition? To have knowledge that there is this charter.

I think that is a point to underline.

Secondly, I think it will be valuable if perhaps you, Markus, can send this to the leadership panel so that all the Members of the leadership panel are aware of this charter. Perhaps also the message might say we have now a new Dynamic Coalition on open education resources. So that is, I think, a point of news and updating that is worth bringing to the attention of the leadership panel.

So I think that is an important step. Rather than just leaving it for people to discover, you know, we should actually bring this to the attention of the leadership panel and to the chair of the AFT MAG.

I actually spotted a typo in the section on mission, multi-stakeholder is spelled incorrectly. Multi-stakeholder advisory group. If you go back to mission.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Indeed, yes.

>> MARK CARVELL: I just spotted that looking through it.

So those are my comments. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, thank you very much for that and for very supportive comments.

I think the idea you made is just a great idea to actually be more proactive and bringing it to the attention of the leadership panel. Although it is not yet fully approved by the coordination group. We can also present it as part of a dynamic process. I mean, it is something which is under construction and while not yet fully approved but it shows that we are very much a long the lines of what you just said, that we are trying to fit in into this evolving space and Wout, you had your hand up?

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. First of all, kudos to you and Ryan for this document about because I think it looks very good in general. And it tackles a lot of the topics that we've discussed.

I've got a few not really comments but maybe suggestions. The first is on the date of the entry reports on the 31st of January that I think that date is too late. Yes, it is night to work longer on the dates, but usually the report of the IGF is already out there and cast in stone. And where does our work show up? It should be in line basically with what the other intersessional work does, that is two weeks or three weeks after the IGF you have to be ready. Otherwise you will not get noticed really. So that is I think one comment that we could think about, if that is a way forward.

The second is on the reports. In the document we are discussing our yearly reports, but as IS3C and other ones as well have a continuous process of reporting. There are two different sort of reports. One is, we have done this this year and that will summarize the work probably, but the real reports are not in that entry report. But what I miss here personally is sort of a validation process because in our own governance document -- Mark can explain it better than me because he is the author.

We have a validation process that goes through several steps to make sure there is a consensus on the text and not just something produced by four or five enthusiastic people, but that others in the IGF community have had the opportunity to respond to it and that the comments are worked into the report.

Then you get some sort of an IGF report. That, of course, ties into the IGF logo later on. In what way that could be used for the Dynamic Coalition. But I miss something on the validation process. If a DC wants to go through that, how do we go about it?

And the fourth one is on the membership of the Dynamic Coalitions. Yes, I agree that full members and people that you can name observers. But it is extremely hard to make a difference between them because we have, I don't know, 30 by now, maybe 150 Members. I didn't check quite recently, but there are a lot of people signed up recently. But do they do anything? Are they really involved in the process? I have no way of knowing often.

So we don't make a distinction. People are on the list as Members and some are active Members and some not. -- some are not. It is semantic, but it is difficult to make the distinction. Like you said at the end, you are treated equal. Do we really need to make this distinction, is the question. That but that is something to put to the others as well.

I understand the point. And it is not very far from what we want. Let me stop there with these comments. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. The last comment, that is clearly whether or not we want members and observers. That is something that is open for discussion. As you point out, it may make things unnecessarily complicated.

I just have one on the annual report. And we had this discussion in previous years. I mean, here we just talk about an activity report. Just that has been in place now for several years. If a Dynamic Coalition wants to be listed as an active Dynamic Coalition, they have to submit their report proving that they have done some work through the year.

This is not in that sense much of a substantive report. It is just proof of existence. Whereas what you are suggesting,

Wout, would go a step further. That would have to be more as part of the italics part where we discuss how do we want to strengthen the work and the validation process clearly would be part of that.

This what we have here is, and we had this also at the beginning of the various Dynamic Coalitions, asked for the deadline to be extended so that they could have a few more days to present, submit their annual report. This is distinct from the report of the meeting they had at the annual IGF or if they have any substantive work done that feeds into the IGF meeting.

So I think this we need to differentiate.

Anyway, thanks for the comments. Also you are all invited to submit comments in writing, of course. But I thought it would be helpful to get the process started by just gathering a few comments as we are, have a live discussion.

Are there other people who would like to comment?

I can't see any hand up right now.

Can I take it -- oh, Alisa, please, your hand is up.

>> ALISA: Thank you, Markus. So I haven't read this report or this charter before. I believe I didn't yet sign up correctly, well, correctly for the mailing list up until two days ago.

So I am not sure whether you had shared it before or if this is the first time everybody is seeing it.

But I was wondering, what do you see as the process for this document to be approved? Is there any guidance on that? And whether, for example, the MAG should first see it and the leadership panel? Does the IGF Secretariat approve it? Or does UN DESA approve it?

Just more looking into some clarity on the process for this document to be, well, officially --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Your question is most welcome. Yes, it has been shared with the DC list 29th of March, exactly.

But there is no formal approval process. This is essentially a collective process of the Dynamic Coalitions. And we would signal it to the MAG once we have approved. And we approve it in a consensus process which is an iterative process. Once we have a rough consensus around the various elements here, we need some more time, for sure. And we need some time also to think about it and to discuss it.

I think one first discussion showed, for instance, that it might be very difficult to get the consensus around the idea of membership and observers, but I take it there is a general positive response to this draft as it is. And that what I heard, at least, that most colleagues find it an important step forward.

But there is no again, it doesn't need to be approved by the
MAG, but we would definitely signal it to the MAG and say look,
here we have agreed collectively on certain procedures.
Anriette makes a suggestion in the chat. Members and
participants. That could be something to make it a little bit
less formal. One of the four elements of a Dynamic Coalition is
that it needs to be open. So whoever wants to join can join.
     Yes, observers sounds a bit maybe too passive, as Anriette
rightly said but as Wout also said, they are obviously, it
happens in any organisation, any group, any association. There
are always people who are more active than others. And some
others are maybe just there to observe what is happening, make
sure that maybe they are interested in the subject, but have
maybe a more defensive interest. I see if it goes some way they
may become more active. No, we don't like if you go this way.
     But how we want to frame this, that is precisely part of the
discussion.
     Participants is too positive a word for many members.
     Okay. But this is good discussion to have.
     Adam, please, you have the   hand up.
     >> ADAM: Thanks, Markus. Hi, everybody. I'm wondering,
Dynamic Coalitions are, well, they are individuals who want to
work and contribute on a particular activity. Why would you
have observers other than participants? You are just interested
in the Dynamic Coalition. It is dynamic and it is a coalition
of people interested coming together on a topic.
     You know, from my memory going back to 2006 in Athens when
they were created it was a formalization of what used to be
called the birds of a feather process. So we seem to be
creating something rather different here, or I'm just old and
misremembering and got the whole thing wrong.
     But it is about coming together because you are interested
in a topic. You don't observe, you are dynamic.
     So I'm a bit concerned by this direction, if I'm honest.
     >> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you. I think maybe we just
leave it at that and just say they are members and that is it.
We have two, Amali and Wout would also like to comment?
     >> AMALI: Thank you. I want to say we have lots of
observers. Why they are observing, one thing, they are
supporting us. This is fantastic when you want the statistics
for the number of members and so forth.
     What happens is, they are interested in a very particular
subtopic of what we are doing. As soon as they see that point
that they have a particular interest in, then they jump in and
want to communicate and join our events and so forth.
     Otherwise they sort of lie low. That is why it is very
important. It increases our diversity. And increases our

inclusion. That is why I support the observers. And we have a membership called the ad hoc membership that is part of our mandate. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Ad hoc memberships, that is also a possible way of framing it. Wout?

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. And thank you all for comments.

I think it may well be we are a bit to blame for this discussion. We identified that we have very active members and members who were just on a list. And what we wanted to avoid is that they could be blamed for not being active. So that is why I think we made some sort of a distinction between membership, if I remember correctly -- Mark, jump in if I don't spell it out right. We want to avoid people being able to blame others. That is basically why we started this debate.

That is why observers is a nice, neutral term. So I suggest to stick with it. People are welcome to observe discussions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Olivier in the chat givens to wonder whether we are starting to over engineer things. I think that is also a valid point. Maybe it makes things unnecessarily complicated. Anriette, please.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks, Markus. Really good to be here. Just to say I absolutely agree that Dynamic Coalitions are an extremely important and under recognised aspect of the IGF.

I think, Amali, I take your point, but online work is very delicate in that you are not in the same room physically with people. I worry about using the term observer, that it might actually encourage somebody who is slowly coming on board, as Adam says, they are interested in the topic, they are beginning to engage. It might put them in a box where they are an observer. It might end up keeping them in that box when in fact they might after a few months or even years become more active.

You know, I would be careful about labeling people. I do think the DC -- the one that I'm active in, schools of Internet Governance have coordinating and informal coordinating team who work together to support and administer the DC. That is a legitimate process. I think you have that with Wout and Mark working in their Dynamic Coalition.

I think maybe you want to recognize that even if informally. I would be very careful about boxes your participants or your members into different categories.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I see quite many hands up. I would like to stop then the list after these people put up their hands because we have still quite a full agenda. We can revisit that, but I think definitely we don't have a consensus on whether or not to have two different categories.

Also Olivier makes the same point that putting them in a box cannot be helpful as they might then not be able to get out of the box.

I think what Amali said, very much what I also tried to say. There may be many members who are not particularly active all the time but they will burst into action when there is an issue close to their heart. Then they gear up a bit and become more active.

But we have three more people on this issue. Mark, Mohamed, and Amali again. Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Thanks very much. I think what is important here is to see this from the perspective of somebody investigating Dynamic Coalitions, you know, considering maybe joining.

You know, explaining that members can include interested people who are not resourceful or not for whatever reason able to be very active is important. It underlines that these are very open initiatives. People can come and go, join, so on. It does rely on some people being very active. Some people as you say may be dormant sleepers and pick up when an agenda or part of an action plan really connects with them.

So I mean that's why it is important to have this sense that you are not expected to be active from the word go.

Maybe this vision here is to move away from using the word defined to saying members can involve observers, interested experts and also stakeholders who are resourced and able to participate actively. Maybe just tweaking the text a bit to avoid the sort of boxes point which is a valid one, I agree. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Muhammad?

>> MUHAMMAD: Yes, thank you. I think I get what Amali and others are saying. While we want to distinguish between observers and members.

But I agree with the point that by doing so, we are fundamentally changing the membership's status or the open nature of Dynamic Coalitions because my understanding of the Dynamic Coalition has been that one of the requirements of having a Dynamic Coalition is to have an open mailing list, membership mailing list where everyone can join.

Now if we want to have active members and then observers, we need clearly defined criteria for the members and then for the observers.

One way would be to have people shift from active members to observers and vice versa. But for that you need clearly defined criteria on the basis of which you would move people or people would themselves move from one status to the other one.

If the colleagues here in this group want to move that direction, I think we need a discussion. I think we would need separate time for that kind of discussion. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

And Amali, you are the last speak speaker on the list.

>> AMALI: We have three categories, stakeholder members which are the admin and regular members who joined our list and we have ad hoc members who come in and join us from time to time. We consider them Members at the time we are doing a specific project.

Now, the one thing that we have, we were told by the IGF to have an open mailing list. Now, we took this initially as being a list where anybody can join. Sorina sold us it has to be published, every list has to be published on the Internet. That's what we have now given the IGF direction.

That obviously has a lot of members because people are watching all our emails but are not members of our list. Now, we actually feel quite uncomfortable with that. We are thinking all these people are observing us, but we don't know who they are. It is a creepy feeling, to tell you the truth, because we don't know who it is.

Something else I would like also to be discussed, what does actually the open list mean. We took it as anybody can join that. We love it, but we can see who they are at least a little bit by the email address. They don't necessarily say who they are. We would like to know more. Join our mailing list, we would like to know who you are. There are issues of conflicts of interest or whatever else it could be.

But this very open mailing list makes us all feel extremely uncomfortable. It is actually run off a personal, person's Google group. So if that kind of discussion can also be had, we would really appreciate that. We would like to have all members to at least register in some manner with their email address rather than this very open global view ofs which we -- view of us which we find very creep Y. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Amali, that is another point which is month worth looking into. The starting point is that we have open mailing lists where everybody can join, but I think in my mind nothing speaks against having each Dynamic Coalition setting up their criteria if they want people to join the mailing lists that they want to know who they are. I think that seems a very basic requirement.

The other thing is, you need to have open archives so people can actually check what has been done in the past.

But I do take it that maybe the way this has been proposed, that doesn't fly. And some tweaking along the lines that Mark has suggested, maybe we could be more descriptive saying that

the Dynamic Coalitions are free, how they want to organise themselves and say that the approach, what Amali outlined, a bit of (non-English phrase.)

That some are maybe more dormant but are interested when it comes to some specific issue that they are interested in that we can cover that in a more descriptive text.

Also there are some questions whether there is any punishment if members are not active. I don't think we can go that far. I think that would also be the wrong approach. But we have the basic criteria that we want to see whether the Dynamic Coalition as a collective group is active. That is, part of it is provided an annual report. Also it is outlined in some of the sections of the draft charter. Can we actually have more, ask more requirements that you have, how many meetings you have. At least whatever. Three meetings a year or four meetings a year or whatever it is. That is something we may consider. That has also been in Sorina's paper.

With that, I would suggest that we park this item and we move to the next item on the agenda. And please, send your comments also in writing. That could be very helpful.

Amali, is this a new hand or an old hand?

>> AMALI: Sorry, I'll just bring it down.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. The next item will be feedback, no follow-up on the contribution to the GDC. Mark has been driving this. Mark, I give you the floor. You have shared a document prior to the call with the list. And Ryan, can you show that? Yes, here it is, thank you.

Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. And we are at an important point because the deadline is coming up, end of the month for submissions to the tech envoys online consultation.

This draft which I circulated -- I'm sorry people have not had much time to look at it before the meeting. But I was busy on the GDC last week with the deep dives and so on. Anyway, part of the excuse.

Anyway, so this draft is taking forward really what we agreed at the last meeting. That is that a joint submission by the Dynamic Coalitions should focus on the law of the Dynamic Coalition in the GDC process.

So this is not intended to be a convergence of all the individual Dynamic Coalition inputs. I mean, know that some have been actively developing written inputs into the GDC process. So this document is not aiming to sort of converge all that, or be a compendium of all the individual Dynamic Coalitions.

It is not aimed to be that.

Basically it is informing the tech envoy and the co-Facilitators for the General Assembly negotiations, the Ambassadors Aru -- Rwanda and Sweden and others who are going to lead on the GDC process, that Dynamic Coalition do see this as an opportunity where they have a significant role to play.

And so what I've done is put together a draft which takes account of the consultations we have undertaken. It's in five parts. There is an opening part you see on the screen now about the relevance of the Dynamic Coalitions to the process, a quick summary of who we are and why there is a linkage here to the GDC process. And we give the links to the list of all the Dynamic Coalitions. I have to change the number now with the addition of the new one.

And the role of this coordination group. That link is there too.

And then I go on to the next two parts of this document, which explains the consultations.

This because the tech envoy is keen to know from anybody who is submitting to the GDC on behalf of a than community to what extent have there been consultations made.

So the next two parts, parts two and three, describe really the consultations we undertook last year ahead of the IGF in Addis Ababa where we had the main session of the Dynamic Coalitions and the second part of that was about the GDC and the contribution of Dynamic Coalitions.

And those of you who recall that and were there will remember we had High Level Panel which included the tech envoy and he was very positive about the role of the Dynamic Coalitions in the GDC process, both in preparation and also subsequently. That was a real eye-opener, I thought, about how to land the GDC and its support and commitments.

That was part two. Part three describes the consultations we've undertaken this year to develop this text where we asked Members three questions. First question, is your Dynamic Coalition going to submit input and if so what thematic areas of the seven that were listed.

Secondly, is your Dynamic Coalition proposing to an additional thematic area? Eight or nine, however more there will be, which is again part of the tech envoy's culltation set of questions.

Thirdly, comments from the Dynamic Coalitions on how they see the role of the Dynamic Coalitions in this GDC process.

That is part three. If you scroll down a bit further, I call it a second phase that we undertook this year.

Then I summarize basically the points of consensus about how the Dynamic Coalitions can contribute potentially to the GDC initiative. So that is part three.

Then I thought it was, this is a later idea, I have to say, which I didn't float at the last meeting, but I thought it would be useful having described our role and our prospective role with all those five or six potential functions that are listed there, I thought we needed to illustrate for readers, well, you know, the extent to which specific Dynamic Coalitions have notified their intentions. So it is not to summarize them. It is just to list them according to the question.

If you go to part four, Ryan, scroll down a bit further, part four, based on the inputs we've received in the last couple of months, I've listed under specific thematic areas of the tech envoy consultations, the first one, connect all people to the Internet and then none of the coalitions commented on two, but on three a number of coalitions -- was it five? Said they would be focusing on data protection.

So then you see the others. And no on question seven on the tech envoy consultation which you may remember was about the digital comments, no coalitions have indicated they are going to comment on that. That's why seven is not there as well as two earlier on.

And then the final part, part five is about additional thematic areas. I've listed there those that I know of following the inputs from individual coalitions where they are proposing additional themes for the GDC.

So I think that's going to be very informative for the tech envoy and the co-Facilitators and everybody else in the GDC process of the extent to which Dynamic Coalitions are really focused on specific aspects of the GDC in terms of principles and commitments to action.

But of course, we leave it for those individual coalitions mentioned there to submit their full responses detailing all of this in all the necessary detail. I'm not intending to do that there. It is just to give a snapshot, this is what the DCs are doing.

This is, I think, I'll stop there. But basically the aim of the coalition is to -- the aim of the submission, rather, is to indicate how the coalitions are channels for focus on specific GDC thematic areas in terms of principles and commitments to action and to inform about how a number of coalitions have already stepped forward with specific intentions on thematic areas that are listed there in parts four and additional areas in part five.

I'll stop there. I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Mark. That is very helpful indeed. Anriette added a comment in the chart that the DC on Internet commons is doing a submission. You said you will check with Luca.

Wout had a relevant question which we forget to address, is there a deadline for comments on the DC charter?

I think can we make it beginning of May? First of May? There is a GDC, we have a deadline there. Then we need another deadline for the DC charter?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, Markus, sorry to jump back in. On the GDC, I forgot to mention this, actually. I propose that the.

(Overlapping speakers.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> MARK CARVELL: For this draft I invite colleagues to get back to me by next Monday, the 24th, with any additions. Anriette, if you can drop me an email, for example. Anybody else who wants to be added to these lists or wants to sort of suggest tweaking the language in some way, do that by the 24th. And then I will undertake to finalize it in time for the 30 April deadline.

I think then it ought to be submitted. It will be done with an email, Markus. It will be done with an email which you should send, I think, saying this is the product of a two-phase set of consultations, and most all the Dynamic Coalitions blah-blah-blah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, I see in the chat there are various comments that they have also comments or input to provide.

I would suggest as Mark has been running this and he has sent it to the list, please send back to Mark when you have comments that he coordinates that. And I think that is very helpful. If you know, also he can add those Dynamic Coalitions who are preparing a submission.

Well, Mark, well said. If you are on the list, Mark will send it to the list. Maybe Mark you can add to the chat what your email is, so that people have it.

My big thank you, Mark. This is exactly what we had hoped for. We realised it would not be possible to have a compendium of substantive contributions. But you really made a great job out of having an overall chapeau of what Dynamic Coalitions are and can do and also signal out the process that we were involved.

So I think that is, it hits it nail on the spot. It just may be a bit of tweaking, but I wonder whether we can maybe limit -- Anriette has a suggestion. Please?

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Markus, I was actually typing it. I I will say it quickly. Thanks, Mark, I read the document and think it is very good. I have one suggestion. I suggest you add a Preamble where you actually talk to the GDC and the tech envoy, to the co-Facilitators to say to them in a way actually

speaking from a point of power, not just from a point of we want to support your process.

To make the point that multi-stakeholder processes are not easy. The GDC wants to be multi-stakeholder process. And just to say that DCs have been working with this since 2006 and that there is a lot of experience, a lot of knowledge of the complexity and the slowness that there often is in trying to build this multi-stakeholder approach. Something a little bit catchy, maybe a little bit -- what is the word I'm looking for? Something that will catch their eye. I think there is the tendency at the moment for the IGF community to just knock on the door and smile. Sometimes we have to knock on the door and say actually if you don't take us seriously you are doing it at your own expense because we have so much experience and knowledge to share in this process.

I am not sure I'm making myself clear, but one Preamble before section one.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that suggestion. You are right, we can be a little more a sertive and show we have done good and let's talk about it.

But maybe you can also produce a draft as an input of what Mark can do with it. The suggestion is excellent. All the others, please reflect or respect the deadline and make your comments and fill the gaps for those who are planning to make a contribution so they can also be listed.

With that, can we move on? I think --

>> This is Judith. I have my hand raised.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please?

>> JUDITH: I thought we decided earlier, but maybe I have it wrong, that we would be sending our submissions and then they would be one paper that, like this. But that would have all our suggestions and would make, a very powerful point and we would not have to send in our individual submissions. We would send in one strong submission that has all our DCs in it. And then that would make more of a powerful statement than individual submissions.

But did I not get that right?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That was the original starting point, but it didn't fly really. Mark didn't get enough response and some had already started their individual submissions.

Then it was decided, there was maybe no point trying to group it all together in one submission. But there was still merit in having a kind of comprehensive chapeau submission on the strength of the DCs collectively.

But Mark, you have been closer to the process. Can you answer Judith's question?

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, yes. The concept originally was some kind of submission that would have a lot of substantive input from the individual Dynamic Coalitions. That was our original thinking.

But what we've done now and there was discussion at the last meeting about this. And Markus has just recounted really the rationale for a slight change of approach now.

But what we have now actually is a kind of, I think, support as a kind of hybrid. I did feel it would be good to illustrate our ambitious as coalitions to have that opportunity to have a significant role during all our experience and our specific areas of profound expertise.

And I'm doing that now. I'm listing, I think in a very easy to digest way the ways that specific Dynamic Coalitions are primarily focused. And that inference is that what they have to offer and also to capture all the extended thinking about what else the GDC should do. That is in the fifth part.

So I hope, Judith, you find this approach as a useful one. It is concise. I think we can actually give it a bit more punch as Anriette is suggesting. I'm very happy to do that.

But it is concise. I think it is -- and it signals, go here on data protection. You know, go there on AI. And in terms of the DC community.

So I hope this is a good solution. And I always think, you know, this goes back to my time in government, the shorter the document, the more impact it has. And each individual submission is going to get fully read. We can't ... you can't question that.

But this document I think is a good easy document to digest with strong messages and we'll add a bit of punch too, okay?

>> Judith: Thanks very much. But my question was, it wasn't communicated on the list that we have to put in our individual submissions. I think that needs to be clear because I wasn't clear on that because we weren't -- the thought wasn't that we were just submitting to you and you would rephrase it and we weren't sending a separate submission. So that is news to me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think it was because there were not enough submissions coming, it was decided we would leave it to each individual DC whether or not they want to make a submission. But what we have now is what we have. And as Mark said, I think it is actually a very powerful document and I definitely confirm as I also have a past of working for government that the shorter, the better. And the more impact it will have.

But it is not too late for each individual DC to make an individual submission and it can be listed then in the document

as it is. So I think it is a hybrid way which actually enhances the impact of us collectively. But I see already people are leaving because we are at the top of the hour and we haven't been through.

>> AMALI: Very quick point. I heard this strongly from all my Members that ethics is really an important point that we must add the DCs take a look at. This is because everybody sees the UN as being human rights oriented in its origin. As a result, I know having worked and lived in many cultures, all our value systems can be quite different.

People think that this is an excellent place for discussions on ethics. And coming from the IT sector as well, I just know the values that go into actually building IT systems and Internet and so forth. I wish there is some place we can put in a place for ethics and human rights which is core not just for the DC that looks at core values but across all DCs.

We strongly believe as a group this should be across all DCs as a principle, as it were. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Mark has taken note. We are beginning to lose people. Can we now move on? We have two more Agenda Items on our agenda. Can you stay on? For a little bit longer? Or do we have to ...

>> Judith: I can stay on.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There was the Agenda Item, the use of the IGF logo which we have briefly touched on in the UN emblem. I have been able to talk to Chengetai about this, who has also checked with New York and with the IGF logo, they can be more flexible than with the UN emblem.

On one condition. If you use the IGF logo, you are required to have a disclaimer on your website that the views expressed express only the views of the Dynamic Coalition concerned and not the IGF as such.

Any reference to the UN is a none good go. You can is not say a UN IGF coalition, but you can say the IGF coalition on this or that. You can use the IGF logo with that proviso, that you have a disclaimer.

But Chengetai promised that they would do something on their website to make it clear, with clear instructions to minimize any ambiguity.

But again, you cannot sign your emails with the reference to the UN, as some of you have done saying UN -- one DC member even signed UN DESA. That is total non--go, any reference to UN DESA on your Dynamic Coalitions is not appropriate.

>> Markus, can I ask a short question as well?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Thank you for the clarification. That settle the discussion as far as I'm concerned except for the validation process that we have to discuss at some point.

When I explain sometimes in writing, but sometimes when impression I usually say we're a Dynamic Coalition under the Internet Governance Forum which is a UN institution or whatever you would like to call it. So people understand that the IGF has a place in the world. And I am not saying that I am a Dynamic Coalition with the UN standpoint, but I do explain the process. I assume that is not an issue because people need to understand what you are, what a Dynamic Coalition is and how to place it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If you explain it, that is another story. If you say -- I mean, already whether the IGF is a UN process can already be debatable. At the beginning there were legal advisors saying that the IGF is not really part of the UN because the UN is part of Member States and the UN is a multi-stakeholder process and it is convened by the Secretary-General of the UN. It is all rather complex, but you have to explain it, that it is part, it operates under the umbrella of the IGF which has been convened by the Secretary-General of the UN. That's correct.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Right. Perhaps it is good to have a formal sentence that everybody can use.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, that is basically what the Secretariat promised that they would put something on their website so there is no ambiguity on what can be said and what not.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Thank you for this, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. The last point is the intersessional event. I had sent out an email to all of you a few days back. I think it was about a week ago or so. And we have a constant note on that. And the basic thing is, the idea when I discussed it with the Secretariat colleague, let's have something forward-looking where we can work together with the other components of the IGF's ecosystem and work towards the annual meeting and what is proposed now is that we would have -- maybe can you scroll down right to the operational bit, Ryan?

That you sign up to -- well, there will be an event on the 10th of July. That is the first day of the open consultations in the afternoon. That would be devoted to the Dynamic Coalition and the other components of the IGF family. That is the best practice Forums, the policy networks, and the NRIs. Then they can look together how they can contribute to the subthemes as they have been identified by the Secretariat.

So this is again -- Ryan, can you scroll down a bit?

Yes. The instruction would be, it would be a collaborative event. We would form Working Groups around the expect subthemes. That should consist of members from at least three different IGF components. That is a Dynamic Coalition, a BPF or BPN or NRI. They would work on one of the subthemes.

There are some guiding questions here. How would you define a subtheme, the links with your work. What do you think is the current State of play in the area? What are common challenges? What shared conclusions can be shared by your Working Group? What opportunities can you identify from your Working Group for collaboration in this area? And so on.

And also this concept, the meeting will take place at the time when the MAG will be discussing the architecture of the annual meeting and also the main sessions.

So if the Working Groups can actually give concrete ideas on having a main session, what will be the main objective and desired outputs of the main session at the IGF 23? This could be a very operational input into the programme planning.

And in order to move ahead, we have actually an opt-in process, propose an opt-in process. You can sign up and can you scroll down to show -- yes.

There is an Excel file where you can actually sign up to where you are interested. There there we go, yes.

We already have the EFLA signing you, Stephen -- signed up and the public access to libraries on digital divides. He would be interested to work there. It is up to you to put down the name of your Dynamic Coalitions and indicate which of the subthemes would be of interest to you.

Have I explained it properly? Ryan, do I need to fill me in anything I missed out?

>> RYAN: No, I think, Markus, you explained it perfectly. Thank you for that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Maybe not perfectly, but sufficiently.

>> RYAN: Yes, absolutely.

>> MARCUS: And yes, the link, Anriette sends the link to the MAG meeting. Yes.

And that is essentially, that came as a feedback from the colleagues who are involved in dealing with the best practices policy Forums networks and NRIs. We said when we have procedural discussions on how to improve the linkages, then it will not work. It will not garner enough interest as if you have it output-oriented and looking as providing an input into the MAG meeting which will take place after this session.

Then there may be indeed some interest. So our output will be an input into the MAG meeting and hopefully the other components of the IGF family will buy in. And also sign up.

It will be great also if you can add geographical
diversities through the NRI network towards this effort.
    Are there any questions, comments?
    I see that Wout already put his name down in the
cybersecurity event.
    And the subtheme.
    Questions? Comments?
    >> JUDITH: I looked for this email. Ryan, did it come from
you? Because I couldn't necessarily find it. Unless it came
from someone else.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: I sent the email on 10th of April, 1119
my time. I sent it to the DC list.
    >> Judith: She said it was from Ryan and I didn't see it, I
will look under you or maybe you can send it again.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: I can send it again to the list, yes.
    >> Judith: Okay, I found it, I found it.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, otherwise, I see some positive
comments in the chat. So all I can then encourage you to make
it popular among your networks. And sign up to the subthemes
that are of interest to you and the Dynamic Coalition.
    And right now it is already ten past the hour. Yes, Mark?
    >> MARK CARVELL: Yes, all right, I'll be very brief. The
MAG, yes, the linkage there is important.
    The leadership panel. I mean, I keep saying this. They
need to know what we are doing as coalitions, as a community
part of the ecosystem of the IGF.
    Because some Dynamic Coalitions are very committed to
delivering recommendations, guidelines. And they should be fed
into the leadership panels dossier of IGF activity. I hope
there will be engagement with the leadership panel in some way
at this intersectional event. Thanks.
    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I'm not sure whether the
leadership panel will even be meeting in July. I mean, this is
-- even be present in the meeting in July.
    This is something that the way to go would be through the
hierarchy. And all is as MAG chair is also part of the
leadership panel. Encourage him to bring it to attention of his
colleagues in the leadership panel. This is point well taken,
but I think this is something to be explored in how best to make
it happen.i.
    >> WOUT de NATRIS: But I understand that Vint Cerf is
sincerely interested in this work. If he would get an
invitation and he is able to join, this will be an hour, one
half hour, I understand. It could be that he will be there or
Delegate somebody to be there.
    With Paul (?) I'm not sure it will come across

(Overlapping speakers.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: As I said, this is something to be
explored, how best to bring it to their attention. But I'm
rather engaging in expectation management. We don't expect too
much.

(Chuckles.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: But you know, first and foremost let's
make sure this will happen and this will actually produce
something if they have this session. That we actually have a
meaningful output and work together with the other components of
intersessional work, the NRIs.

But with that, I am not sure whether we have enough people,
but there was the desire expressed last time that we have a
regular meeting always in the same day at the same time. So the
next four weeks from now will be 17th of May. Can we fix
already at the same time 3:00 o'clock afternoon central European
summertime, that is 1:00 o'clock UTC on the 17th of May? Or is
it better that we again send out a doodle poll for that week?

>> Fine for me.

>> Judith: I have a question on this intersessional. If
you are just signing up on a link, how do you register? Are
they going to take that information?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, we will see who signs up and then
the Secretariat will form the Working Groups.

>> Judith: Okay. I wasn't

(Overlapping speakers.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It is just the first, take the interest,
would you be interested in working together? And then it is up
to the Secretariat to make it happen. Then we need smart people
like Ryan who can make it happen and hopefully as he promised he
will not disappear completely. So he may still be able to be
supporting this.

Then it will be some official support in the Secretariat.

>> Judith: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Can we fix then the 17th of May, 3300 UTC
for the next meeting?

>> Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Well, with that I thank you very
much and maybe we should actually have more frequent calls
because we have quite a lot to discuss. Today's discussion
showed it is almost impossible to do this in one hour. But that
is something for you to consider, especially if you move up to
then the intersessional MAG meeting.

>> Judith: Markus, maybe we can schedule the sessions to be
90 minutes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, let's schedule it as a 90-minute
session.

>> Judith: If we finish sooner, we finish sooner and we give people back time. Otherwise people can block that time in their schedule.

>> If you allow in me to say one short thing to Ryan. I think he did an admirable job supporting us and has come up with great documents that we can work with and really got a grasp of everything that we are working on. I think that's a compliment for somebody who is on an internship. I hope you enjoy the next step in your career.

Let me speak on behalf of all of us, as far as I can do that. Thank you very much, Ryan (Wout.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Wout, for doing that and I think you can speak on behalf of all of us. We all appreciated his great work and great support.

On behalf of all of you, let's thank Ryan. With that I thank you all for an excellent discussion. Thank you. Bye-bye.

(The meeting concluded.)

(Realtime captioner signing off.)