

IGF 2022
Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group
Virtual meeting 61 | 26 April 2022

Summary report

1. Debrief from EGM

On 30 March – 1 April 2020 an [IGF Expert Group Meeting \(EGM\)](#) was held in New York to consider how the IGF can contribute to advancing digital cooperation and implementing proposed initiatives in this area. Prior to the EGM, [DCs developed a paper](#) which was submitted as background material for participants.

Key points raised

- DCs featured prominently in EGM discussions. Appreciation was expressed for the work conducted by DCs, and it was noted that more should be done to promote this work. At the same time, some concerns were raised over issues such as the dynamism of DCs, the extent to which they abide by core principles, quality of outputs, etc.
- Other important discussions at the EGM revolved around issues such as the role of the Leadership Panel (LP) and its relations with the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG), IGF contributions to the development of the Global Digital Compact, and how to better promote various IGF outputs. The Secretariat will publish a report highlighting key suggestions arising from the meeting; the report will be open for public comment. While some of the suggestions may be easy to implement in the short to medium term, others require resources and more time to be put in place.

Next steps

- DCs will wait for the EGM report to be published for public comment. Depending on the deadline for the submission of comments, it will be decided whether the DC Coordination Group (DCCG) could have a call to review the report and consider a collective response.

2. Respecting the DC principles

DCs are required to follow three basic principles of inclusiveness and transparency for carrying out their work: open membership, open mailing lists and open archives. Following up on a discussion at the previous DCCG meeting, the IGF Secretariat has conducted an assessment of the extent to which DCs abide by these principles.

Key points raised

- The Secretariat's assessment revealed that not all DCs abide by the principles related to open membership, open mailing lists and open archives. Out of 24 DCs currently listed on the IGF website, only 10 were found to be in compliance with all three

principles. Some of the issues found with other DCs include closed mailing lists, lack of clarity on how people can join a mailing list and links to mailing lists not working.

Next steps

- The Secretariat will write to individual DCs to inform them about the identified shortcomings. DCs will have a month to fix the issues and demonstrate compliance with the three open principles.
- If there are certain issues that prevent a DC from compliance, these can be discussed with the Secretariat with a view to finding a solution. But the 'final' sanction for non-compliance would be to include the DC in the list of inactive coalitions.

3. DCs-MAG relations

Key points raised & Issues to explore further

- DCs may want to consider modalities for more engagement with the MAG on either substantive or administrative issues. Although a MAG-DC working group was suggested, it was noted that this could be difficult, given MAG workload. Instead, suggestions were made to improve the communication between MAG and DCs and to ensure that DCs are proactive in approaching the MAG and offering to bring contributions on various issues on the MAG agenda.

4. DCs funding

Key points raised & Issues to explore further

- Some questions were raised regarding the likelihood of DCs benefiting from financial support for the IGF Secretariat or from assistance from the MAG in identifying funding sources.
 - It was noted that, with the IGF as a whole being underfunded, it is expected that most fundraising efforts will continue to be focused on 'central operations'. And even if funding were to be available, it would be difficult to define a mechanism to decide which DCs would get funded and for what. Moreover, DCs need to be aware of the implications that potential IGF funding may have for their independent and autonomous nature.
 - It is also rather unlikely that the MAG could assist with identifying funding sources, given the group's current roles and responsibilities (although this may change if the MAG terms of reference are reviewed).
- There is nothing preventing DCs from looking for funding elsewhere. Given their focus on specific issues, DCs might be able to get funding from sources that may not consider funding the overall IGF.
 - One option worth exploring could be for the IGF Support Association (IGFSA) to provide assistance to DCs by looking for targeted funding for specific DC work.
 - The DCCG itself could consider what it can do to help DCs identify funding sources. For instance, once the Leadership Panel is formed, the DCCG could communicate DC funding needs to the Panel and ask for support in obtaining the needed funds.

- Also important to look at is the fact that there may be fluid boundaries between the various components of the IGF ecosystem, such as DCs, best practice forum (BPFs) and policy networks (PNs). We have already seen this with the PN on environment, whose work now continues within a dedicated DC on environment. The opposite might work as well: A project within a DC might be suitable to become a best practice forum (BPF) or a policy network (PN), both of which benefit from IGF Secretariat support (i.e. through a consultant).

5. Developing common criteria for assessing DCs

This agenda item, which builds on previous DCCG discussions and the report DCs produced in 2021, was deferred to a future DCCG meeting.

Issues to explore further

Meanwhile, DCs are invited to consider the following:

- Should there be qualitative or quantitative criteria to assess DCs and their work?
While quantitative criteria (e.g. a certain number of calls a DC is expected to hold) may be easier to develop and assess, they may not accurately reflect DC dynamism, especially considering that DCs have different focuses and work modalities. On the other hand, qualitative criteria may be more difficult to develop, and there is also the question of who would assess the quality of DCs work.

Annex List of participants

Apologies: Wout de Natris (Internet Standards, Security and Safety Coalition)

Coordination facilitators

Jutta	Croll
Markus	Kummer
Adam	Peake

Participants

Mauricia	Abdol-Tshilunda	
Laura	Becana Ball	
Mark	Carvell	Internet Standards, Security and Safety Coalition
Frederic	Cohen	DC on Data Driven Health Technologies
Avri	Doria	DC on Schools of Internet Governance
Valensiya	Dresvyannikova	DC on Public Access in Libraries
Judith	Hellerstein	DC on Accessibility and Disability
Rajendra	Gupta	DC on Internet Jobs & DC on Digital Health
Fred	Kwadwo Aazore	
Sivasubramanian	Muthusamy	DC on Core Internet Values
Michael	Oghia	DC on Environment
Umut	Pajaro Velasquez	
June	Parris	DC on Data Driven Health Technologies

Secretariat support

Sorina	Teleanu
--------	---------
