

UNEDITED COPY

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION  
DYNAMIC COALITIONS COORDINATION GROUP  
WEDNESDAY, 17 MAY 2023  
1300 UTC

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

This is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is 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: With this, sorry for the delay, about by now I think we are ready to go into full meeting mode and I can see the captioning in the separate window I've opened. Those who rely on captioning, you can actually see it in, if you open a separate window.

With that, can we revert to the agenda that we have sent out?

Ahead of the meeting? And I think it is a fairly standard agenda. I hope that you are okay with it assent out.

If there are no further comments, I would assume that we have an agreement that we move ahead with that agenda.

But before moving into agenda, I would like to introduce Celine. Celine, can you actually open your camera so people can see you? Yes, hello.

We are very happy now for the first time ever we have a regular staff member, a new regular staff member who will be assigned to support the DCs. I shouldn't be unfair because Eleonora was a regular staff member and she looked after the DCs as well. We are more into a regular, I mean, that is no negative comment on the excellent Interns we had, but it gives us more continuity.

Eleonora has a contract, if I am not mistaken, of two years. But I would like to hand over to you -- not Eleonora. Celine, please, introduce yourself and say a little bit of your

experience, your previous experience with the UN. Please, Celine.

>> CELINE: Thank you very much for the short introduction, Markus. I join the the ITC Secretariat last week. I'm really new to everything. Markus was already very kind to give me a good introduction about Dynamic Coalitions. I'm the new focal point here with the IGF Secretariat.

Prior to that I have been actually already working at the UN. But in Vienna, not in Geneva. Mainly in conference management and in communication, both at the international and atomic energy agency for a couple of years and at UNIDO. This is now going to be my very first experience here in Geneva and I am pretty excited. Until now the team has been really kind and welcoming. So I'm excited about this new interesting job. Whenever you have questions regarding Dynamic Coalitions you can reach out to me as a focal point for the Dynamic Coalitions. I look forward to doing it. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Celine, for that and we are equally looking forward to working with you. Ryan has also kindly agreed to still help support the Dynamic Coalitions. Celine has already been in touch with him to make a very smooth transition. That is excellent news now that we have this continuity. Again, my apologies for the previous mix-up between these two excellent ladies, Celine and Eleonora.

Eleonora is the next person on the agenda because she will not be able to stay with us for the entire call.

So she asked whether we could maybe shift the Agenda Item and what was listed as Agenda Item five, use of the UN emblem and IGF logo that we could take it right up front because she will not be able to stay with us right at the end.

With that, Eleonora. Again, with my apologies for the mix-up. Can I ask you to give us a little bit of authoritative insight of when and what, and there has been some amount of confusion among all the various constituent elements of the IGF when they can use the UN emblem, if at all. Or when they can use the IGF logo.

Please, Eleonora.

>> Thank you, Markus. No worries at all on confusing me with Celine. I'm honoured to be mixed up with her. We've only just gotten to know her, but she is an excellent colleague.

Thank you for pushing this up on the agenda. I was following just a little bit some of the discussion that had already occurred among DCs on this topic. And I just wanted to come in on actually a particular point because I saw that within the exchange the example of the UN emblem being used by UN volunteers had come up. And I just think it is important to note from the Secretariat perspective, from a UN institutional

perspective that UN volunteers are organised and administered by the UN. They are recruited by the organisation. And although they are unpaid, they are still processed by the UN and empowered by the UN to act on behalf of the organisation.

So I do think that they are a case quite apart from DCs that are self-organised voluntary groups. So I just wanted to make sure that there is a clear idea of why there would be a distinction between groups like UN volunteers and DCs under the IGF.

I thought it was also important for DCs to know that the kind of limitation that we have placed around the UN emblem is by no means unique to DCs. NRIs are subject to the same limitation that they have also been told and by the NRIs focal point on occasions too that the emblem cannot be used by them. Like DCs they are self-formed and voluntary and their information did not originate with the UN.

So this is something that we will endeavor from the Secretariat side to make more clear in our public information. We are going to have a page that describes the restrictions around the use of the UN emblem. So it's clear for everyone and doesn't create confusion moving forward. We will draw from some of the legal provisions that we've seen within the organisation and we are lucky to have within the Secretariat our colleague Anya who also has a legal background and can make this more clear in writing.

That said, we have said in the past and we still think that it is acceptable for DCs and NRIs to use the IGF logo as they are IGF entities. And that's okay. In fact, several times we have shared the logo. So they can use it in print materials and on their individual websites, et cetera. You can still come to the IGF for that.

But I know that this is a sensitive topic and it pains me that for some it is a disappointment that the UN emblem is off limits. But that is the reality. There is a clear legal basis for it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you very much, Eleanora, that is a very clear and concise explanation. Also to sum it up, the UN emblem is governed by international law. There is just no discussion. Whereas the use of the IGF logo, there is no copyright on that. There is no international law implication. So it is much more flexible. That is what I take also from your explanation.

It can be more flexible with the IGF logo, but there is no room to maneuver when it comes to the UN emblem.

Nevertheless, many thanks also for preparing a clear explanation on the IGF website.

I see Wout has a hand up. Please, Wout.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Thank you, Markus and thank you, Eleonora. That is extremely clear and something we will all learn from, I think. Some have been using the logo and others have not.

Thank you for making clear that we can use the IGF logo. That I think is very important to most DCs when they publish reports in the future.

I have one question. We do work under the IGF and so indirectly the UN. And when we explain to people who are not involved in the work that we do, we would like to become involved. I use a phrase like we work at the IGF under the aegis of the UN or something like it. We don't use the logo but we explain that somehow we are part of the UN process.

Is that off limits as well? Or is there a phrase that we could use perhaps that the Secretariat could make it for us so that we all use the same phrase, so there is no ambiguity there. Is that something that we can do? Or is that off limits as well? I thank you, Eleonora.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Eleonora, can you have an answer to that?

>> Eleonora: Yes, it's absolutely fine in speaking with others to explain the association of the DC to the organisation as long as it is fully explained.

I think it is also okay to do that in writing. It just has to be clear the way in which the Dynamic Coalition relates to the organisation, meaning it is a volunteer group under the IGF and the IGF is part of the UN under the Aegis of the Department of economic and social affairs. That all has to be spelled out. That is the problem with the UN emblem, right? It is just a symbol and doesn't explain that.

As long as there is a clear explanation, it is perfectly fine, whether it is if verbally or in writing.

>> WOUT: It would be good if we are provided with a piece of text that we can all use so that we all use the same text and not make it up themselves.

If that is an option I would very much prefer that. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. You anticipated what I was going to say. It would be helpful if on the website if the Secretariat could provide some guidance that has been sanctioned by the UN, how you can describe the relationship. I mean, it is all -- it is a complex relationship in a sense as the mandate of the IGF was given to the Secretary-General of the UN in person, in a way. It is a link to the Secretary-General but all this, I think it needs the lawyers of the Office of the legal advisor to explain.

But it will be very helpful just to have a sanctioned sentence that describes the relationship. If the Secretariat could come up with such a sentence, that would be most helpful.

>> Eleonora: Yes, Markus. I think as part of our explanation on the emblem we will provide some standard language, as we said, a sentence that describes the relationship.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right. That would be excellent.

With that, can we leave that Agenda Item which at the Vienna meeting it has annoyed some MAG Members who wanted to go up to the substance of matters. But to some people this is a sensitive and important issue to have clarified. If you can clarify that for once and for all, it will be very helpful for everyone concerned.

Can we then thank Eleonora and we hope you can still stay on with us and we can benefit from your experience on other Agenda Items.

In this particular Agenda Item, we relied on your guidance and we can then move on to the next Agenda Item. That will be the draft charter of DCs. We had discussed it at some length at our last call. And you will remember -- if you can scroll down in the charter, there was, we have some comments already. Okay. That's good.

There was one of the basic issues, a roam in the draft charter we have prepared at two kinds of memberships. And still further down. Can we go down on that still? Scroll down.

There, membership governance, yes.

We have totally redrafted it. Ryan and I took into account the comments received and we realised there was strong resistance of having two classes of members. We made it clear that there is flexibility. That DCs are free to organise themselves however they want, depending on their objectives. And also recognizing that not every member will be equally active. That was a strong point that was made at the last call. There are some members who are just following the discussion but they become very active. There is an issue that is important to themselves, that they come up with that.

We tried to make that a little bit more flexible with the new wording. But also at the same time making it clear that there should be a sort of minimum participation. And actually, may I also open parenthesis with that. One thing that would be helpful for Celine is if you can indicate, and if you see, if you go into the participant list you see the names. But you don't see the affiliation.

You can actually change that yourself that you say which DC you are representing. Over the years Celine will know you all, but for the record and for the list of participants it is very

helpful if you can actually state when you sign in which DCs you are representing.

And that also will make it easier. Then when it comes to checking the participation of the DC members in the coordination group. But that is one of the points that whether or not there should be some requirement on active participation in the DC coordination group and also whether we should have a more shall we say stringent requirements or record of the meetings the Members attend.

So the wording that is here is fairly flexible. We have -- excuse me -- we have some comments from Amy and all this, they are all very relevant comments.

I just open the floor. Are there more comments on that? Or do we need more time, give you more time to go through it?

Oh, in the chat Jutta says it is not possible to add the participation in the participant list of this Zoom call.

Is it or is it not?

And here we see from the Secretariat you can add abbreviation of your DC next to your name.

And Tracy says can't rename.

>> TRACY: Yes, it is not possible. I think it is due to the format of this Zoom call. But the option that is usually there does not exist today.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, okay, okay, okay.

Well, it will be helpful if you can just say in the chat then -- I mean, it is for the benefit of Celine, who is new. If you can just -- you can also send a separate email to her to make sure that she knows who you are. Or then say it in the chat. Okay, I get that.

So okay. So are there comments on the spot? Or shall we give you more time to make comments on the Google Doc for the charter document?

(Pause.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: One question from Amy, the coordination group meetings also have a thematic not just a procedural focus. That was actually a point that was made, I remember already, I think it was back in the Berlin meeting. We had a meeting at the IGF itself. There the point was made it would be useful sometimes to have theme mat particular focus on that. But we -- thematic focus and we never went that far, but the coordination group is open to that as such.

I think the contribution to the DC, to the GDC was more than just procedural. That is definitely something that is open.

And okay, other suggestion: Can the DC coordination group be chaired by a different DC on the rotational basis?

That is clearly something worth discussing. We had and there have been now, in this role maybe for too long. We

started this back in I think it was 2014 to have coordination group meetings and we always had co-Facilitators and always a MAG members and Jutta volunteered to stay on after her MAG role stopped and Adam is now the MAG member who is on the group as co-Facilitator and at the same time the liaison to the MAG. This is definitely something that can be discussed.

One thing is you have, if it is on a rotational basis you may lose a bit on continuity. I felt and definitely don't want to enshrine myself here for eternity, by no means. But there is some merit in having continuity.

I think sort of rotational co-Facilitators makes very much sense. But I think this is definitely something we can discuss. Are there other comments?

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Markus, this is Wout.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Where is it, under twoa, at the end of the annual reports, if it feels that the list is considered inactive, should there be a deadline on terminating a DC when after two or three years nobody has responded to anything?

So that there is clearly an end date to an inactive DC.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That is definitely something worth discussing. But we have not so far, all the rules we had were very light. It is a very light hand on the tiller. There is active and inactive. But we actually, your suggestion would be kind of three strikes. If you don't respond for two years, then we don't consider you inactive anymore. We consider you not existent anymore.

That is definitely again something worth discussing.

And I see Rajendra has an comment in the Google Doc. We should remember that the DC and its members are volunteers. Yes, of course.

(Rajendra.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: More accountability. We had that again, a worthwhile point that we make. I mean, the annual report was again a very light obligation, just to say that you have been active and done something. But Rajendra says we should actually see how it was in line with your stated goal. That is again something worthwhile considering.

And Mark, you had your hand up, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you, Markus. Hello, everyone and welcome, Celine, to this meeting. Great to have you on board. Thanks very much.

I just want to go back to the new text on membership. I was just trying to scroll down where you talk about minimum standards. Minimum participation standards.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, yes.

>> MARK CARVELL: As outlined in the terms of reference. Sorry if I missed earlier discussion about this. What terms of reference are we referring to there? A minimum participation standards. That means what? How many times a member attends ... a Convention?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, it could be maybe more precise, but I mean it is meant to be in their respective terms of reference. We leave it up to each DC to organise themselves. So but there is some kind of control that it would be left to each DC to exert that control.

>> MARK: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There is always room for improvement in language. For more precision.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Actually, I have come to connect this from the agenda point about volunteers, et cetera. People volunteer but are often quite, due to other conflicting commitments can't engage on a consistent basis. And also some members may have niche interests, you know, in coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Exactly.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, so --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I mean, that point came across very strongly when we discussed it last time. That is why we also said let's leave it up to each DC.

>> MARK CARVELL: Right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: But at the same time it should not be one active member and a lot of hangers-on. It is a kind of community-driven project.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes.

And then reading on, members are expected to attend monthly meetings organised by this group. That is the first time I've heard of that. I mean, the earlier reference to the coordination group was about Coordinators being appointed to attend. But here this is suggesting that all members of the coalition should attend.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Again, that.

>> MARK CARVELL: Am I reading in too much?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, no. The language, the idea was the Coordinator might not be able to do so, but they may designate another member of the group.

>> MARK CARVELL: Right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Again, there is always room for improvement in language and precision, especially --

>> MARK CARVELL: As you read it at the moment, one is expected to attend monthly meetings of the coordination group.

We haven't, in our coalition, RCC, we haven't said that. We've always said, you know, by depend will represent the Members of the coordination group.



Okay. Well, I don't know.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Any comments are welcome to make it more pre-size and clear. The less ambiguity you have, the better. It should not be a straight jacket for the Dynamic Coalition. But we at the same time, there is an expectation that they engage also in the common activity. And that is the coordination group.

However you want to say that, reading it, yes, I see the point that maybe there is an element of ambiguity here that is not quite clear that can definitely be improved. It is helpful to have this discussion. We can go back to the drawing board, maybe improve the language or again invite comments. I think we have very few, I don't know how many people. Amy commented and Rajendra. So, you know, if you can, there is no particular hurry to come to closure with this charter. But I think we all agree that it is helpful if we all sing from the same hymn sheet, so to speak. And that we have a common understanding of how we operate that would be helpful.

>> MARK: Forgive me, I haven't really had time to go through the draft charter line-by-line because of busy staff time. I will come back to it and see if I can suggest a tweak to remove the ambiguity that you mention.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That is helpful. As we said, the first draft didn't fly because of all that. The point you made, you know, that there are what the European Union likes to call.

(Non-English phrase.) of interest, that you don't have every member of the Dynamic Coalition are of the same interest, but every is interested in some subitem of the, but my suggestion would be that we park this discussion and we encourage you all again to go through it and give your comments. And maybe we can then present the next slightly updated version for the next call. And Wout in the chat also suggested a three strikes out clause here as well. How long can a DC member remain inactive.

That's fine.

But would you agree that for the time being we try to park it and we invite you to provide comments for us to review the draft in time for the next call. Would that be a fair assumption?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus, I raised my hand, if I may.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry, I didn't see that.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Just to say that it needs to be comprehensive and precise in the wording but also we need a bit of, I believe, flexibility in the phrasing of the charter. And when I get back to that paragraph that we have just been talking about, I think it is fair enough to encourage members of dynamics Dynamic Coalitions to attend monthly meetings organised by the Dynamic Coalitions coordination group. We just encourage

them. No one is obliged. I don't think we have to expect that from all of the dynamics more than 20 and each of their ten to 30 Members that they will all swamp to the monthly meetings, so I do think that enough to encourage them to take part in their meetings. And if a Dynamic Coalition is in the meeting with their members just out of their interest. In the work of the coordination, then that would be fine with me.

So not to be too district in the phrasing of the charter having a bit of flexibility of the Dynamic Coalitions to decide on their own whether only one representative will be in the meeting or two or three members will join.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: (on mute.)

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Markus, if Jutta has finished, Mark just mentioned under 3, the membership governance. It is far less ambiguous under 2b. There it says a Coordinator may not be present, they can appoint an official representative. That is what we mean under 3b as well. Because then it is covered.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: (on mute.)

>> JUTTA CROLL: Maybe we have lost Markus? We can't hear you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That is because I muted myself. I had to cough.

(Laughter.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I said yes, that maybe we don't actually need to change. We can leave it, if you read it again, the concerns are actually taken care of. We do say we want the Dynamic Coalition to participate in the coordination group and encourage as many as possible to participate.

And Eleonora in the chat said it was never actually restricted. The meetings are open-ended. If you want to attend two or three per Dynamic Coalition you are most welcome to do so.

Again, it is helpful to have this discussion. I would encourage you again to go through it, provide your comments and I think one new element that came up was actually that we also limit the duration of how long a Dynamic Coalition can be listed on the website as inactive. If after three years, that is something which was introduced by Wout. And it is definitely worth considering should we set a limit to how many.

Wout's proposal is that three strikes out. If you have not been active for three years, then you are out of, you are not listed anymore as inactive, but you are canceled from the website. That is something for your consideration.

Right. Can we now park the charter and leave that for your further scrutiny and bring it up at the next call again? It is an iterative process that will not go down in circles, but it

goes up in spirals. We end up at the higher level of commonality after each iteration.

If there are no further comments on this Agenda Item, I would suggest that we move to the intersessional event. Now, good news is that the Secretariat has proposed it also more in detail the concept note to the MAG chair, who has reacted very positively to the intersessional event. So I think it will be part of the Secretariat's agenda, proposed agenda for the next open consultation MAG meeting.

Eleonora, can I hand over to you on explaining a little, providing insight in where we are with the intersessional event?

You may recall that in the concept note we set the deadline of 30th of April. But that maybe was too ambitious because the other best practice Forums and policy networks were just about information and not sure whether or not they have actually signed up. But Eleonora, can you give us an overview?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Sure, yes, thank you, Markus. I think what you mentioned is already quite important, that the MAG chair is in approval with this idea. And thinks that it would be great to have as part of the MAG meeting on the open consultations day. Most likely scheduled for the afternoon of the open consultations day.

We will be introducing it to the full MAG on our next virtual call next week with the MAG.

So it will be reviewed and approved as part of the overall agenda for the face-to-face MAG meeting.

On the deadline, as you were saying, Markus, it was set for the 30th of April. That may have been a little bit restrictive. Nevertheless, we did see good up take on the sign-up sheet. We have many people who have volunteered to be presenters for this event across the intersessional spectrum, including many NRIs. And I saw that we have five DCs who have signed up. DCAD, DC Powell, that is public action in libraries. The Internet standards coalition and the youth coalition.

So for any other representatives of coalitions present here, you still have the opportunity to sign up and join your DC colleagues. I think what we will do is actually eliminate the deadline and allow people to join on a rolling basis.

But those who have signed up early and clearly stated that they would like to be presenters during this intersessional event, the Secretariat will start reaching out to you. And proposing that you get together with others who have signed up for the programme theme. We will help you organise into Working Groups to start discussing the themes.

I'm seeing in the chat a request for the sign-up sheet. I will share that right now.

But the takeaway here is that there has been very good uptake on the intersessional event. We were pleased to see that. It was intended as a cross-intersessional collaboration. That's really what you have in this sign-up sheet. Members of NRI and DCs and although the best practice Forums and networks have only gotten just off the ground, we have Wim de Gazelle who has been involved with both of those communities for many years. He is very much on board with the intersessional event. Through him, I think we can without too much difficulty grab some people from both BPFs and the positively networks to participate in that as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Eleonora, for this update. I think the two points to remember, it is good to have the support of the MAG chair on this. And I personally also think it is a very good initiative to bring together the various components of the IGF ecosystem to provide input into the main sessions and bring in their expertise.

And the second element that we actually forget about the deadline and we allow the signing up on an ongoing basis leading up to the meeting in July. Also the good news that there has also been some active signing up and in particular from the NRIs, which is I think very helpful.

Are there questions or comments?

If not I would definitely encourage all the DCs again to look at it and sign up.

Mark, your hand is up. Yes.

>> MARK: Yes. Thank you, Markus. Well, this is excellent to hear from Eleonora that there has been support expressed for this and it is checking out very well. And I just one -- shaping up very well. I wonder also what documentation or process around it there is. When I say documentation, I mean, when the concept of this intersessional meeting came up, I thought it would be a valuable opportunity for all intersessional activities including Dynamic Coalitions to flag. This is where we are in our work and this is the direction we are taking up to the IGF event this year in Kyoto and what we will be announcing, publishing, whatever. So it's an opportunity, a kind of window for the Dynamic Coalitions to broadcast to the wider IGF community to other intersessional activities like the policy networks and DCFs, where they are and what they are doing and what it is leading to in terms of in some cases tangible outcomes. That can be before the leadership panel as well as the MAG and other leading actors in the IGF community.

Potential advocacy.

So it is not possible for all 25 Dynamic Coalitions to be present to speak. The time is not sufficient for that. But if

they have the opportunity to sort of put in a one-pager into a briefing document or an issues document or something like that, at the time of the intersessional, that then provides them with some visibility if they are not actually speaking and presenting.

And that input would be, as I say, this is our progress. This is our milestone on the way to Kyoto and what we plan to do in Kyoto, announcing, publishing, resolving a theme, whatever their objective is.

And then the process question I have is, well, what will flow from the intersessional in terms of reporting or would it just end on the day? Or will there be some sort of way of communicating the key messages from the intersessional which all have to help develop.

This is -- forgive me if this has been considered already and found to be too resource intensive, but I think it is important for this to be a process rather than just a standalone event. Otherwise the momentum of its impact will be lost.

Yeah. So those are my thoughts.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well.

>> MARK CARVELL: You can do whatever you want to do.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. I think it was, the idea came from the Dynamic Coalitions, but the idea was also to bring together all the other components of the IGF ecosystem and when discussing it with the Secretariat the idea then was let's turn it around and make it part of the programme shaping.

So the intersessional work would provide input into the MAG meeting. Here we are discussing the main themes as defined by the MAG from the perspective of the various components of the IGF ecosystem. And we would present it on the following day. The MAG would then discuss how to approach the main themes and the MAG in its wisdom, MAG members in their wisdom may then say, hang on, what we heard from the day before from the intersessional meeting was brilliant. Why don't we ask these guys, for instance, to help us with shaping the main session on this particular issue. That was the main idea behind this idea to make it as part of a process or shaping the IGF meeting in Kyoto.

And bring up front what the DCs, the NRIs, the BF Fs have to contribute to these main sessions. I mean, we had in the past maybe a main session on security and at the same time the about BFFs on security. There was very little linkage between the two. And with this hopefully with this concept, there will be a better linkage between the various components.

And so far, as Eleonora said, the buy-in, especially from the NRIs, it has proved very difficult to bring the NRIs into the main. They had their own sessions where they compare

themselves, but to bring them into the main session has always been very difficult. The same with the DCs as well.

The hope was with this concept there might be a better connection. Now, whether it will work or not. But so far judging by what Eleonora has said, there are positive signs.

Also the fact that the MAG chair thinks it is helpful, it always helps when there is support from above. Or an initiative. So all the suggestions you made, they are all very happy. We can provide all sorts of papers here. But the concept would be to make it a more dynamic process between not just based on the paper, but those are the MAG members will be there. They could participate and listen and they can listen to the input and have the intersessional meeting to provide what they have to discuss the following day.

It is an organic sequence of events. There are many papers floating around and not everybody reads all the papers.

Whereas if you are in a meeting you may be more attentive to listen if it is well presented. Or it is assuming that these groups do a good job. And then the challenge will be to make the presentation compelling enough that MAG members will listen and take note.

It is an opportunity. I hope I've answered your questions. I don't know whether any questions remain.

>> MARK: Well, I think we are on the same track here, which is, you know, breaking down the silos and establishing where mutual linkages, mutually beneficial linkages across the intersessional activities can be established.

That's certainly true.

I don't know, I just like the idea of us creating a kind of resource. But not a heavy load.

(Chuckles.)

>> MARK CARVELL: Because we are all so busy. But especially, I'm just mindful of coalitions that are not as fired up with integration as some are. Like I have been with Wout and ISVC, very keen on integration. But also those who are restricted by resources. But are able to contribute to a document and this is what we are doing. Contact us if it is of direct relevance to what you are doing.

We haven't got the capacity to speak or present at this intersessional meeting, but this is what we are doing. In the form of some contribution to a document. That was my thought.

Then that will be easy reference point for subsequent follow-up by the MAG, by the leadership panel. And the MAG chair and so on.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> MARK CARVELL: What is the Dynamic Coalition doing on standards? You can easily find it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Nothing prevents us from doing that. I see Maarten has his hand up. You are most welcome.

>> Thank you for that. Wise words, Mark. It is not about international speaking. It is seeking each other to collaborate.

Thank you, Mark, for sharing that Wim is helping the coalition network on AI, at some point? Because one of the binding themes, for instance, is AI. I think many of the Dynamic Coalitions will touch upon that. It seems to be very logical to work closely with the coalition network on that.

I've tried so far and haven't had a response that would help. So that is one thing.

If you can update me about when this, you expect this to start rolling, that would be great.

Second thing, of course, we have the sessions, and session proposals that bring us further. And as far as I am aware of other Dynamic Coalitions also working on IOT, I have been reaching out to them and see take they can be a part of that. I sent out an open invitation to those who may not have IoT as a priority. That may end up as a coalition between Walter, Mark, and Roget.

I think that is another thing. Last but not least I must say that there can be helpful for people to indicate, I find the pages on the integral Forum with the description of the DCs mostly illuminating. The only thing that isn't clear is when the last update was. Other than that, it brings a lot of information and it shows who are on target and who are a bit more just in a distance currently.

My first request is AI, when do you think that will start moving? The second thing, invite us all to look at the session proposals and the INCOF website and reach out effectively.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. My suggestion would be really sign up to the list on this document, which Eleonora has circulated. And which has each of the themes as defined by the MAG. There you can turn up with, join up with others.

And the other questions, I don't know, Eleonora, do you have a response? The policy networks are just about to get started so they are not yet -- I don't know who is assigned to which network. Eleonora?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We had to say this last time as well. We have to submit our proposals by Friday, end of this week. After that, it is very difficult to integrate it into the workshop proposals themselves.

But I see it also as an opportunity to really go across the board. And many DCs are affected by AI in particular, I think.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Markus? Sorry, may I jump in? I'm so sorry, because I have limited time before I have to get off

the call. I wanted to answer a couple of Maarten's questions and make a final point about the intersessional event.

So Maarten, good to see you again. Sorry, my camera is off. I'm a little bit sick today.

But anyway, for the policy network on AI, we have a new consultant who has come in. Her name is Miki. In fact, I'm speaking to her after this call. She is in the process of setting up the first call of the PIN AI. That is going to be widely publicized. I know that she is excited to get this off the ground. That is one point.

The second is you are hearing it here first because we have not widely disseminated the news yet, but the deadline for session proposals is extended beyond 19 May to 24 May, which is next Wednesday.

So you have five extra days. So I hope that that is a relief to some here who were planning to submit.

My final point on the intersessional event was just this. That it was really nice to hear from you, Markus, and from Maarten that really the emphasis should be on kind of cross-IGF component collaboration on integration. That really was the intent.

I will say that from the Secretariat perspective when we were first coming up with this, the vision was actually kind of triple purpose in that yes, integration was going to be a big objective in holding this kind of event. Not just transverse Allie in many ways across NRIs, intersessional groups and even the MAG in shaping the programme. But also as a kind of promotional event for the IGF programme itself.

I think this is going to be really the first opportunity that those who are coming and joining the open consultations will have to hear about the various programme themes. We have not really done a public dive into those themes. I think this is, you know, a chance for DC members, members of other intersessional groups to kinds of show off their expertise on the various issues and give people a sense of what to expect in the programme.

and then the third purpose would be, of course, what Mark was talking about a little bit is for intersessional groups to, you know, plug their own work a little bit. I think I can see that also being done perhaps in some written documentation that we share maybe in advance of the event. We can put links to various outputs and that sort of thing.

I see this event as fulfilling a lot of really great objectives: Integration, promoting the programme non-general to the public, and also for DCs and other intersessional groups to promote their own work.



So that is all I will say. I have to jump off now unfortunately. It was good to be here with you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Eleonora, for this. I hope, Maarten, that Eleonora has answered your questions.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We have five extra days to get in such with PN on AI.

(Chuckles.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Are there more questions and comments on the intersessional event?

(There is no response.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If not, I think I would like to conclude by saying please look at the list again and sign up to the sessions that are of relevance to your DC.

And to more DCs we have participating in this, the better. It will be up to each group forming themselves again in a bottom-up way to define their parameters and organise their input into the intersessional event.

We can take stock at our next call and see whether we can provide more guidance.

With that, if there are no more comments or questions on this Agenda Item, then the last remaining Agenda Item would be the contribution to the GDC. Mark was driving our common efforts. I would like to call on you to sum up a little bit of. You have followed it most closely and also checked the website of the tech envoy's office.

We have submitted the collective input provided by the DCs. And some DCs have provided their individual inputs.

Mark, can you update us on that?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Markus. Yes indeed. And our joint submission went in the supplementary information. It is listed as you go to the tech envoy's digital compact website you can see the formal list of all the submissions that were sent in the form of supplementary information.

There are about 180. So it is a hefty response, I think, for the tech envoy's team to get stuck into. I don't envy them. It is a huge volume of material.

The joint one went in and there were five individual Dynamic Coalitions' responses in that form. From the DC on network neutrality, one on platform responsibility, the one on community connectivity. So those three Dynamic Coalitions which hadn't contributed to our joint one. I had no contact from them. The Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, they submitted one.

And the coalition that Bart and I work on on safety, IFDC, ours is in there as well.

Five individual ones. Of course, the joint one also included a section for the youth coalition because of their

substantive viewpoints. We agreed that we would highlight those points in a section in our joint submission.

And the joint submission I had contributions from half, I think, of four Dynamic Coalitions. So that was all very much appreciated.

That is the situation with the submissions. There may have been coalitions who responded only through the questionnaire survey form. Right, I don't have the data on that, how many coalitions simply entered in the survey form boxes that have taken form of that.

There maybe other contributions from other Dynamic Coalitions on that format. I don't have that. It is not easy to get it. You have to call throughout tech envoy site, I couldn't find an easy reference list of who responded only to the questionnaire.

I don't know if anybody else has done that. Okay. So that is the situation there.

Of course, the consultations conducted by the co-Facilitators in the form of deep dive sessions, they are continuing. There are four more to do and we have the dates for that. Do I have them handy?

On the 25th of May, coalitions might wish to note there will be two deep dives on digital trust and security. And on a and emerging technologies. One is in the morning, New York time. One is in the afternoon New York time.

And then on the 14th of June the final two. In the morning there will be global digital commons and in the afternoon accelerating process on the Sustainable Development Goals.

So those are the dates for the final consultations, the coalitions may wish to note and register for. They each have an individual registration link. If they are all directly addressed to your coalitions.

While we wait to see, there is publication towards the end of May. I had one date possibly the 25th of May of the policy brief. The Secretary-General's policy brief on the global digital compact. Look out for that.

And then, well, the next big session will be the ministerial meeting on the 18th of September. And that will be an issues paper published. Then we have to wait for the negotiations to start from the Member States in December due whenever, next year, the summit on the future on the 27th to the 24th of September next year.

We can continue to shout that all stakeholders should be engaged through at every stage right through to the summit. We have to see what the -- the final opportunity seems to be at the moment the 14th of June with the final deep dives.

That's where we are. We can, I think we should broadcast at every opportunity the fact that so many Dynamic Coalitions are committed to engaging in the GDC process. As we've seen with the consultations with and the inputs we've provided. Keep broadcasting that message. That Dynamic Coalitions generally are on board for the GDC process and wish to stay engaged. We'll follow it right through to the summit next year and beyond when it goes to implementation of the compact in terms of commitments by stakeholders and follow-up thematic work, whatever happens, whatever is decided at the summit.

I think those are all the main points that perhaps are helpful for our surface dive. Markus, have I missed anything?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. That was very comprehensive. As a matter of information, I also when I submitted the DC contribution, I also filled in the questionnaire, the online questionnaire. So I did both.

But as you said, they are not that easy to check. The submission process is much easier than the.

Celine, could you send out a reminder of the deep dives to encourage the DCs to response.

>> Celine: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: At this point there is not much we can do but participate in the deep dives.

>> Celine: We have a question from Daniel in the chat.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Is there a point person to take envoy's office to engage -- there is not, but the tech envoy himself, at least he participated in the DC main session in Addis. He seems to be quite encouraging.

Mark, any inside information that you have?

>> MARK CARVELL: You're right, there have been changes in the tech envoy's office. There isn't a single point of contact in terms of the DCs. As Markus said, our end point of contact is the tech envoy himself. The thought occurs to me, actually, that we might invite him to attend a DCCG meeting.

To one of our future meetings so we can enforce the key message that I described earlier. That DCs are fully on board with the GDC process and want to stay on board. And maybe we would get some further advice.

I'm also mind full that in Addis Almendein (?) was energized by the youth coalition. I remember that. His response in particular in reference to the youth coalition. During our main session on Dynamic Coalitions in Addis last year.

So I think it is, you know, we might want to invite him to join us for a further exchange about the GDC process and how the DCs can continue to engage. That's the thought I have, for your consideration.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, thank you.

Well, we don't know yet -- I mean, he was not at the meeting in Vienna, the high level -- what is it called? The High Level Panel. Many people are surprised, we thought he would be there as the tech envoy. But he was not.

The question is, will he be in Geneva in July? I think that will be a good opportunity to exchange with him and have the intersessional. But we can also consider inviting to a call. Not sure whether he would respond to that. But let's find out. The question is, we did say -- I think it was good to say that we wanted 90 minutes for our slot. It is what, 60 minutes is just a little bit too short. We don't need to fill 90 minutes just for the sake of it. But yeah, a little bit more time.

The question is, we did say we wanted to fix the slots long time in advance. So a month from now would be 17th of June, the 17th of June is a Saturday. I presume that would not be a good thing to do.

Could we go for 6, Friday is maybe not the best day either.

Could we name for the 15th of June? Would that be acceptable, if we fix it right now? Do we need to send out a doodle poll?

Just a tentative sounding whether we could fix.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I do think it is better to have a doodle poll because not all Dynamic Coalitions are here now on the call.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Fifteenth is also the ICANN meeting.

>> ADAM: That is what I was going to say also and that is where Lisa and I will be. Hello. Yes, Maarten.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It would be will the following week?

>> ADAM: That is Euro dig, so we will all be in different sessions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hmm, hmm, hmm, hmm.

That goes from 19th to 21st, yes. Twenty-two, is that too early after? You still will be traveling back? Could we make it on the 23rd?

Which week? Should we put it that way? Jutta says it's best to send out a doodle poll.

>> JUTTA CROLL: From today on it would be the 14th, I think, if we go for four weeks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: But that is the ICANN meeting that week.

>> JUTTA CROLL: That is also the ICANN meeting, okay, the entire week.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The following week is Euro digital compact meeting.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Markus, I have my hand up. As we need to organise and coordinate on the Special Session at MAG meeting, maybe it is better to do one two or three weeks from

now and have another one in the week before the MAG meeting so that we have everything under control.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That was my other question. Do we need two meetings instead of one ahead of the MAG meeting.

So we could in theory then try and go for a meeting during the week starting on June 5th.

And have maybe then another meeting on June 26th or July 3rd.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Makes sense.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Can we ask Celine to send out a doodle poll for the week starting June 5th?

>> Celine: Absolutely.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent.

With that, then I think we can conclude the meeting.

Oh, and we have in the chat, the tech envoy will be in Geneva. That is good news. So we have an opportunity to connect there with the tech envoy in July. So with that, then -

-

>> WOUT de NATRIS: Can I make one short comment, Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> WOUT de NATRIS: We still have a few minutes. What I would like to reflect on is the discussion that we started in January last year and where we are now with, where we are recognizing DCs, the special meeting we have, the meeting with the tech envoy, everything that happened in between.

I think that we have almost a full circle from what we intended and started to discuss a year ago. I wanted to reflect on that. That we made tremendous progress here as Dynamic Coalitions with your assistance, with Mark putting a lot of things into writing and with the support of most Dynamic Coalitions we are definitely moving ahead and getting more recognition for the work that all Dynamic Coalitions are doing.

And I think that is something that is worth notices and also to say thank you to all that have been active in spreading the word. Let me stop just there for now and let's reflect on that for one moment.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. It is always good to celebrate success.

(Chuckles.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, it is true that we have come a long way. Again we had this collective work, which resulted in a paper which is still on the website which did not come to conclusion. It has issues to be raised and the charter very much builds on that. That is the part of collective discussions and it was part of surveys the Secretariat did with Dynamic Coalitions, what could be improved here, what could be improved there.

Obviously, there is no 11 size fits all solutions for such a varied group of organisations as the Dynamic Coalitions are. It is complex environments, but let's try to herd the cats and make them move in the right direction.

I think we have come a long way.

With that, can I give you back five minutes of your life?

Thank you very much. We will wait for the doodle poll then.  
Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

(Chorus of thank you and goodbye.)

(The meeting concluded.)

(Realtime captioner signing off.)

This is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is 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.