

RAW FILE

DYNAMIC COALITIONS COORDINATION GROUP MEETING 90  
NOVEMBER 8, 2024  
11:30 A.M. CT

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
Monument, CO 80132  
719-481-9835  
[www.captionfirst.com](http://www.captionfirst.com)

This text 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.

>> Hi, everyone.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, everyone! Markus here. It's still a bit early, so let's wait for others to join.  
>> Mm-hmm.  
>> AMALI: Hi, there! Good morning from here. Thank you! It's Amali.  
>> Hello.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello!  
>> AMALI: Hi. Thank you for arranging the time. Thank you for this one. Thank you.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's still early for you, isn't it?  
>> AMALI: Yes, yes. It's about 7:30 or so, yes.  
>> IGF SECRETARIAT: I hope it's still workable.  
>> AMALI: Oh, it's very good, yeah. Thank you.  
>> IGF SECRETARIAT: Thank you, thank you.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, anything before 6:00 is really a bit difficult.  
>> AMALI: (Laughing) It's actually the middle of the night. Anything from 5:00 onwards is okay for me, but it's when it goes 3:30 on.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, no, yeah. I agree there totally. Well, the same after midnight.  
>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Exactly. Very early hours.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: For me, after 10:00 in the evening and before 6:00 in the morning is a no-go zone, so.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Roman, can you actually put up the agenda in the chat?  
>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, yes, I will, definitely, when it starts, for everyone to see.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Still a few minutes to go, and I think Jutta will not be able to join before. She has another competing commitment till half past 4:00 Central European Time, so.  
>> IGF SECRETARIAT: Hi, everyone. So, I guess we will need to wait for a couple more pins.  
>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, Roman.  
>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Hi.  
>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's 1630 on my computer, which is the given time for our meeting to start, but as Roman said, we may as well wait another minute or two, waiting for more people to join us.  
>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, great.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And Roman, you may want to change your name to say "Roman" instead of "IGF Secretariat," which you are, but...

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, noted.

>> Roman, could you allow me to change my name as well? Because I'm with the name of my organization, and it's not possible to change that.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Oh, it's possible now! Thank you. Wonderful.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay, with more people joined us, maybe it's time to start. Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Okay, let's start. And Jutta is here. I was slightly nervous, as she said she had an overlapping meeting, but she is here and she will lead the agenda item 2, the DC main session, as she kindly agreed to coordinate the preparation of the main session. So, we have a draft agenda ahead of us, and we already have a comment by Mark, who would like under Any Other Business, to raise the consultations by the IGF MAG Strategy Group on the letter from WSIS+20 and IGF vision paper. So, that would be under Any Other Business. We discussed that in the strategy meeting, as the point was raised then, but the agenda was already out for this meeting, so the only way to deal with it will be under Any Other Business. With that amendment or adjustment or specification for AOB, can we agree with the draft agenda as proposed? I'm not hearing any objection. I will take it that we agree and adopt the draft agenda as proposed with the addition of WSIS+20 letter and IGF vision paper proposed by the IGF MAG Strategy Group.

And with that, we go to agenda item number 2. That is the DC main session, and over to you, Jutta. We had the first prep meeting on that main session last Friday, and you informed the Coordination Group on that. Over to you. Please, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus. I may not be able to speak much today, so I am trying to do my very best to moderate that part of our meeting. I also had hoped that more people would join the call today, because it's more or less only a few more than had met on Friday to prepare for this session, but nonetheless, we've got already some comments in the Google Doc. And Roman, could you please put the link to the Google Doc also in the chat?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I just did, yes.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Wonderful, it's there. I scrolled down. Yes.

So, referring to the preparations of the main session, we have agreed on a title, previously, with the whole group. That is that we are aiming for a main session called "Contributing to the Global Digital Compact: The IGF's dynamic community support for sustainable digital development." And you will, if you listen exactly or have a look at the Google Doc, you will see that it's asking for the dynamic community. So, it's not a single Dynamic Coalition. It's not 32 Dynamic Coalitions, but it's the dynamic community. That means all of us, more or less.

And the co-facilitator for this session is Jaoa, who had prepared for our meeting on Friday this fantastic table. If you scroll down to the Google Docs page, I think it's the fourth page, then you will see that we have tried to sort the Dynamic Coalitions to the five key objectives of the Global Digital Compact. And there, you will find, or may find the names of several Dynamic Coalitions that the preparation group on Friday thought they might fit under these key objectives of the DCCG,

but we have to bear in mind that the main focus of the session is how could Internet governance be improved in this exercise. So, each Dynamic Coalition that's named here or wants to be named here needs to try to answer, how is the work of the Dynamic Coalition related to the improvement of Internet governance? And I think this would be a good point to open up for the discussion with the representatives of Dynamic Coalitions who are already here with us in the room. Whether you have questions on the concept for the main session of Dynamic Coalitions or whether you have further comments to that. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jutta. And your voice is perfectly okay, so we expect more from you to come. Anybody would like to come in at this point, ask questions, make comments? And there were other people on this call who are part of small group. Yes, Judith, I was thinking of you. Please, you have your hand up.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, but Mark Cornell was first.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, Mark, then Judith, then Maarten.

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you, Markus. Hi, everybody. Thank you to Jutta and team for putting this together, for all their hard work. It's much appreciated, I'm sure, by everybody in the Dynamic Coalitions. I just queried, first of all, the title, when it refers to dynamic community. That seems a little bit odd to me. I know what you're intending. You want to ensure that this relates to all stakeholders involved in Dynamic Coalitions. So, in doc community will strike newcomers as something, "What's all that?"

I would suggest, albeit it's slightly longer -- I mean, you could say "the community of dynamic coalitions." Maybe that's the way to put it. "Dynamic community" will raise queries, I think, on that.

So, while I've got the mic, the allocation of Dynamic Coalitions under specific objectives, IS3C, which I'm working with Vout, and he may want to come in with this as well -- he's on the call. Our main blockers, really, in the whole GDC agenda is under fostering a safe, secure, and inclusive digital space that upholds human rights. This is because our focus is on security, which ensures that we achieve a more secure and safer world for Internet users who will not feel inhibited from participating in the Internet world and also in the knowledge that they will be treated equally and fairly and with due respect. That's really a core element of our mission in IS3C. So, as I say, Vout may want to come in this as the coordinator of IS3C. We should be there.

Data governance, we've done a bit of work on that, because that's where we're listed at the moment, under 4. But we really haven't got a strong locus on that particular topic at this time. Those are my initial comments. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Mark. Just for my understanding, you're essentially asking to be shifted from one slot into another, yeah, correct?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, that's right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: But the second, another question on your comment on the dynamic community, as you're a native English speaker, is that, just to know, do you also react from the English grammar understanding point of view. You said it sounds awkward to you.

>> MARK CARVELL: It does, because it's not a term, and the community is not described in the title. I mean, the community

we're talking about is all stakeholders who are volunteering their time to participate in year-round Dynamic Coalitions, so I think we need to explain in the title what --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> MARK CARVELL: -- what the community is. So, that's why I'm saying "community of Dynamic Coalitions."

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Judith is next.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, it's Judith Hellerstein of DCAD. I was on the call on Friday. One of the problems we're also having is how do we get enough coverage in each of them so that we have at least four groups in each bucket? So, that may be why we put you in there with governors because we know you've done some work there and we didn't have enough people and we had enough in the other one, but that's another side point.

So, yes, as I was talking about the other thing, this is also why the DCAD was also in two areas, but we moved into the digital inclusion because we want that. Most of our work is about inclusion and ensuring benefits for all, even though a good chunk of our work is on connectivity. And we brought up the problems with libraries not having the right software for persons with disabilities, but also, Dr. Shabeer mentioned to me that he's having a general problem with -- which is also a digital inclusion issue -- with libraries' management systems which are not accessible for persons with screen readers. So, that also falls -- a lot of our issues fall -- can be catalyzed under digital inclusion, which is why we're there, but we're also falling in other ones.

But my other question was, is on, once we arrive at those coalitions in there, how do each of those coalitions decide who is a speaker? We spoke about criteria, whether coalitions who are new, who haven't really done much, will get their points across but may not get a speaking role, and have the main speaker chosen by the community by other criteria within the groups that the group can nominate the person to speak, provided they speak on all the points that -- everyone sends in their talking points. But is there some sort of criteria of choosing the person who's going to be speaking? So, that was my question. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Martin?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sorry for missing the meeting Friday. Traveling too much. I'm generally happy with this. The key, what we try to do, as contribute to, I would say even the title, that is to get clear on how global good practice looks like. For me, the focus is on IoT. And I can imagine that maybe we can make that also a kind of overarching team for here, how the global good practice looks like for each of these five sub-teams. What should we consider?

Having said that, happy to be in the AI part because emerging technologies is one of the things we look out for IoT, so I'm not challenging that. And yeah, willing to have a speaker and also willing to support another speaker by a contribution in text, if that is the best way forward. But how to organize that is something I'm not clear on. Maybe there is already clarity that I missed.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Amali?

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Thank you, yes, we are okay with where we fall in. And what I do realize is our group falls in all those areas. So you know, this year it may be this area because this is a focus of work, but in another year, it can be another area. So, I think we are very broad in terms of the

categories we can fall under.

I just wanted to say, for ourselves, we are about inclusion, we are about dealing with vulnerable people, and we are about assessing risk and harms, and that really has been a focus for us, and that leading to then the quality of data and how it's operated. So, just wanted to share that we deal very much with sort of vulnerable groups. In our case, it's patients and patient families, and then trying to actually increase health care into rural areas so that more people can have access to health care. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Back to you, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. Thank you, Markus, and thank you for all your input. First of all, let me say, in regard of the title, the dynamic communities, I really like it. Also, I am not a native speaker, but it was said in one of our previous calls. It's not the decision that was made on Friday, that we already had that title. I'm not sure. We can have a look at the minutes, when the title was decided on.

And secondly, still, referring to all the input that you have given, be it that you think you are sorted to the right bucket or to the wrong bucket. I really would like to emphasize that it's not -- the decision was not taken -- or the suggestion, I would say, because at this point it's only draft sorting to the buckets. It was not based on exactly what work you are doing. Many of the dynamic coalitions do bring forward something to each of these key objectives of the Global Digital Compact. So, we try to sort the dynamic coalitions to that bucket, where they can play an important role in regard of improvement of Internet governance.

And I do think that it was a suggestion from Rajendra, if I'm not mistaken -- correct me if I'm wrong -- to say Dynamic Coalitions 3S would fit into that, into that bucket. It's not like we said, okay, we must have them, and let's see where they fit in, in this one or in that one. It was because someone thought you might be able to bring forward under that key objective how Internet governance could be improved. And I would like you to bear that in mind, to all of you. Now we have much more participants in the room, and maybe we have also some more comments.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Jutta, if I can add. One of the things was that we should try to see most active people in this. And I have seen always, that's why I said, Mark, you know, has been very vocal and both have been there. And we have seen -- we tried to put into the best of our knowledge in the last call, but as said in this call, those who feel that they need changes, it can be done with their input sop, so nothing final. It is our initial thoughts, but I'm sure it will evolve into a good one, with everyone's input.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Amali, please. You are next. Sorry, Markus.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Sorry, that's an old hand. But I do just want to say, with Mark's comment there, I do 100% agree with him.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry, that is about the title?

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Yes. Yes, Markus. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Well, I think nothing -- you know, even if you agreed upon that earlier, you can still revisit, and essentially, it's a draft, and we can still do some fine tuning. But I think some important points Jutta made were that we do not look just at the work of the dynamic coalitions, but

on each of these headings. Whoever will be the speaker should not speak on behalf of his or her Dynamic Coalition but on behalf of all the Dynamic Coalitions listed under that heading, what they can contribute to improving the Internet governance, the global governance of these areas, or as Maarten said, what are the good practices in these areas. So, it's not a beauty show of dynamic coalitions here, but it's more of a contribution to a broader objective. Jute jute maybe --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus, maybe we should remind of the time we have for the main session. We shouldn't take for granted that everybody has remembered that we only have 75 minutes. We would need definitely an introduction to the session. And if you have a look at the Google Doc, we have foreseen 40 minutes for these five themes or five key objectives. So, each speaker was selected to speak for that key objective, would need to bring in this, I would say seven to eight minutes, at a maximum. We couldn't overdraw, so we only would have seven minutes for each speaker. Then we have to change to the next speaker, so it's a very tight, tight time frame, and that makes it necessary to focus on the contribution to improving Internet governance. That is like a joint effort of all these Dynamic Coalitions that are listed there.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. It's always good to be reminded of the time constraints. And okay, you can say a lot in seven, eight minutes, but again, also to avoid misunderstandings, if there are four or five Dynamic Coalitions listed, it doesn't mean that each of them will have a speaker, but there will be a speaker chosen. And how we want to go about -- should we leave it to the Dynamic Coalitions listed there to agree on who will represent these Dynamic Coalitions, or do we want to do it, leave it to the steering group headed by Jutta, be that as it may? But just to make sure that we all have a common understanding. There will be one speaker for four or five Dynamic Coalitions, and the speaker should try to bring in all -- represent all the Dynamic Coalitions listed under that heading, not just speak for his or her Dynamic Coalitions.

And I see hands up. Jutta, Judith, and Amali. Judith first.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, it's Judith Hellerstein. So, one of the things we discussed also in the meeting on Friday was that in the steering group, we, in deciding about who would be the main speaker and bring out the point of all the other DCs in them, we would look at maybe focusing, not having the main speaker be a new coalition or a coalition who's not fairly active, but have them give talking points to the main -- for each coalition to the person, the main speaker, who will be chosen. And I don't know whether it's how we will do it. And maybe Rajendra pointed out that we should check who will be there in Riyadh.

But one of the other topics we discussed is how many of our speakers do we want to be remote, or how many in person? And how will that work? And so, I don't know if all these are going to be decided by the core group, or are they going to be decided here? And we, in figuring out of how we are going to have this. So, that's my thought on those issues. So, I would like some more clarity of how we're going to be deciding who in each group is going to be the nominate the speaker. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. There have been comments also in the chat, and we have some more hands up, Amali and

Dino. Amali first.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Thank you. This is Amali. I want to say, we have Dr. Espinoza on site, so we can provide that onsite presence from our group, if needed. He's also very experienced and has been with MAG and so forth, and very active in our group.

And also, I just wanted to say that we can send in a paragraph, a summary paragraph of the points we think are important. And I think we should do that from each of the Dynamic Coalitions to the speaker for our area so they have some background, and you know, some understanding of our vision and so forth, because we just have so much content out there. So, I think that should be part of it, that the leader for each of the groups reads this paragraph from the three or four Dynamic Coalitions that form the group, please. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Dino, then Mark.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you, Markus. I wanted to make a comment. I understand clearly the distinction that is being made, vis-a-vis speaking/presenting on behalf of Dynamic Coalition as a group and not necessarily as a single Dynamic Coalition. However, I just wanted to clarify.

So, in my case, in our case, although, of course, we are collaborating extensively with Professor Rajendra and the Dynamic Coalition that he leads, and also with the Internet security, but our emphasis is being really on multi-stakeholderism, on making sure that whatever we do in our Dynamic Coalition, we put emphasis in representing and joining, involving many other actors in representation -- Civil Society of a member state, technical community, so forth. I don't know whether these are complementing each other or if the focus is only on speaking on behalf of the other Dynamic Coalition as a group.

The second thing I just wanted to confirm, I will also be attending in person. I would be in Riyadh during the event. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, I think the physical presence in Riyadh should not be a prerequisite, but we need to have a balance. We cannot have all remote participants speaking or all physical presence in Riyadh speaking. It would be good to have a good balance. And I think Mark also has some criteria in regards to presence and remote participants. I think that was also seen in past IGF meetings. If you have too many remote participants, it's not good either, but we have to be aware that not everybody will be able to travel to Riyadh. Mark and then Maarten.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I just wanted to comment also about the members of each group, working together to define their messages, in relation to the goals set out in the paper, which I think the goals are very good. What are they? The four goals. Which I think, you know, if each group can prepare beforehand an outline of their message from their group discussion, led by their leader of the group, with bearing in mind the goals, clear, short, concise messages. And these goals, as set out in the document, relate, first of all, to the Global Digital Compact itself, its commitments and specific areas of action, which the Dynamic Coalitions are saying, look, we're doing work on those particular commitments in the Global Digital Compact, and this is the kind of output we're producing, we have produced and are going to continue producing. That will be a very strong message about how Dynamic Coalitions work within

this environment.

And you know, some expression of -- these are experts coming together. They are the expertise that can be drawn on by the GDC process.

And then, as Jutta's saying, a broader message about how this group of Dynamic Coalitions on that particular objective are actually delivering on Internet governance principles and improving through their work, through the model of the Dynamic Coalition, they are enacting effective Internet governance. That's a strong message. And how greater integration, coordination, strategic planning that will involve contributions from Dynamic Coalitions will even further strengthen the multi-stakeholder model. So, if the groups can bear these very high-level objectives in mind, relating to the GDC and the future of the Internet governance multi-stakeholder model, as captured within the whole idea of ecosystem, that will be a very effective result from the main session.

I hope I've made my point clear. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Maarten.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Great setup. I think the selecting criteria would be that the speaker or the coordinator of each of these areas is able and willing to collect the input, reflect on the input, and sent the kind of draft on the topic back to his little group, I think that would support inclusiveness. Yes, it's demanding, but that's the extra bit that I think the person who is there to speak should take upon herself or himself.

For me, early assignment of these five themes to the five speakers, "coordinators" would be important, because time flies.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you so much, Maarten. Also very important to know that we need to be quick now. My suggestion would be, as I have already written in the chat, that after this call, we have not all the Dynamic Coalitions that are listed in the Google Doc here in the call, so it's necessary to inform them all again and call them to action within a very short term of time to say who will be speaking for that, for that main objective, one of the five.

And then, what I could imagine -- I do think it's a very good idea what Mark said, that we need them to prepare something that they will bring into the main session. This is also necessary for the person or the two people that we will recommend to be moderators. We have not yet discussed that, and I think we will have a little bit of time. But once these moderators know about the session and about the really strong time constraints, it will be really helpful for them to understand that, how the run of show will be in that session.

So, what I could imagine is that we prepare some kind of a very short, small template that for each of the group will follow with their content, with their information for the session, so it's a bit more structured. And the moderator, once the information is filled in by the group. Then it's up to the coordinator or the speaker of that group of four or five Dynamic Coalitions to organize how he or she will get the input to this -- a template might be too big a word for that, but a very short, structured paper, whether they can put in their input to this session that they will bring forward within their seven minutes they have.

Without, Wout, you have a comment.

>> WOUT: Yes. I have a bad cough, so I could go into a coughing fit. Please excuse that if it happens. What I was



wondering is we have not discussed having speakers or whatever, and there are some Dynamic Coalitions mentioned that are seldom or if ever present on these calls, so how do we decide who speaks? Because some of these people we don't even know, at least I don't know them. And if you start coordinating, you might have an issue.

And we don't have weeks. It's five weeks, and we've already travel. So, we're waiting for people to volunteer. May also lead to a lot of loss of time. So, I'm wondering how are we going to cut corners here? Because we can't afford to wait two, three weeks.

>> JUTTA CROLL: No, definitely not. But I think that the call and the email we had on Friday has cost now 15 people at least to attend this call today. So, when it comes to being part of a main session, being able to speak there, I think it's even more seems to be important to the people. So, if you set maybe one week till the four to five Dynamic Coalitions in one bucket have to agree and name their speaker, because we also want to put the names of the speakers on the session description on the website, then I do think that that's enough.

I don't think we should pick speakers without giving people at least the opportunity to decide who will be speaking for each of the key objectives. So, if we take one week, and then, of course, we wouldn't need in the run-up to the IGF, we will need another call where we then can discuss who will be the moderators of the main session of the Dynamic Coalitions, which is not yet on our agenda for today, and I do think we also -- looking to Markus -- we need to close the debate on this approach to the main session, I think, because we have other issues on the agenda, as well, and we have 24 minutes left for these other issues.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Actually, correction. We set aside 90 minutes for the call, so.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Oh, wonderful!

>> MARKUS KUMMER: A little bit more time. And yes, preparing the main session is our main purpose of this call. Just, there will be a MAG call a week tomorrow, it will be good to be a little bit closer to have more closer concept by next Tuesday, when you have to report back to the MAG of where we are. So, can we give a deadline, next Monday, that we have the short papers? And I think we don't need to over-engineer. If you have a half page, a few bullet points of what you just said, what is each Dynamic Coalition's main contribution towards the GDC and again, that should not take that long for people who work on these issues all the time, and not asking for a very elaborate, long paper, but just to give a few bullet points, what are the three main points or five main points DC would contribute towards that objective.

And my question is now, do you want to leave it to each of these groups of DCs under each heading to sort themselves out in a bottom-up way, or do you want to be more authoritarian and impose somebody who will be then the speaker?

>> JUTTA CROLL: It would not be my preference to be authoritarian. I do think, if it's four to five Dynamic Coalitions, it should be possible to decide among themselves. And I've followed the chat. We have several volunteers already naming themselves, and it's quite a bit difficult. If one Dynamic Coalition is volunteering here in the call, while the three or two other Dynamic Coalitions who are sorted to the same two main objective are not in the call, then

I would not feel very comfortable to decide right now and select those who have volunteered here in this call. I prefer to send out an email to the list after this call, and then asking people to decide on their speaker and coordinator, within the time frame of one week. And then, also, the debates on these short papers that Markus, that you have mentioned, should be taken within that group and not by someone who is, I guess, organizing them. I'm pretty sure that Dynamic Coalitions are able to organize themselves.

And if one or two groups are reduced to only three who are active, like Wout mentioned, we have some listed who are not able to join the call or who have not been willing to join the call, then it's up to the other three or four who are left, if one or two skip out, to decide how to deal with that situation.

Definitely, no one can represent the Dynamic Coalition who is not willing to cooperate.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct. And actually, looking at the people present on this call, seems to be sort of a core group of the Dynamic Coalitions who actively participate also in the coordination activities. I don't think we should have problems finding qualified speakers. And I agree also with those who said we were not going to ask somebody we have never met or never heard about to be a speaker for a group of other Dynamic Coalitions, so we have to have a certain element of trust with the people who will be represented.

My other question is, the steering group you have been cheering, and you had a meeting. Will there be a need for more meetings of that group, or do you think you can do that in an online process?

>> JUTTA CROLL: I would prefer to have another call of the organizing group, but only after we have got some input from the Dynamic Coalitions, knowing whether they have been able to organize themselves or whether they need to be pushed a little bit in the right direction, then we can help to organize that. But at the moment, I would say it's necessary to have one more call, probably next week.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I was just going to say, maybe it would be after the MAG call, towards rather the end of the week or so, and hopefully, by then, you would have the input. Maarten, your hand is up.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If I would know who I should contact for the DCAIG, DCH and DC journalism, I'm very happy to reach out to them and talk to them to see how we could do it, but I have no idea how to reach them and send a mail to the general list is very unlikely to result in a lot of intensive feedback within a couple of days.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right. I think our face turn towards, Roman, can you help out with providing the email lists for these people, if asked for? Amali?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I think each of the Dynamic Coalitions have someone who is organizing or is responsible for the Dynamic Coalitions list. So, probably, these persons could also be addressed in that way. And Roman, you might be able to pick that out.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Roman, my request is, Dynamic Coalition, we have a Dr. Joao Gomez representing us, but I am the coordinator of the group. So, Roman, it'd be good if you could combine both lists so that we are all, in terms of writing the vision, I would like to do that. So, it would be good if you

can combine both lists and send it to the coordinators, as well as the team there, the steering Committee.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So, are we all set? We haven't --

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So, we've got the list? We've got the list of coordinators for DC, right? We get the list of email addresses? Because --

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. We try to get that from Luis, because he -- at least someone at the IGF Secretariat should know who is responsible for each of the Dynamic Coalitions' separate email list, so that it could go that way.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, that would be good. Definitely help. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Rajendra?

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: I was thinking with the five thematic areas, for each group, we could pick up a coordinator today, because otherwise, sending emails to everyone, you will get everyone volunteering. You will have one more week to get and choose finally, or either we will have Jutta take a call, who is going to coordinate. Because just imagine, you send out email. Three people respond from each group, "I volunteer." So, whom do you pick? There are three --

>> JUTTA CROLL: No, we don't pick. They need to agree among themselves. I don't feel up to deciding for four or five Dynamic Coalitions who will be their speaker. They need to decide among themselves.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: I'm not saying who will speak. I'm saying someone coordinates in this five-member Dynamic Coalitions to choose. So, what's the process going to look like? So, there's a mail going out from your mailbox that says, hey, look, this is the five DCs in these particular thematic areas. Who's going to speak? Just decide and let us know. So, just imagine, you know, that all of them either are getting on a call coordinated by Roman, that's one way to do. Or else there's an email trail that keeps going on, leading nowhere. It could be a possible at the end of the week, you will end up saying, okay, three out of five don't have anyone to speak. So, we've got to be clear about -- so, that's what I'm saying, if someone can coordinate in this call to say, we will coordinate with this four or five-member DCs, set up a call, and then let them choose whom they want to speak, but they get on a call, at least, because that could be a fair process to let the groups decide. So, that is the coordinator I am saying, not the speaker. So, someone coordinates this four or five-member DCs. That's what I was proposing.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I am willing to do that for group 5 without insisting I'm the speaker. But at least then I would know how to reach the other three. Otherwise, it's an endless process.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Thanks, Maarten. That's what I propose, for group 2, I could do. It totally depends. If somebody else is there, very happy to help.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you for the input. Maybe I have mistaken the volunteering in the chat for volunteering for being the speaker, and not for volunteering to be a coordinator. If these are all volunteers to coordinate, wonderful! That's really --

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: That's what I was saying. Otherwise, we will be talking same things.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. And Rajendra, I'm happy to

coordinate with you.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Fantastic. Awesome.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And since we're probably also the more active ones anyway who come to these, and we are doing our joint session with OER, so we could represent their views, too, since we are doing our joint session together with them. And I can work with the financial coalition Aiden Ferdilane, who is a new coalition, on what they want and get their points from them. So, we're happy to help with coordination of the group.

>> JUTTA CROLL: So, I'm just going through the list. I've seen that, who has -- I'm asking the five main objectives. Has someone volunteered for bridging digital divides and accelerating progress towards the SDGs?

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: I can volunteer to coordinate the discussion for that first objective.

>> JUTTA CROLL: That was Dino, right?

>> DINO: Yes, that's me. Apology.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I'm trying to put that directly into the document. I will just clean it up a bit. Dino for coordinator. I see Rajendra has volunteered for 2 and 5?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Well, Rajendra, if you want to take 5, we can take 2.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Absolutely, no problem. In 2, there are two DCs I represent, so I can coordinate with the rest, too. No problem.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Rajendra will take 5 and I'll take 2.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay, then I don't have to do 5.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, I wasn't realizing where you are, Maarten.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I volunteered earlier, but I'm very happy with Rajendra doing that.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I am, too.

>> JUTTA CROLL: So, we have a count of Judith --

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Judith or Shabeer.

>> JUTTA CROLL: For coordinator, I'm putting your name. Your speaker needs to be decided with the other Dynamic Coalitions in the same group, right?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I'll be coordinating, because I won't be speaking.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. Do we have a volunteer for the third bucket, for securing a safe and inclusive digital space that upholds human rights?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Jutta? Maybe...

>> JUTTA CROLL: I can do that, but I was looking for if someone has raised their hand, someone else. That would be -- I'd be happy to...

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't think they're here, though. That's the problem.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: This is Wout. Coming back to Mark's comments, I really don't think we have anything to contribute in bucket 4, because that's the only topic where we failed as a Dynamic Coalition. I won't go into details, but there's no report. There's no whatever. So, we have nothing really to contribute there.

I am willing to be a coordinator but would prefer to be going into the third bucket, but if you really insist that we should stay in 4, then I'll coordinate there, but we have a strong preference to be moved.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, Mark made that point, yes.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. So, then, I only see the option to shift one from the third bucket to the fourth bucket, and vice versa -- Internet standards, security and safety coalition to the third bucket. But it wouldn't be a good idea to have only three in the fourth bucket and five in the third bucket. So, I don't think we have someone here from the Dynamic Coalition on gender in Internet governance? What about Internet rights and principles coalition? Do we have someone here in the call?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I do not think so.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: The youth coalition could be in either, I would think.

>> MARK CARVELL: Can I just jump in on that for Maarten? It would look really good if we have a youth speaker in our main session. So, if there's nobody from the Youth Coalition --

>> JUTTA CROLL: No, we have the Youth Coalition -- we need them. It's just a question of whether they are in the fourth or in the third topic.

>> MARK CARVELL: Right, okay. No, I'm -- well, I'm just saying, you know, as a coordinator, a Youth Coalition coming forward as a coordinator would look really good politically. Thanks.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. So, I do think it was Joao who suggested to have them in the third bucket, talking about safety and security and inclusivity and about human rights, as well, which is definitely also the question of young people, so that was the basis for the suggestion to have them in the third bucket. And the question would be, if we change that, whether the Youth Coalition would be able to talk about advancing responsible, equitable, and interoperable data governance.

I would feel better if we leave the IS3C coalition in that bucket. Because like Rajendra said before, you have definitely to say something about that, and I don't think the Youth Coalition would feel very comfortable in the fourth.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Like I said, we don't have anything to say on data governance. We don't have a report. We never got anywhere with the lady who was the researcher, so that's the only thing I will say about it. But we have a lot to say on the others.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We do have a representative of Youth Coalition on the call. Marco, I think.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Olivier is here, also, I think.

>> MARKO PALOSKI: I am here instead of (?) so I joined on Friday but I continue with this conversation. This meeting because someone is not available anymore to join these calls. But yeah, it's a good decision, I mean, good discussion now where should we put as our coalition, I don't know, in the third bucket or in the fourth.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Maybe we can have a look again at the whole list. I'm trying to do the screen sharing so that we can see... that's the Dynamic Coalitions... let me see...

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Jutta, this is Amali. May I please make a comment?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, please, if you have a good idea.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: I think Joao may still classify as a youth. Referring to Mark's comment, group 4 can have a youth presence, but obviously not from the Youth DC, but we have a youth within our coalition, so we could approach it that way as well, if need be.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. Thank you for that suggestion. How could we go forward? I think we had already decided on Friday

that we would have the Youth Coalition definitely in the main session, and it's up to us now to decide how we can move forward.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: My two cents on that is if there is one DC, and that is Mark and who have strong feelings on that, have good arguments to say they cannot contribute much on the four, but all their work has been under 3, I think we should listen to them and shift them under that bucket and they could take on the coordination role for bucket 3. Which leaves us with bucket 4, we don't yet have a volunteer there. The question is, would the Youth Coalition be willing to take on that role or not? If not, who else could possibly be? But we could also leave that open and take it offline, see whether we can find somebody, maybe discuss it with Joao.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Markus, I think Amali said she has youth in her coalition.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, we heard that, Judith, but we wanted to have the Youth Coalition themselves, the Youth Coalition, not only a young person in the session.

I was considering whether Marko could have a look at the Google Doc and see whether -- we have five main objectives -- whether the Youth Coalition fits into one of the other four, if it's not number four? So, that would mean one, two, or five, so that we can have -- move someone from one or five to the fourth, and put the youth into the one or -- the first or the second bucket.

>> MARKO PALOSKI: Yes, I am looking just now in the document. Just a second and I will let you know.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can also give you more time, if you need to consult with your colleagues. You could get back to Jutta maybe tomorrow or so. We don't want to put the gun on your head now and say take a decision.

>> MARKO PALOSKI: That would be perfect, because we can have a group chat where I can consult them tomorrow, I don't know. I can give you a better answer.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Oh, wonderful. So, I just put that down in the comments. And Markus, probably while I'm writing in the document, could you please moderate?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think we have gone as far as we can on this main session and had a very good discussion. The open issue is still about heading, the title, and there was, I think, again, a proposal to change the title somewhat by Mark. And I usually trust native speakers with their feelings.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That we would revisit the title. Again, can we make a decision now or not? That's open. And I see also Rajendra has his hand up. Please.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Thank you, Markus. Markus, maybe we can do a poll right now in this Zoom call and get to a decision. That makes things easier for now given pending we have five weeks only. We can do a poll now in this Zoom. It allows for that. If Roman can put maybe the poll head what title we should choose. It should be a straightforward thing. We have 16 people here in the call.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Rajendra, it was you for the fifth bucket, enhancing global AI governance?

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: That's right, thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: To follow up on Rajendra's suggestion, Mark, can you type in the suggestion you had for the title of

the session?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, okay. I mean, I'll type it in, but basically, I was suggesting contributing to the GDC, as you have now, the IGF's community of Dynamic Coalitions support for sustainable digital development. So --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's just community of Dynamic Coalitions --

(Talking at the same time)

Instead of doc community, okay.

>> MARK CARVELL: Which, it doesn't mean anything. It doesn't explain what the community is. And you know, people will, "what is this dynamic community?"

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. I'll read it out again. This will be, then, the title: Contributing to the GDC, the IGF's community of Dynamic Coalitions' support for sustainable digital development.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. So, basically, we should supposed to put our hand up.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: To support, right?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Under React, do we find that there?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. I see a number of people raising their hands. I think that's a majority.

>> I can't.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Markus, hand, you may not be able to. No, you can react. You can't raise hand.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, hand up I say, then, in the chat, yes.

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, I put my thumb up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thumb up, yes, okay.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Which the Dynamic Coalition represents, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I don't represent any.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. Okay, then! We have a title. We have coordinators. We have to move some of the Dynamic Coalitions in the list, and Marko will give me -- did you say by tomorrow evening, Marko?

>> MARKO PALOSKI: Tomorrow noon, yes.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Oh, that's wonderful. Wonderful. And then we will send out a link to the link again with the named coordinators, and we will also call the Dynamic Coalitions to action to group themselves, and then we will have -- we will ask Louis, or probably Roman, you can ask Louis to set up these smaller mailing lists for the organization of the groups. Wout, you have your hand up.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. I see Judith's comment in the chat. It's my comment. I think it is important that the questions that we ask are exactly the same so that what we asked of the other coalitions in the bucket, that everybody gets the same questions or demands, so there's no misunderstanding or changes and differences between groups. Thanks.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, thank you, Wout, but that is already set with the subtitle. They all need to deliver what is their contribution to improvement of Internet governance. So, I think that's really simple, and it should be also simple for the Dynamic Coalitions to give an answer to that. But nonetheless, we will prepare for that, so to make it very easy for the coordinators.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Have we gone as far as we can, I think? Yes, thank you, Jutta. Tremendous job. There's not much

time left. We have to be aware of that. It's really around the corner, the meeting.

With that, can we go to the next agenda item? We have a scheduled meeting with the MAG in Riyadh, and this agenda item is how to prepare for that meeting. My starting point would again be the paper we produced in '21, and I feel quite attached to that paper, as it was produced under my leadership. It was Serena was holding the pen, but it was a very comprehensive paper. And Roman put up -- is that a link to the paper? Yes, I think so.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, mm-hmm.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There are, under the paper, if you look into it, there are issues that are relevant to our meeting with the MAG. There is a chapter on Dynamic Coalition outputs, issues to explore, develop guidelines on what constitutes DC outputs; encourage DCs to operate procedures. And so on.

Then there is also relationship with the MAG. And one of the items we have discussed several times is also to have a liaison between, of the MAG, with the Dynamic Coalitions, and the Secretariat said that they would, behind the scenes, sound out with MAG members whether they would be willing in that role, but this is definitely an issue to be discussed with the MAG also, what will be the exact task of a MAG liaison to the Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group.

And we have had in the past, but it was never fully satisfactory. And right now, we don't have any. And there's also a chapter of Dynamic Coalition's vital integration into IGF processes and relations with other intersessional workstreams. So, there is a lot of food for thought in this paper, which I think would be an excellent basis for our discussion with the MAG. We can produce a structured agenda, and we have the advantage, if you base ourselves on that paper, that we have something that was part of an iterative process. MAG members may not be aware of that, but it will be a good opportunity to revise the paper and bring it to the attention of the MAG, and there is also a chapter, a last chapter, Dynamic Coalitions and the future of the IGF.

Now, yes, has been used the paper before the GDC's global environment is somewhat different, but still valid.

I see two hands up, Jutta and Mark. Jutta first.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, Markus. My question would be, is the meeting already scheduled, the meeting with the MAG? Because otherwise, it seems to me very good to have that meeting after we had the Dynamic Coalitions main session. We could invite the MAG. Of course, we want to have them in the room when we have the Dynamic Coalitions main session, but it would also help to get some common ground for the debate that we will then have afterwards, especially when it comes to those MAG members who are not so familiar with the whole community of Dynamic Coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Roman, do you know it off by heart? As far as I understand, we even have two slots given, because the assumption is not every MAG member will be able to attend. But Roman, do you know it?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: This is something to be checked with Celine. So, I can come back to you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. And then we have Mark and Judith. Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Markus. Dynamic Coalitions have progressed. I mean, the number has expanded since the 2021



work done by Serena, and that was, as you said, it was a valuable, effective work at that time. I'm slightly anxious that the MAG may feel things have not moved on if the sort of briefing paper for the meeting relies on that piece of work, five years ago, whenever it was, so I'm a bit anxious about that.

I think we do need to ensure that they get an up-to-date picture of the Dynamic Coalitions, the answers that are being covered by the various coalitions, over 30 now. So, that's my first point. I think we need to ensure that the picture is very much forward-looking.

And this connects, actually, with the vision that the MAG has been developing. And we're going to talk about this in the AOB section, where they talk about integration and translating the work of the IGF community, including the intersessional activities, including the Dynamic Coalitions, being translated into outputs that have impact.

And that vision paper also talks about reviewing the intersessional models, including the Dynamic Coalition model, as part of the vision for strengthening the IGF, so it's not simply an annual event but much more productive process. And this is where Dynamic Coalitions, critically, have an important contribution to make. And the popularity of the DC model is demonstrated by the number continuing to increase. So, I think we need to understand clearly what the agenda is going to push on with regard to the Dynamic Coalition community, and it is on those areas, in integration, outputs, and strengthening the intersessional models, including the Dynamic Coalitions one.

So, that's my expectation for this meeting, and I hope it's going to be an open session, and I hope also that the leadership panel will be represented at it, because this is a very strategic moment for the IGF. The MAG to engage the Dynamic Coalition community going forward in the context of the WSIS+20 review with making the IGF much more impactful and how the intersessional activities, including Dynamic Coalitions, deliver that impact. So, those are my thoughts.

If we can narrow down the objective with the agreement of the MAG -- I mean, maybe they've got their own objective for this meeting, I don't know. I haven't attended recent MAG meetings where they might have discussed this. But if we have a clear objective of about three key issues for this meeting, it would be very productive, with the leadership panel being represented at it, too. Because they want to see the strategy for the IGF evolve in a very positive way, and this is how Dynamic Coalitions can contribute to that evolution. So, there's my thoughts. I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I don't think we disagree, Mark. I think all these points are also in the '21 paper, you know. It's still the same issues, but they are, probably say more urgent now or more in the forefront than they were then. I think there's broad support for it, but there are sub-questions there.

And as far as the agenda, I don't think the MAG is actually -- we have signaled it repeatedly that it is our expectation that we have such a meeting with the MAG. But to be frank, I don't think the MAG has given much thought to it. It would be up to us to propose an agenda, I think to take the lead on that, and to say these are the issues we really would like to discuss with you.

And one option could also be, okay, why don't we take the

vision paper as a starting point? Say, look, we fit in very well in this paper, and take that as a starting point of the discussion, as the MAG may be also more familiar with that paper right now, as it is on the discussion, so that could be a good starting point, as it's more on the agenda of MAG right now. But Judith, you also have your hand up.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, sorry. I think it was an old hand.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think it was an old hand.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, okay. Jutta, is that an old hand

or --

>> JUTTA CROLL: No, no, that is a new hand. Yes, having seen the debates that we had right now with regard to the main session, I do think that has already underlined that the dynamic dynamics community is very heterogenous and not so much homogeneous. The question would be whether we can achieve what Mark has already suggested to agree among the Dynamic Coalitions what are the key issues that we will bring forward to the table when we have that meeting with the MAG.

For me, the highest priority would be that as much Dynamic Coalitions are present in the room when we meet with the MAG, because if we give a weak image of Dynamic Coalitions, whether we are a community or a small community, or really a community of 32 Dynamic Coalitions, that depends on the impression we give to the MAG when we gather for that meeting.

And then, I think we really need to try to agree on the main issues that shall be on the agenda, but we have to bear in mind that it's very heterogenous group. Judith, I hand over to you. It's a new hand now, right?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, it is a new hand, and I put my thing in the chat. It was for the other point. And what I said -- and it's for the Secretariat. So, Roman, could you take it back and find out from Luis and others, if this is a main session, are we going to have sign language, like we had in the other main sessions?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: You mean the sessions for the MAG?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, not the MAG session. This is for before.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: DCCG. I just forgot my point that I wanted to make then.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, if Roman could discuss it. Because last year, for the main session, we had -- for our DCCG main session, we had sign language. And I know all main sessions are, or some of the main sessions have interpretation and sign language, so I'm just curious, what is the role this year? Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I'll make it clear.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Roman, what did you say?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, I will make it clear and let you know.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you, Roman.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Wout has his hand up.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. I also do not agree with you. And I am extremely worried that if we use only the 2021 paper, that we have no idea what sort of surprises may happen in the room. Because even in these called, sometimes

somebody says, "but I don't agree with that at all. I don't want any interference with my Dynamic Coalition," or whatever. And I was in the GDC meeting of the UN last week, and there it was said clearly, the Dynamic Coalitions are going to play a major role in the, whatever they call it, that is going to happen in the GDC process. And if that is the case, then we need to prepare the Dynamic Coalitions. What is exactly expected of us? What is it actually we want to contribute to the GDC? And that is not in that document.

We don't know what Dynamic Coalitions are willing to do, willing to accept, willing to go forward with. Because if we make -- just like Jutta says -- a weak impression at the meeting with the MAG, that's the end of us, because this year we have already been slashed. I'm really, really angry about how many hours were taken away from the Dynamic Coalitions, and we got nothing in return. So, we got four sessions or something and a main session, and the rest was taken away. While we're the ones working all year round. And we've got, literally, as I said, I've got a result that I can't present at the IGF. I've got a plan that I can't -- and I, I mean the Dynamic Coalition -- my Dynamic Coalition has a result we can't present on because it doesn't fit the format. We have a plan that we can't present because our main session was not agreed upon. So, how can you work a whole year round in the IGF if people don't understand the importance of the work that's being taken on in the IGF?

So, if we make a weak impression at that session with the MAG, we're done for. And like, I think her name is Marilyn Franklin, and I'm going to stop there, said almost three years ago, what if we never let us hear anything about Dynamic Coalitions again? Would anybody care? And she said, no, this is the last time I'm here. We never met her again. So, in other words, that's what I'm afraid of, that we're going to be irrelevant.

And at the same time, the UN says, you are going to be pivotal in this process. So, in other words, what is exactly expected from us? And that is why we need to know what Dynamic Coalitions think in 2024, looking forward to 2025, because otherwise, we may have very, very bad surprises at this MAG meeting when somebody doesn't agree to what is being said there. So, that's my main worry, Markus, and that's not to take anything away from Serena's report because it's excellent. But it is 3 1/2 years old, and we don't know what the Dynamic Coalitions, new Dynamic Coalitions, think about this matter. So, I think it's tremendously important that, like Jutta says, we have some points in common before we go into the session with the MAG. So, that's my final plea. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: May I also, Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Jutta. Your hand it up.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you. Yes, Wout, you made it sound a little bit like we are the only ones that work all around the year, and that's definitely not the case. It sounded a bit like that to me. But I'm sure you didn't mean that. But in the end, I'm pretty sure we won't get one answer to these questions.

That was also the case when we did that study three years ago. It's not like we have an opportunity to speak with one voice of the Dynamic Coalitions. It's a dynamic community. Also, I know, Mark, you don't think that term is -- but it's so dynamic, we won't get one voice that all can agree on. That makes it difficult to approach the MAG, definitely. But I'm

pretty sure, even though the MAG might say, what do you want us to do? You will get at least 15 different answers, and not one answer from 32 Dynamic Coalitions. So, it is a difficulty, but we will be able to cope with that situation in the meeting with the MAG, definitely. And that's why I suggested to have the meeting with the MAG after we had our main session, because from the main session, all the participants will understand afterwards how heterogenous the group or the community of Dynamic Coalitions in the IGF ecosystem is. It's not homogeneous; it's heterogenous. And that will be one message that comes out of the main session, I'm pretty sure. Amali, you have raised your hand.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: If I can respond, then I'll give to Amali. I'll be very short.

I know we are heterogenous, and I know there are Dynamic Coalitions that are totally happy with just having one meeting a year at the IGF, discussing a topic together, and then they go home. But we need to know at least what we can say, because we don't know what we cannot say, because it may well be that there are suggestions in the report that 50% doesn't agree to.

But everything that was mentioned in the response is in the report. There's no saying there's 75% agrees to this. No. It's one made a comment, it's in there. Another made a comment there. It's in there. But it's not aggregated. And I think that that is where we could go terribly wrong in the MAG meeting, if we propose a topic and then 75% says, yeah, but we don't want that. We never should have proposed it. So, that's why I think it is important to have, like Mark said, a few topics that are totally clear we can discuss. Because otherwise, we may go wrong. And then this is the opportunity for a whole year. So, that's why I think this is tremendously important to know more than we do now. Let me give to Amali.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Let me say, we must differentiate ourselves from the other IGF groups. We are not regional. We are not NRI. We are not the policy groups. We are very specific.

Because the DC crosses the whole globe, the whole world, while at NRI, it will be very regional. We know, for instance, in health care, this is really evident for us. Each one of our regions have different levels of sophistication, connectivity, knowledge, et cetera, and support from the government and philanthropy and so forth. But as a region, you can work together on a topic, but then across the world, it's a completely different issue, and especially in terms of us, we're interested in data governance as well, and we're sharing across jurisdictions.

So, I think what is specific and identifiable about Dynamic Coalition is that it works globally, not regionally, or not specifically, perhaps, in the policy groups. The policy groups are not quite the same as the Dynamic Coalitions. We are really grassroots. So, I think that differentiation really must be made, please. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think we're running slowly out of time. I take it that there is no consensus on basing ourselves on the last paper we had; that is the '21 paper. But one option would be to have the specified questions that Mark proposed. But again, there is not, Jutta made the point that there may not be consensus ongoing at that level of detail, although I'm sure we could agree on a more higher-level definition of relationship with the MAG, between Dynamic

Coalitions, for instance. But I don't think we'll be able to conclude on that right now. We have to take it offline. Jutta, you have your hand up again.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, let me say one sentence. We had the debate whether it will be successful to send out a very short email to all the Dynamic Coalitions to agree on these buckets for the main session, and everybody in this room, or more or less everybody in this room said this wouldn't be successful, we wouldn't get the answers that we need. So, I'm pretty sure that if we send anything else that is longer, that demands more from the Dynamic Coalition, we just will not get what might be necessary. I don't think it's necessary for the meeting with the MAG.

I do think we need to make a good impression, but that is not based on having this homogeneous position of the Dynamic Coalitions. We all agree, we are different, like Amali said, from NRIs, from policy networks, from best practice forums, definitely, but we all know that we are different from other Dynamic Coalitions. Each Dynamic Coalition knows they are different. And therefore, I'm pretty sure that we won't find that common position, neither with a survey, nor with any other approach that we try to come to that solution.

So, I still would support the approach to base our self on the study from three years ago, and then move forward from that, of course, but it's a basis that we have at that point of time jointly been working on, and all the suggestions in that paper have been sent to all of the Dynamic Coalitions. We gathered feedback from those who wanted to give feedback. Others didn't give feedback. But still, we can say this was a joint effort, and it's the outcome of a joint effort.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Just a brief question. We have still two agenda -- well, one agenda item, a substantive one, which is the booth, and then the Any Other Business, the question for WSIS+20 letter and the vision paper. Can we go 15 minutes over time? Is that okay?

>> JUTTA CROLL: For me, it's okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, okay. Seems to have a tentative agreement. If you have to leave, then you have to leave. Okay.

So, still on the meeting with the MAG, we have Wout and Mark put up their hand. Wout first.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. Sorry. (Coughing) Cough again. I'm sorry.

I think that responding to Jutta, it's, yes, we are homogeneous, where the topics are concerned, but what we want to discuss with the MAG on part is on principles. And there we may be homogeneous as well, but we need to know what some DCs agree on the principles. Do they want MAG oversight or not? Because if the answer is no, then we don't need to discuss this with the MAG. If they don't want a MAG liaison interfering, then the answer is, no, we don't have to discuss it. And I would not like to have that surprise during the meeting, because that's -- I think it's about the principle and not about the different topics. Of course, we won't be discussing content with the MAG, at least not at this stage. So, that's why I think it's important to prevent surprises. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to reiterate an objective for this meeting, which is to connect with what the MAG is saying in its vision paper about reviewing and refining intersessional work models with specific reference

to the best practice fora and the Dynamic Coalitions. It acknowledges that there's been work done, and in our case, indeed, Serena's paper is a foundational one, but we are in a new era now. And the MAG is saying, this model needs reviewing and refining. So, DCs need to be at the table with the MAG to talk about how this vision for the IGF, with a refined model of intersessional activity, is going to connect with our established principles, as Wout was saying, with regard to how Dynamic Coalitions operate, whatever field they're in, whatever objectives they may have, whether it's concrete policy recommendations, toolkits, or platforms for sharing information or whatever, whatever objectives the heterogenous makeup of the 32 current coalitions may be. But that's what the MAG is saying. It's saying it's time to review and refine the intersessional model. So, I think this is a core and incredibly timely opportunity as the MAG and the IGF community gears up for the WSIS+20 review.

For us, as representatives of hard-working, committed Dynamic Coalitions to get together with the MAG and say, look, this is how successful the Dynamic Coalition model, based on shared principles, has been, and let's talk about the future. So, that's, I think one of the key objectives for this meeting with the MAG. It's an opportunity that we shouldn't miss, to talk about the future, to do our bit to convert perceptions of the IGF as a one-off annual event that's just a talking shop, to convert that impression that many people may have into one where this is a community with a network, a year-round scheme of activities that includes Dynamic Coalitions with committed volunteers to investigate or share information on specific aspects of Internet governance or digital cooperation. So, that's what I'm pushing for, really, to make sure that we seize this opportunity. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think we really have to come to closure now on this agenda item. We will need to revisit it, but I think we will not be able to agree on details how to discuss it, but I think we should be able to agree on a very high-level agenda saying to discuss the future integration of the Dynamic Coalitions into MAG in light of also the vision paper, refine it a bit on that, but keep it at a relatively high level of abstraction and try to make, as Jutta said, make a good collective impression as the Dynamic Coalitions. Don't go there and complain, but be forward-looking and constructive, and say we are willing to make our contribution, and I think the main session is there to prove it.

Now, I'm not sure about -- I think Celine said something that the meeting would be on day zero, or I'm not sure whether it's the second meeting scheduled. But in any case, if it's on day zero, it would be a good opportunity to promote the DC main session, to invite MAG members to come and actually to see how we constructively approach the post-GDC future and are willing to make a contribution. And we can do some refinement, bearing in mind of all the opinions expressed. But my view is if you frame the agenda at the relatively high level abstraction, it should be okay for everybody, but we will have to discuss the booth and also the reaction to the WSIS+20 and the vision paper. Mark suggested putting on AOB, but Jutta, you have one more comment.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. I just wanted to refer to what Maarten has written in the chat, and I do think he has written that "It will be difficult to develop joint view, but may be

best to agree to kick this off together at some point." And probably the meeting with the MAG could also be this kickoff point. Then we could ask the MAG, what do you think? What do you need to know about Dynamic Coalitions to better integrate us in the whole system? And then we can move forward with that. And probably, as I hope for many, many Dynamic Coalitions, we'll be able to join the meeting. It should be a hybrid meeting, definitely, to make sure it's inclusive as possible, and then probably this could be the kickoff point. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Oh, and I see a comment in the chat: Do we want MAG oversight by Avery? I thought we had the MAG liaison.

Essentially, that's what we said, we wanted the MAG liaison, but this year we didn't have one, and we have also never discussed with the MAG what such a liaison, actually what should be his terms of reference. This definitely is also a possible agenda item. Can we move on? We have eight minutes left. Mark, to this agenda item?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, just briefly about the leadership panel. Can they be invited to this session with the MAG?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can always invite them, yes. Of course, yes. Okay.

Then, the next agenda item is the booth. Roman.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes. Dear colleagues, so, I believe that we should have a schedule of which Dynamic Coalition can volunteer at what time to be present at the exhibition stand. So, I will share the document and kindly ask everyone to find those time slots of you or your colleagues who will be on site, so fill it.

And regarding the brochure, I believe that we will have it before the next meeting. And we want to propose to hold the next meeting in three weeks from now to have enough time to prepare for some outstanding questions before the forum. So, what do you think if the next session would be on the 25th of November, where we can finalize the DC brochure and finalize the schedule at the DC booth?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Roman. I don't think we need to agree on the date here and now, but can you send out also a Doodle poll?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, just to let everyone know, it will be not like the first week of December, but rather --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, yeah, 25th or 26th, and we find the slot then, a suitable rotation.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: And by the way, so, next time slot should be the morning one, correct? To rotate.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think that was the idea, that we have reasonable rotation.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Mm-hmm.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think Amali won't like it, but... or Rajendra, it could be more convenient. Dino, you have your hand up.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you, Markus. Yeah, I just wanted to confirm my understanding. I remember that in one of the previous meetings there was an indication that this year's event, in the hall where the booth will be hosted, there will be some sort of a stage where representatives of the different booth will be able to make some sort of a presentation briefing. So, I just wanted to understand whether my understanding was correct, and if so, what is the plan for that? Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I'm not sure. I think Celine made the point, but I'm not too familiar with the setup there. Roman, can you comment?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: So, there is some program which has been scheduled in the Village stage. But Dino, do you wish to have a slot, an opportunity to deliver some of your DC's, like, progress or... What do you think? Do you need some time slot there?

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Well, I mean, if there is an opportunity. And my understanding is, we have been invited to have a village booth under the name of the organizer, the organizer of the DC, not the DC itself. And if so, also in response to your first question, I will be able to identify the onsite representative of our booth, vis-a-vis also this opportunity. So, if there is going to be some sort of a village stage, then I will organize ourselves and we can definitely present or contribute to the event by showcasing what it is that our booth represents and what it is that we have done and invite other people to participate. Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay. So, let me check it and then in our next meeting, we will be able to finalize all those arrangements.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. With that, can we go to the Any Other Business?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I have a quick question.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Judith.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, is this booth different? Are we giving short presentations, or how is it? Because we have, I know many of us -- I know the DCAD does -- many of us have scheduled annual meeting slots, a one-hour meeting room, in the hybrid meeting room that Celine has organized for us. This is not that. This is something different? And are we giving little teasers, or are we just taking time to fill in and speak about all of the other DCs that are in there and remind people? And if that's the case, are we going to be given pamphlets or information so that we can answer questions about any and all DCs? Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, that's the idea, that there will be a booth with a table where the DCs are supposed to be represented. And we hope that the table will never be empty, we have volunteers throughout the week, also during lunchtime. And the Secretariat will prepare a brochure of all the DCs collectively, and Roman is committed to do that. And hopefully, then, by the next meeting, it will be ready to be shown and you will be able to comment on that.

And whenever you volunteer to be at the booth, you are supposed to speak on behalf of all the DCs, present collectively, but obviously, point to the various DCs that you aren't. Obviously, they're all more than welcome to present papers, pamphlets of their own activities.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes. Sorry to interrupt, Markus. It would be amazing if we can identify one chief coordinator from the DC side, because from the Secretariat, we will not be in a position to track is there someone in the booth right now? So, it should be a self-organized process. So, it would be really best if someone can volunteer, or I can provide such section in the document to fill up the slots so that each, like half of the day we will have a volunteer, or each day we have different volunteer coordinator. So, let's see how to better arrange this,



but then I'm sure it's crucial that someone who has all the cell phone numbers of people who are supposed to be there can really coordinate all this.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So, you're looking for a pit bull. We'll make sure that somebody's always there. But you also make the point, it should be self-organized and --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: It is clear I am not going to play this role, unfortunately, because we will not have time.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, that's understood, but let's take it as a bottom up and let's hope it will be self-organized and will work. To be frank, it did not work very well the last time we tried it. That was at the 2016 meeting in Mexico.

We have no minutes left, but nevertheless, we have still one, Any Other Business?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Two questions. When is this face-to-face meeting on day zero, because it's not on the schedule? And 1300 is lunchtime. And so --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The answer is I don't know.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So, I think Celine is very much in the schedule, and Roman will ask her, maybe get back to the list.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, you know so schedule right now is going back and forth, so it's pointless to have it now, but I really hope that by our next meeting, these things will be sort of finalized so we have everything clear and we can then plan accordingly, given that we have, like, precise time slots and dates for everything.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Over to you, Mark. Any other business?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Markus. I'm sorry. I realize we're out of time, basically, but I just wanted to, first of all, bring to everybody's attention that there are these two drafting exercises by the MAG Working Group on Strategy. The first one is the vision paper on the IGF, and we've referenced that quite a bit already. I won't say anything more on that, except to underline that it does contemplate, in particular, reviewing and -- I forget the exact word -- the intersessional models of activity of the IGF. So, there's text about that, and there should be the opportunity for Dynamic Coalition representatives to feed into that drafting exercise.

I provided right at the beginning of the meeting the link to the Google Doc. The question is, do we coordinate a Dynamic Coalitions group community response into, or input into this drafting exercise about the vision of the IGF and the role and enhancement of intersessional models, including the Dynamic Coalition? So, that's that one.

The other one is a draft letter to the -- I think it's intended to be to the co-facilitators of the UN WSIS+20 review. Correct me, Markus, if I'm wrong on that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Now it's tentatively addressed to the Secretary-General.

>> MARK CARVELL: To the Secretary-General, okay. Well, it will no doubt be cascaded down to whoever is co-facilitating it. So, this is a draft letter. It's not very long. It's basically setting out the pledge of the IGF community, including all the stakeholders involved in Dynamic Coalitions, to support and participate in the WSIS+20 review process. And it makes the clear point that that process, conducted by the UN next year, which is already kind of kicking off already anyway, should be open and transparent and inclusive. So, it's making that key

point.

And another key point for everybody on this call to note is that it's saying that there is going to be -- the IGF and its intersessional modalities are going to be engaged in a platform for engagement in the WSIS+20 review. Now, when I sat in on the Working Group Strategy call last week, on the 31st of October -- you were there, Markus, as well, and maybe Judith, I can't remember. For me, that was the first time I had heard about this platform proposal that would involve the intersessional activities. So, there is the prospect of the 32 Dynamic Coalitions being involved in this platform for engagement in the WSIS+20 review. So, again, it's a draft letter, and the question is, should we be saying anything more about that, the modalities for engagement in the WSIS+20 review of the IGF, and in particular with regard to Dynamic Coalitions? That's a bit of a rush, but that's basically why I wanted this on the agenda today. I'll stop there, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, I'm not sure, actually, is there any deadline given for the reaction to the vision paper?

>> MARK CARVELL: I didn't note a deadline. It's still -- it's certainly still at drafting. I did say at the meeting that the Dynamic Coalitions community should have the opportunity to engage on both this letter drafting and also the vision paper, of course. I said that at the meeting, as you may recall.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. No, no, the question is, a collective response may be too ambitious. I think it may be more efficient to let individual -- encourage individual Dynamic Coalitions actually to look at both documents and to comment individually. I think that may be more, have more impact.

Also, given, Jutta said the heterogenous nature of the Dynamic Coalitions, it might allow to give more pointed, more focused contributions, if it's done separately by each Dynamic Coalition. Some Dynamic Coalitions may not be interested, whereas others may have a strong interest and different voices can sometimes then have a bigger impact if they say a similar thing but in different words, in different terms than a collective input, which would reflect the smallest common denominator. That's my suggestion.

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, on the other hand, a collective, consensus-based input will have -- could have stronger impact, but okay, I take your point.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, again, if it's watered down and says, you know, motherhood and apple pie and Dynamic Coalitions may be less impactful than a more-focused proposal from an individual Dynamic Coalition. And there's a time factor, as well, if you want to have a collective input. My fear is it will take us too long, and the output might be rather disappointing for those who would like to see more, but that's my personal impression, but I really leave it up to you.

And I see Avery has her hand up.

>> JUTTA CROLL: We are running out of time.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Let's give Avri the last word.

>> AVRI DORIA: I think that's good, but getting people to sign on -- we've seen lots of value of fairly significant subgroupings of larger organizations that put out a statement. You get six or seven to sign onto it. That's strong. So, I think that you've got time to do that. And any of the notes that any of us write, get people to sign onto them

with you, and that will give them extra oomph. I hope I didn't speak too long. Thank you!

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, that was very good and short and concise and very constructive. Do we have a consensus on that way to proceed? So, let each Dynamic Coalition react individually, and then pass it on to see who wants to sign on, whenever you have anything. Okay?

With that, we're greatly over time. Thank you all for your patience. All in all, we had a good discussion and a constructive meeting, and thank you and see you --

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus, for your strict moderation. Thank you so much. See you all --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Very strict, with 23 minutes over time.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Thank you, Markus.

>> Thank you, everybody!

>> Bye-bye!

>> Thanks, all!

>> Thank you.

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.