

RAW FILE

IGF DCCG
APRIL 11, 2025
12:00 P.M. UTC

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
Monument, CO 80132
719-481-9835
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.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, it's top of the hour, but we clearly don't have a quorum yet on the call, but we have a high-quality participation, but not many people.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Please wait for a couple minutes. A link was just shared to WhatsApp, to the email.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I don't know, maybe Friday's just not the best time. So, okay, let's never repeat this experience again. Usually, we are on like Wednesday or Thursday, right? So, probably people are just busy.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, I agree, Friday's sort of an end of the weekday.

Well, there are people joining slowly but steadily. And again, as you are joining, we did that at the last meeting. It really helps, makes life easier for the Secretariat if you type behind your name the affiliate of which DC you belong to. For some of you, Roman may know it out of his memory, but it makes life much easier if you actually join, if you say which DC it is. I see some of you have already done that. And at the request --

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I need permission. I don't have permission to do mine.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Then, Roman, can you give permission to change their name?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Now it should be possible. Please try.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Not only the affiliation. You remember, there was the DC on Teams, the colleague who said he would like to do research about the location, in terms of time slots. So, it will be very helpful if you actually add behind the DC where you are located.

I know I see Avri's name. I know Avri is the Schools of Internet Governance, and I know Avri is located in Rhode Island. So, if you can do that, say where you are. It's just as a request to make the research, our colleague from the coalition

wanted to make it much easier.

I also have to ask formality, that you agree to be recorded, as we record the calls and make it available afterwards. And I see people put in the Dynamic Coalitions and also the location, wherever possible. Thank you very much for that. And with that, I think we can start.

Roman has sent out an agenda, which is posted in the chat. It's fairly straightforward: Adoption of the draft agenda, then the webinar, taking stock and looking forward to the next round, and also the DC sessions, and continue the discussion of DC accountability, and last, any other business. And I sent out an email earlier today that under Accountability, I would like to pick up on the email Wout had sent and circle us back on the Working Group on Strategy that proposes a webinar that would include the DCs discussing internal governance mechanism.

Are there any comments on the agenda, or also any issues you might wish to raise under Any Other Business? If not, can we approve, then, the agenda as proposed? Not hearing any other comment. To the contrary, I take it, then, that the agenda is approved as proposed.

So, we go, then, to the first agenda item. That is the webinars. We had our first webinar last week, and I would like to ask Roman to report, as he was very much the driving force behind it, and Rajendra was sort of the organizer, and I would like to ask both of them, then, to comment. But let me, just as an introduction, say it's huge. Congratulations to both of you and everybody concerned. It was, as they say in the UN, an outstanding success. Really, I thought if you have more than 50 participants, it will be fine, but you had more than 100 participants at the very short notice, and I thought that was amazing.

Over to you, Roman and Rajendra, if he's on the call. Yes, please.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Hi, Markus, hi, everyone. Thank you so much. There is nothing really much to add. I am quite happy that our idea which we discussed in Riyadh starts to be taking place in reality, and it's very good to be able to showcase the strength and insight from the DCs to the IGF community and I think this is exactly how intersessional work should be done. So, let's just continue this good work. With this webinar having simultaneously 100 speakers and totally 123 unique viewers with 181 registrations, I believe it's a good start.

So, next one, this is up to everyone to discuss here, but what we have preliminarily discussed is that possibly 30th of April, the date of the next webinar. And Dr. Rajendra is already, I believe, collecting the speakers. And probably it's already, like critical mass is already found. So, hopefully, our next one will be in several weeks, so on 30th of April. And this time we plan to share the information a bit more in advance, also maybe during next week's open consultations. And hopefully, an email shout-out, as well as social media. Both will bring even more, eventually, to the webinars. Yeah, thank you so much. And I think Dr. Rajendra is not with us today. I don't see if

he's here. Basically, we can report back via email list when we have some, like, final update on the concept and the list of speakers.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for that, Roman, yes. And I think it will make a big difference if we have at least advance warning for the community that, okay, two weeks from now or three weeks from now, we have another of these webinars. But it really was a good showcase that DCs do some substantive work. Are there comments or questions with regard to this agenda item? Yes, Avri, please.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, Avri speaking. One curiosity on this, and perhaps people from the last one can speak, or whether it's the intent. Are these just dog and ponies to show, yes, we do work, you can believe in us, or are we actually trying to further something in the process? And do we have anything that will show evidence at the end of it of, okay, we did all these wonderful things and everybody came, but where do they lead to? What further work gets done? What are the outcomes of these things, other than successful dog and ponies? And I'm just curious about that. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. It's definitely an excellent question. But I mean, it was a pilot seminar, and I think the main objective was to show, to see whether we, as Dynamic Coalitions, can work together and produce something. And then, there is, obviously, a next question and a next step to go to, and Anriette already has the answer to that. Anriette, please.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Of course, I don't have the answer to that. Greetings, everyone. I'm in Geneva this week, where we are discussing the future of the IGF, amongst other things.

And IGF wanted to say, it is a good question. It's a challenging question. I think Markus is right, I think this was the first time, so I don't think we should kind of really, we should just be glad that it was so successful and inclusive. But I think it is a legitimate question going forward.

I think the one reflection I have -- and I got feedback as well from some MAG members -- is they would like to see the participation -- for example in this case, the participation of the Policy Network on Artificial Intelligence -- to be maybe a little bit more deliberate, possibly even discussing some of the work that's taking place, and also, looking at some of the processes, for example, at the moment, such as the AI dialogue and scientific panel on AI that's being developed, and looking towards maybe giving an input or writing a comment on that. So, I think that for the future, yes, maybe being a little bit more deliberate about where this is going, a little bit more deliberate about collaborating with other related initiatives within the IGF ecosystem is a good idea.

But I think as a start, it was really excellent, so I also just want to congratulate everyone who was part of this first initiative. But it's good that you do ask that question, because otherwise, we also won't sustain the interest.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Anriette. And there will be,

actually, next week's MAG meeting will be a roundtable with the DCs and all of the other components of the intersessional work, where we can actually discuss on that.

And I see Muhammad and Roman's hand up. I give Muhammad precedence, and Roman, you come after him. Muhammad?

Please, Muhammad, you have the floor.

We can't hear you. Do you have a connectivity problem? But we did hear you when --

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, can you hear me, Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Now we can.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Perfect. Just a quick comment. I thought the very excellent question by Avri -- by the way, this is Muhammad Shabbir, for the record. One of the outcomes we discussed in the initial discussions of this webinar was that the outcome report of these webinars would be presented in the IGF in Norway.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, yes --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Of course.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That was also one of the attentions. The webinars would prepare the sessions we have, and prepare the session, so we can draw on these webinars to prepare our sessions in Norway. Roman?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, I can try to summarize the initial idea, this preliminary stage, and possible next action items. And Dr. Rajendra is now with us, so, hopefully he can also say a couple words, since we're discussing this great beginning of this work.

So, again, the idea. Intersessional work, amazing Dynamic Coalitions, showcasing the real success stories of what is being done. Who are DCs, why they exist, what innovative ideas and insights they are bringing to the IGF community, why we are all spending time on maintaining this space, supporting each other, how we are building synergies. What is the real added value of Dynamic Coalition? This is question number one. And this is what we started to answer with our first webinar.

Again, we have four IGF sub-themes. Each will end up into this intersessional work for our webinars before IGF in Norway, as a sort of warm-up before these four thematic workshops in Norway, after which we have the main session, which already summarizes all work done, as in the webinars, as in these four sessions.

At the same time, Norway forum ends at the end of June, but we have still the rest of the year, and this is when I believe we are already reaching out to MAG members, to BPFs, NRIs, policy networks, other formats, UN missions, sister UN organizations. And we are already in the creative mood, actually creating this intersessional work with our partners, with our synergies and people from our community, from our space, to already discuss other topics, which can be then synthesized and presented to the MAG, as this is expert vision for the next year's IGF. So, this was one of the topics in Riyadh that we were comparing the possible work of Dynamic Coalitions with, for instance, global agenda councils of the World Economic Forum in

the past. I'm just reminding those who did not attend, this is an example of how the agenda is being set with this bottom-up approach, with an inclusive approach and multi-stakeholder approach, absolutely in the nature of IGF.

So, now it's just the warm-up to actually prepare better for IGF and better understand who we are, to show who we are and what we are doing. But then, we can do even more ambitious things, also by trying to enter the agenda, because that would be a beautiful case when DCs are submitting their wisdom and expectations about, for instance, next year's priorities. And probably, with the future host country, can somehow collaboratively, of course, under MAG's supervision, move on. So, this is briefly what we would want to see, and I would ask Dr. Rajendra to comment, because he made the discussion, which is basically his success, first of all.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Roman. Over to you, Rajendra. Yes, and congratulations. It was a huge -- you were not here when we started, but we did recall, it was a huge success, the webinar. Congratulations.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: Thank you, and for the wonderful team. It was not just me. But I think this was the first test of us as Dynamic Coalitions on what is applicability, what is the power of collaboration, and what is about contribution to the success that we are existing for. So, I think picking up the first topic of global AI governance for humanity's benefit, we had an excellent webinar. We literally ran short of time, though we did have a quorum for the call. It was a huge success, and the next one went as well for security.

So, what I see evolving are topical issues that matter to all of us. It also tells the way we have thematic cooperation, thematic capacity, thematic contributions to what we stand for. And I think the papers that come out as a result of these webinars will be quite a value for people. Am I audible? Sorry, there's a background noise.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hang on. There is some sound coming in. Can you make sure you turn off your microphone, if you're not talking?

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: So, Markus, this is where we are, and I think we will continue to build webinars with compelling topics that concern the Internet policies and are important to driving the Internet for all. So, I think it has been a good start, and we are also off to the next webinar which will happen soon. Over time, we will always work with all the DCs to figure out who are interested. It's very democratic process. Anyone can propose, others will chip in, and we'll host it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Rajendra, for your comments. And on the chat, I would say we have an almost philosophical discussion between Avri and Anriette. Avri mourns a bit what she considers the loss of the bottom-up nature of the DCs. And I don't think we need to mourn the loss of the bottom-up nature, because the bottom-up nature is still there. But I think what we have been trying to do is to integrate the DCs more into the mainstream of the IGF family. And I think also

connecting the various components of the intersessional work, like at the first webinar, we included the Policy Network on AI, and we will have this roundtable at the MAG meeting, I think on Wednesday, of all of the intersessional work components. So, I think it just adds another dimension without actually changing the bottom-up nature. But obviously, that is something we can discuss, and we have to be mindful of that whatever we do in our coordination group, that we don't change the DNA of the DCs. They're self-organized, bottom-up, and also not under MAG supervision.

But I don't know, maybe Anriette, as you are now the MAG liaison, it might not be a bad moment if you report back from the MAG meeting on the overall picture of the availability of sessions, which, obviously, has an impact also on the DCs, and that's why we tried to come up with more focused sessions, because we know we cannot have that many DC sessions that each individual DCs would be given a session, given the constraints on the number of sessions. Anriette?

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks, Markus. So, just to, you know, for the sake of transparency, I wasn't in the meeting for more than the first few minutes, but I did speak to the Secretariat and catch up with MAG members, so I do have a bit of a report. But anyone else who's here who was in the meeting, including Roman, obviously, could report.

I think, really, the one key message is that the MAG always knew that the Norway IGF would have fewer spaces, physical spaces, for sessions, and that it would, therefore, you know, the normal IGF would have anything between 70 and 80 workshops. This year, the number is around 39. So, this is really just an advance warning to all of you that have submitted session proposals, workshop proposals, not necessarily the DCs that have done workshop proposals, not DC sessions.

It's going to be extremely difficult to be selected this year because there are so few slots. And this is partly a function of physical space during the IGF. There are essentially six rooms for workshops, so there can only be six parallel workshop sessions at a time.

And I think, you know, I know the DCs have plans about organizing the collaborative sessions. I think even doing fewer of that might not be a bad idea, because the program is going to be so packed. So, I think that's really, you know, the key message. Aside from that, it sounds as if the Norwegians are proceeding very well in terms of preparing for the IGF.

And then, for those of you that are waiting for the MAG to send the outcome of the evaluation process, expect to hear either late next week or very early the following week. I think that's all, Markus. And if there's anyone else who was in that MAG call who feels there's something important to add, then please do.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Anriette. I don't know, Roman, would have anything to add, as you are part of the Secretariat?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Not really. Not really. So, I believe that we can just go to the next item.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay! Well, and also, I think, you know, the good thing is, our main session is accepted in principle, and so are the four --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Of course, of course, yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: -- sessions.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: We are absolutely flexible to submit it within the reasonable time. Our ambitious goal is to do before the end of April. In reality, I believe that middle of May is also not a disaster, so --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Don't say that, Roman. Keep the deadline.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Let's be realistic.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If you indicate flexibility to begin with, that's a bad start.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: For me personally, flexibility is to have them done one day before the IGF in Norway.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, no -- well, I think one of the criticisms was always that the program is not ready in time. So, I think --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, of course. That's why the end of April is our mission.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, UN rule is usually six weeks, you know.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: By the way, Markus, nobody -- I asked -- knows about this rule, so maybe it's something from your UN experience, but neither my colleagues in the Secretariat, when I quoted you, nor some other diplomats know about this rule.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's written in stone. The documents should be ready six weeks in advance.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: No, I didn't know it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Then they go into translation. But also, it was a criticism made by stakeholders, that the program is not -- you know, if you want to attract high-level people, you need to have something to show them.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: That's true.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Come to this meeting, because it deals with utterly important issues, and it's vitally important that you are there. So, okay. If nobody knows about the six weeks rule anymore, so be that, but let's not aim for having the program ready one day ahead of the meeting.

And Avri commenting cynically: "Do not worry, they will find the rule when they want to stop you from doing something." Yes, that may be the case, but okay, let's look at it in a positive way. And I think the sooner you have the program ready, I think the better it is.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Sorry to ask, but who are "they"? And who is talking, anyone from what? I'm also referring to the previous comment that some sessions were surrendered, like ego in workshops? What are we doing, colleagues? Let's please keep some positive, neutral tone, and I believe that it's something really strange.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, Avri has her hand up and she can comment on her comments. Please, Avri.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you. I didn't realize we were

only allowed to speak of things that are positive. I have been raising alarms about all of these things for many, many years, and they keep slipping, pace by pace, into something that I consider a worse and worse situation. So, therefore, unless I am barred, I'm certainly being polite enough, I hope. And so, I don't understand the issue with all speech must be positive? Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Apologize for the comment. I meant more politeness rather than, it's a matter of language, you know. Maybe it is my native language, but this is how I would say it in my own language.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think Avri was utterly polite and correct and Avri knows me, and I've known Avri for --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, everything was very polite, except for the ego-driven workshops, which I still did not understand. Sorry.

>> AVRI DORIA: Have you read the workshops and seen the discussion of "I must get my workshop, it's part of who I am and I declare myself"? No, you start reading the workshops, and you see how ego-driven they are. "I've got to get a workshop or I don't get support to go to Norway." "I've got to get a workshop or I don't get this." It's driven by the ego, by the necessity of the individuals that are writing them, and it's less about contributing.

I would, you know -- contributing to the solution of the issues. But I've had these complaints about the MAG and its way of picking workshops and the fury, the energy that goes into, "Oh, I must get my workshop," that I really do consider it correct to say they're ego-driven. Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And that has actually been an issue right from the beginning, that people need their workshop approved if they want to have their participation approved at the IGF. So, that is a fact, and we cannot close with that and at the same time, that was in many ways the heart of some of the tensions we had between MAG and the workshop selection process and the DC process, because they were given, to begin with, automatically a slot. And that's where we are. This is no longer possible. The automaticity is no longer possible. So, here we are.

But I think the DCs have done remarkably well by playing the game and being part of the mainstream IGF. And we have to fit in. If the organizer says there's only room for that many separate slots, then let's see how we can get these slots. I think in end, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, as the saying goes, and I think the DCs have actually increasingly lived up to the channel, produced the main sessions that were definitely better from year to year. And I think last year it was objectively, again, an excellent session, and also the collaborative sessions we're going to have look very promising.

But I see Anriette is posting. Would you like to comment?

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Sorry, Markus. Not really important. I think maybe just to say this, and we should move on, but I think, you know, Avri, those are important issues you

are raising. And I think there has always been a tension in the IGF between it being the product of the contributions and the sessions organized by the community on the one hand, and on the other hand, an event that is more curated, that addresses priorities in global Internet governance, in digital governance, debates. And that also reflects the intersessional work. And I think that tension continues. I think we still have lots of work to do in dealing with that.

But I think what's happening this year is that there are practical considerations that have to do with the physical space that the host country is using for the event, practical and finally considerations, and that's the primary reason for the reduction in the number of workshops. So, I guess my advice is, we have to adapt to this year. It's not easy. It's going to have impact, I think, also on participation, but we shouldn't stop engaging the bigger-picture issues that you are raising, Avri. I think they are relevant. I don't think we've resolved them. And I think we will continue to adapt.

And I think what you're talking about, which is to retain the bottom-up nature of the IGF, is very important, but I think this year is challenging because of the physical constraints, and possibly, also because of the IGF renewal still being uncertain. So, that's really all, Markus. Important issues, but I don't think we should feel that the character of the IGF has been transformed, you know, fundamentally or in any finite way. I think that creative tension that Markus talks about that's been there from the beginning is still there.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Anriette. Yes. And I don't think -- I see Avri's comment. Well, yes, the proof of the pudding will be excellent or more excellent. Yes, there is the joke, you know. All the UN meeting exceed expectations, and we never say it's a bad meeting. But I think your comment, top-down event, I would not agree with that. I think what we are trying to do with the collaborative theses sessions, they are not top-down. They are bottom-up, co-organized among the DCs.

Avri, is your hand still up? Would you like to come back, or is that an old hand? Otherwise, I can recognize Olivier who has his hand up. No, Avri's hand is down, so Olivier, please.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Markus. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I understand the concern that Avri is sharing here, and I also do have concerns as well, because we are going off course year on year.

And one of the concerns I see is, with the reduction in the overall number of spaces in the IGF caused by the actual location itself, we should be very careful that this does not become the norm, and therefore, in further years, we'll end up with an ongoing saying, "Well, you know, we tried the one with 600 sessions, we tried the one with 30 sessions. 30 sessions was less of a headache, let's just stick to 30 sessions in the future." In which case, I think that many of the DCs here will feel disenfranchised in some way, because we are doing intersessional work, and we are put on the same level when it comes down to requesting sessions as any other organization

requesting sessions, some of which are actually better funded because they are big organizations that are doing this professionally, whilst many of us are volunteers. So, I'm a little concerned about this, and I'm just voicing that I hope that in the future, for future IGFs, we'll be in venues that will allow, again, for a full opening and allow the diversity that is usually allowed when you have a large number of sessions.

There is a concern always in saying "too many sessions spoil the broth" in some way. But the point is, I mentioned that word, diversity. If we reduce the number of sessions permanently and end up with a more elitist way of doing things in the IGF, we're going to lose a lot of people, and we're definitely going to lose the diversity. That's all, thanks. I wanted to put this to the record. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Again, that circles back to the discussion right from the beginning. And it is a fact, the more sessions we have, it actually brings people to the IGF, because many people can only justify their presence if they have a speaking role. If you have to go to your supervisor, say "I need a trip to wherever," Oslo or Bali, yeah, it'd be nice, but "Why do you need to go there?" "Oh, yes, because I'm speaking in a session." Then the trip might get approved. But if you just go there to be there, the trip might not be approved, so there's a direct correlation as well. I mean, that's, again, a natural tension. But as you said, Olivier, each year, we had to take stock, and there was overwhelming feedback, too many sessions, too many things going on, we get lost. Whatever. It's a tension we had right from the beginning.

My argument was always, it's like if you go to a buffet dinner, you don't have to eat every dish. You pick what is interesting to you. And the same if you go to a meeting with many sessions. You cannot possibly attend every session. You go to the sessions you're interested in. But that is a debate that needs to happen, again, when we take stock of the Oslo meeting and look on the way forward what is the right balance between bottom-up and MAG-curated sessions. But first of all, I think we need to have to have the mandate of the IGF to be extended before we can have this discussion.

With that, I hope I have your indulgence. Can we move to the next agenda item? I think all valid points. Thank you for engaging in the discussions. These are very fundamental issues relating to the very essence of Dynamic Coalitions, but we don't operate in a vacuum. We have to take into account, as Anriette pointed out, the overall discussions of the MAG and the host country, and we have to find to make our best.

But again, you can have your annual general meeting. There will still be bilateral rooms where you can actually meet and have your AGM in Oslo. So, I mean, here, we're talking, and we also discussed about creating a space where Dynamic Coalitions that actually have an outcome to present can do that. And one of the options would be on the lightning sessions, on the space which will be presumably in the middle of the village. But, so,

that's still an option.

And actually, in the chat, I saw Joao, who's representing Wout and Mark, said that his Dynamic Coalition would like to prepare a security seminar. And I think that is the next webinar, tentatively 30th of April, but we do seem to have problems with people not being able to attend, but that would be also a question to bring back to Wout and Mark, or could you, Joao, represent your Dynamic Coalition in the webinar.

But with that, can we go to the next agenda item? I have spoken too much. The next agenda item is the DC sessions at the IGF. And we have already addressed to that. We are going to have the collaborative sessions, we're going to have a main session, and at the last meeting, we agreed to have some drafting based on the voluntary collaboration, drafting groups to prepare the narrative for the sessions.

And Roman, could you actually -- the report has been available on the website for quite a while. But on the report, actually, it points out the voluntary groups that have actually volunteered. They said they would prepare the text for the sessions. Could you show us that in the chat or on the main screen? I see, yes, here is the report. It's right at the back of the report, I think, we have, on the next steps. There we go, next steps. All right. Wout, Avri, Anriette and Amrit to ton working on the six topics identified by the Working Group on Strategy. And the third was more relevant to this, Avri to create four Google Drive documents for the core team to start working on the session ideas. Where are we with this Google Doc? Any? Please, Avri, hand up.

>> AVRI DORIA: I did them that very same day. I sent out some notice that they were there, and I believe they're still completely empty.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Well, thank you for --

>> AVRI DORIA: I'll get out your -- I created one document with sections for four in it. The reason I did that is, no need to have four empty documents. I figured once they started getting filled, if we needed to, we could separate them into other docs, but I was never faced with such a difficult decision.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. IGF wonder, should we go a step further and find volunteers to take on responsibility for each of the sessions?

I can so hands shooting up. No, I can't. Well, we have to fill the empty space. Roman says it's okay if you have something the day before. I don't think it is okay, the day before. I think we really -- and we said tentatively, it should be the 30th of April.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, I said that for me, personally, it is okay. And we keep the deadline of 30th of April, according to the next steps which we see on the screen.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct. But Avri, your hand is still up. You have ideas on how to fill the empty spaces?

>> AVRI DORIA: No. I should have lowered my hand. What I

was trying to do was find the URL of the document and was also checking to see whether I was telling the truth about it still being empty, and indeed, it mostly is. So, yeah, I have no idea how to get people to volunteer. That's something I've been a failure at for 30 years now, so, sorry, no help on that one. Probably it's my cynical, negative attitude, you know?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think you've been amazingly efficient over the past 30 years in this multistakeholder bottom-up space. But Anriette has a very good idea on how to move forward.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Markus, you keep doing this to me! And IGF wanted to say, you know, I'm sorry, I was actually struggling to hear because the delegates are coming back into the room here at the UN where I'm sitting.

-- I just wanted to say, on the working group and strategies, I think we are actually doing fine. I think the working group strategy is open. There are several people that are involved in DCs that are also part of the working group strategy and that are contributing to the work of the work strategy. Wout is obviously a key person because he's active in both. So, I don't feel there's actually open or empty spaces. I think that what's important is --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry, Anriette, we're talking about two different things.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Oh, are we? Are we talking about the DC planning document?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct, correct.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Okay, well, I'm so sorry. Let me just close -- I was worried that I had the wrong thing. But just to close on the working group strategy, I think that's going quite well and I don't think the DCs should feel they are failing on that part.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We're talking about presenting the narrative for the four collaborative sessions, and then also the main session. And it was, at the last call, we decided to leave that to a bottom-up collaborative idea. And Avri very kindly created some documents, some Google Drive documents, where the volunteers could add their ideas, but nothing has happened since. So, obviously, that idea was maybe a bit too bottom up, and I think it needs to --

>> AVRI DORIA: It's happening now! Pardon me for jumping in, but people are in the document.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, okay! So, maybe the call was necessary. So, well, okay. If it's happening, all the better! But might still not be a bad idea to have people take on responsibility for each of the sessions. It may be a bit old-fashioned, but if you have somebody that says, okay, I'm herding the cats for this session, you are our interlocutor, then we have somebody we can talk to. Avri, your hand is still up, or up again.

>> AVRI DORIA: Not still up, it is newly up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Newly up, okay.

>> AVRI DORIA: What I was thinking is, sure, if we have someone who comes along and says, I'm really doing into cluster

3, and I know what it should be called, et cetera, that's great. What I was hoping would happen in this as a fully bottom-up, open exercise -- which wasn't working -- is that you would see that one person was writing more and would naturally sort of become leaderish on it. But I think either one is fine. I have nothing against people volunteering to be the one that leads something. It's not something I intend to do, but I have nothing against people doing that. But I was allowing for natural evolution. If you start writing, well, then, obviously, you've taken a lead, and that's a good thing.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, I couldn't agree more with you. The question is, can we continue with this, as you said, the documents are filling up. People are beginning to write. Do we find natural leads emerging from this process, or do we need to decide now who should be the lead person on each issue? I'm absolutely open to this. My only worry is that nothing happens. But if things start happening, that will be fine.

>> AVRI DORIA: I put my hand up again. I think if you have anybody that wants to volunteer now, that be great, and they should write their name in the document.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right.

>> AVRI DORIA: Or do you think we should appoint someone without them volunteering?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think it's better if people do it on a voluntary basis, than we volunteer them. And I see Rajendra says main DC session he volunteered to work, and as always, with Jutta, Judith, Dino and Avri are in it. Okay, that's the main session, but the main session will be the component of the four collaborative sessions. So, can we not maybe just farm out the main, lead persons for the main sessions, that you can take a section of the collaborative sessions? Let's say, okay, Rajendra, fine if you're the overall lead for the main session, but then can we see if Judith, Dino, and Avri are part of it, can you volunteer for one of the sections?

And also, don't forget, Joao is in the chat. He's representing Wout and Mark, who are very active members, so you could also volunteer to be on their behalf and bring in Wout and Mark.

>> AVRI DORIA: I volunteer to keep shepherding the document itself.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. So, we have someone who is responsible for the document itself.

>> AVRI DORIA: Right, but I'm not volunteering to do a session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, okay, that's great. We have somebody, volunteers. Other volunteers?

Okay, Ayden volunteers, put his name somewhere in the document. And June is happy as a co-lead but not confident as a lead. Well, we're talking about -- well, okay, we maybe need to form clusters for each of the collaborative sessions. But okay. Maybe we can shelf that and leave a decision.

Okay, we have Rajendra, "I can lead AI cluster." Okay. That's noted. We rely on you. Avri, is that a new hand?

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah, and I just wanted to add, as people are working on the document, if you've got any issues, any problems with it, any whatever, you know, either communicate with me through the document or through email or whatever and let me know. I mean, I'm ready to help make the document work. I'm happy to explain why I wrote what I wrote, et cetera. So, please, call on me for any document needs you may have.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Well, I would suggest, then, that we keep going now with the documents. I understand there are more people willing to weigh in and see how it works and try and follow a true bottom-up approach. And we can then take stock at the next call and hope that real progress gets made.

As we are moving on, there is some -- yeah, I see there are some people in the chat who keep adding their names, so that's very positive. Actually, may I take a short administrative break? Because there are people who joined the call lately. And again, I ask you to add on the list of participants behind your name, the affiliation, which DC you belong to, because it makes work of the Secretariat much easier. And I think, also at the request of the team coalition, that you add the location so we get the clearer picture of who participates at what hours. So, please edit on the list of participants that you've been given editing rights so that you can actually add which Dynamic Coalition you belong to, and also add your location after the affiliation.

With that, I think can we close that agenda item and move on? The next agenda item would be then the issue of accountability. We have the gamification is still one of the issues we started, which is essentially an elaborate list of attendants, but I think it was a starting point of the discussion on accountability. And also, it's part of the ongoing discussion on the obligations of DCs. And I think we consider DCs should engage into the Coordination Group calls. And if we actually then have a list of participants with this gamification tool, it makes it more in a, shall we say, yes, like a game, but it's not. It's more, looks a bit less serious, but the objective is the same, just to show who is active. And yes, we do understand there are issues with times and locations, and that can also be built in.

Now, is our friend from -- who runs the gamification -- I don't think he's on the list. Is somebody else from his --

>> DC G4P: Hello, hello.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, he's there, okay.

>> DC G4P: No, he had an emergency and was not able to join the call, so I volunteer on behalf of him.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's fine, okay.

>> DC G4P: So, there were some unexpected errors, and we were not able to reach out as of now. But hopefully, we will do it by the next meeting or next week. So, that's from this side.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, thank you for the update. These things do happen. And I did send out an email earlier today, picking up -- Wout had sent an email to the list on the Working Group of Strategy. And there is one working group I was given

the lead, and that is essentially to prepare a webinar on implementation of the Sao Paulo principles on multistakeholder participation.

And the aim of the webinar will be that we show sort of internal governance mechanisms to see how multistakeholder bottom up and how we deal with these issues would be... Now, I do know this, we will not solve in five minutes. But again, I did say in the email I sent out to the list that we have actually -- we don't start from zero there, because we did have this paper. We looked at this collective effort which was actually a very solid effort based on various interviews on numbers, numerous interviews with Dynamic Coalitions, participants.

And one of the issues to explore was actually on governance frameworks for the DCs. Again, recognizing the fact that there's no single framework that fits the mold, no one size fits all framework, that each Dynamic Coalition is different. But again, I'm just quoting from the paper. And maybe, Roman, can you actually show it on the screen? It's on page 4 of that paper, under "Issues to be explored." The first point. That's okay. The first point was, recommend that DCs develop written governance frameworks. Such a recommendation could be included in the DC guidelines.

It was argued that having governance frameworks in place would provide clarity for DC members. It's on top of page 4. And others outside the Coalition on how the Coalition is run and how work is expected to happen.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Markus, this is page 4.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Nope, I'm looking at the short version. There's a long version and there's a short version of the --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: That's why I asked you before the call which one I should get.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry! My fault, my bad. Anyway. And the second issue to explore was develop a blueprint for DC governance frameworks to serve as a source of inspiration for DCs that want to develop that such frameworks. It said there, "the blueprint will be based on the experience of DCs which already have comments frameworks in place and would list options for interested coalitions to consider if they intend to develop such frameworks." The blueprint would not -- there we go, yes, thank you, Roman -- would not impose obligations on how DCs should govern their work, but rather, list aspects that the governance frameworks would cover, how work is conducted, how coordinators/chairs are appointed, how outputs are developed, et cetera.

So, I think these are very -- can you go slightly down, Roman? Scroll down a little bit. Okay, that's perfect. That's okay. It's all there.

So, these are very sensible issues to be explored. There are two options. And I think the first stop would actually be to ask DCs, "Do you have anything in place you could share with the Coordination Group?" So, that would be a first step. If you have that information, we could go into the webinar with something in

our hands to say, look, here we have. They vary greatly, but so do DCs. They vary greatly. There's no one size fits all, so they all are different.

And the other issue will be something to work on. Obviously, that will take a long time frame, you know, from today to tomorrow, but it could be a useful thing to consider. That could be another option. But we could say, when we go into the webinar to say, look, we have looked what are the various mechanisms in place, and we have this and this and this and this. Some Dynamic Coalitions don't have anything written, which is also fine. But unwritten rules can also be effective, and that's how they operate.

So, the first message will be, in the first phase, we suggest we collect information on how the DCs organize themselves. And then, once we have that, we could then discuss, do we actually want to develop a blueprint? There may be pros and cons. And there may be very good arguments to say, no, we don't need that, we are fine. Let 1,000 flowers bloom and have multiple governance frameworks. But my suggestion would be, at this stage, let's reach out, let's ask all DCs, "Tell us how you organize yourselves and how you manage your cooperation," be that based on written rules or be that based on unwritten rules. Would that make sense? Something for us to report back into this proposed webinar by the IGF Working Group on Strategy. The floor is open.

And I see that Anriette is leaving. Can I take silence for approval? I mean, it's nothing radical. All I'm suggesting is that we actually ask all DCs, "Please tell us, how do you organize yourselves."

Okay, there doesn't seem to be any objection, so can I take it we have agreement on that?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: We probably have agreement, but will it work? I cannot understand if everyone is happy or...

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I mean, at this stage, all we ask is, please, if you have anything in place. And I think some Dynamic Coalitions do have some rules in their own internal rules of procedure, then share it with us. And if you don't, then send us an email and say how you organize it. And if you say it's based on good faith, okay, we can take that, and we can report back to the webinar. But we need to have input. We cannot -- I don't know how the Dynamic Coalitions organize themselves. And the days of webinar on implementation of the Sao Paulo Multistakeholder. And Avri, over to you. You have a brilliant idea.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. No, I wanted to ask a question. It seemed fine with me. But if I understood. So, if we have a written-up charter of, this is the way we do things, submit that. If we don't, but obviously, we do have some sort of governance that we've been using -- I don't think any of us are fully, you know, wild, so, we have some soft form that we have been using -- basically, you're asking that we write up a description of that and send that in. And then, later we can decide whether we all need written ones. But if we have

something we can describe, especially if it's been reviewed by the DC itself. So, did I understand correctly?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think you summed it up much better than I did. But I think, you know, it could be five bullet points. We have a few core principles. If you have a written, elaborate rules of procedure, fine, but I presume most of the Dynamic Coalitions don't have that, and it's based on a collaboration based on good faith. You trust each other and you have... but what are the core principles? Like, we have the core principles of Dynamic Coalitions. You have to be open, open archives, open membership, and that's sort of core principles.

And maybe, based on what we get as a feedback, we can then discuss, should we adopt some core points, include them in the overall guidelines as a baseline for each Dynamic Coalition?

The other question is, you know, do we need to develop a blueprint for a governance framework, which would be somewhat more ambitious? But I think the first step, we are looking at the very concrete ask, which is, can we participate in a webinar and say how we, as Dynamic Coalition, organize ourselves? Are we in conformity with the Sao Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines? Are we different? But again, a first step would just be hear from you how you organize yourselves and maybe send us a three or four or five or six bullet points, what you consider the core principles of your governance framework of your respective Dynamic Coalitions.

Does that make sense?

I mean, it would be great -- yep? Sorry, who was that?

>> AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Sorry, it makes sense to me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you. And it will be great, you know, if you have this webinar and if you can go in, and it would also help to explain, again, the diversity of the Dynamic Coalition to say, we don't have a joint framework, but we may consider developing some core principles which will be observed by all of them, but that will be a process. But right now, that's what we have, and we could present the various ways of Dynamic Coalitions organize themselves. And I think it will be a useful input in this webinar the Strategy Group is proposing.

Okay. If there's no objection, can we agree on that? And then we would conclude that agenda item, so we would have... okay, on the accountability of the DCs, we would still wait for the gaming coalition. We would have a little bit more at the next meeting. And hopefully, well, it would be great if we could already have some feedback by the next meeting we have on the individual framing, governance frameworks. But there are those who may have it ready, still others who may have to think about how to put it on paper.

And I see Rajendra is boarding a flight. I think people are leaving us. Okay. And Olivier needs to go as well.

I think that was all on the formal agenda. So, we come then to the Any Other Business point of our agenda. Is there anything under Any Other Business? If that's not the case, then maybe we should look, when should we have the next call. We did say the next webinar... and we also said, we will call it a webinar, but

we will not use the webinar function of Zoom because the normal Zoom meeting makes it easier to follow. But at the same time, there is also, obviously, the danger that we have unwanted guests. May be more difficult to monitor. But the next webinar would be on, tentatively on 30th of April. And when should we have the next call? The following week? Would that be an option? But we rely heavily on the Secretariat. What are your availabilities, Roman?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: So, what if we do it on the next day after the webinar, on the 1st of May?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: 1st of May is a holiday in some countries.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay. So, you mean the next week, yes, starting from the 5th?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Maybe the next week may be better.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Mm-hmm. Let's have a call the 6th or 7th of May, because 8th and 9th are also holidays in some countries.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, no, 6th or 7th will be fine, yeah.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Or 5th, I guess. It is also an option, I guess.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: 5th is also... I mean, I already know I have a --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay, so --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: 6th or 7th --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Forget about 5th.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: -- will be better. 6th or 7th will be fine. Can you already agree on a date and a time in terms of our rotation of times? I think it will be more of a late afternoon time slot now, no?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Well... Like, when? What time?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, either we have the early morning slot, the early afternoon slot, like now, or the late afternoon, which will be 4:00 or 5:00 UTC, 4:00 UTC, which is very late for Asia but will be very good for the Americas. 1600 UTC is 6:00 in Geneva. And midmorning in the west coast. Would that be acceptable to everyone?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Again, if we are thinking about the deadline for workshops as the 30th of April, what if we have a meeting before? Like, we had this breakfast in the beginning of this year, so that the next meeting could be on the 24th or 25th of April to understand where we are, in terms of preparation, because this is a priority now, right? So, we have simultaneously track with the webinars, but to have the DC sessions done. I believe it's quite a priority, again. Sorry for repeating myself. What do you think about that week, the 21st to the 25th of April?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's fine with me, except I will be traveling a bit, but it doesn't matter. I don't have to be there. We also have (?) you can and yourself.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: What do we think? Do we need a meeting to sort of see where we are in terms of session preparation?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, why don't you have a separate meeting with all the volunteers who indicate their willingness

to collaborate on the session proposal?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I believe we should do it in the joint meeting, so that everyone is included.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, it would be open, but I mean, but the main thing is, the main actors would be the people who would be involved in the session proposals. And Avri, would you mind if I suggest that you should be then the lead person, as you volunteered to take the lead of the overall document?

>> AVRI DORIA: Now, that is a clever spin.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Isn't it?

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes, yes! It's terrible. Sure.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: In other words, you agree?

>> AVRI DORIA: Said as briefly as I could, yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you very much for that. So, I will, as I said, I will be traveling. I will try to tune in. But essentially, fix the slot with Avri, and it will be a meeting of the DC Coordination Group, but focus will be the preparation of the session notes, which is the Google Doc.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Well, 24th of April looks good, because today shows that Friday is not a good idea, as we have less people joining than usually in the previous several DCCG meetings. So, 24th of April, maybe 3:00 p.m. UTC.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: To balance --

>> AVRI DORIA: Fridays are never good. Fridays are never good because they're somebody's Saturday.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Of course, mm-hmm. So, 3:00 p.m. UTC on 24th, right, for this sessions preparation meeting.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> AVRI DORIA: What time -- 15? 15, was that it?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: 15 UTC. It's like webinar. So, something really convenient to everyone. And for the next meeting, just DCCG meeting for everyone, is, like, 6th or 7th of May.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Why don't we fix a time right away?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay, tell me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, 6th?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: 6th. 6th of May, yeah?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: And time?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Shall we go again 4:00?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Or maybe early-morning slot, because we --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Tend to do later.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, early morning. That will be, what?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Like 8:00 a.m.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: UTC? 8:00 UTC? Okay.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Or 6:00 or 7:00. Want me to decide,

just --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Maybe 7:00 UTC. That will be...

>> AVRI DORIA: That be 3:00 a.m. for me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's a bit early, isn't it?

>> AVRI DORIA: It is one of the more challenging times to hit. But I'm usually awake at 3:00, so I can handle it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, why don't we make it 8:00 UTC, give you some --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: That helps, Marcus.

>> AVRI DORIA: Pretty much the same to me, but sure.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Okay.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, with that, okay, we have a path carved out on the way forward. And we've reached the end of our time. Thank you very much for your attendance and constructive participation. And there is work to be done ahead of us. Thank you and have an excellent weekend. Bye-bye.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thank you, you, too.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Bye-bye.

(Session concluded at 1:20 p.m. UTC)

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.