

RAW FILE
DCCG Meeting Number 192
Tuesday, January 14, 2025
10:00 a.m. UTC.

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are 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: Hello, everyone. Just testing the sound. It's Markus speaking. Can you hear me?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, we can hear you and see you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent. Thank you.

Hello, everyone. It's Markus here. It's two minutes to go until the top of the hour. Let's wait for others to join, hopefully. It's not a very friendly time for those in the western hemisphere, for the Americans. It's very, very early in the morning. It's a bit kinder for Rajendra and I.

>> RAMESH RASKAR: Thank you, Markus. Happy new year. It's a good start, I would say. But most of the time on the other side.

>> JUNE PARRIS: It's 6:00 a.m. in Barbados. Not too early. Not too early. 4:00 was really bad. But 6:00 is not too bad.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, six is just about tolerable, but --

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yeah, yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Maybe we have to revise this idea, the idea of changing the hours is, basically, a very good idea, but, yeah, also have to see how many more people it actually attracts. And if it puts off quite a few people, we have maybe to assess what are the benefits from having court -- I mean for the Europeans, we are, sort of, in the middle, so it doesn't matter too much. But it's essentially, especially for Australia, it's very difficult to keep them on board. But we don't seem to have anyone from Australia or further east. So, makes you wonder then whether it's worth it.

Anyway, we reached the top of the hour. I suggest still waiting a minute or two. And the agenda has been circulated in the chat. Thanks, Roman. We have essentially two major agenda items. The first one is taking stock, and the second one is looking forward on how to organize our work this year, and always bearing in mind that the next IGF meeting is more or less around the corner we have from now. What, it's five months to prepare. Yes, it's in June. Yeah. Five months and a bit. So, it's really -- we have to be focused.

With that, I suggest that we get started. Let me start by wishing you all a happy new year. I hope you had good holiday and rest after the IGF meeting.

And first agenda item would be adoption of the agenda, as we have it here in the chat. And we always have the possibility to add any other business in case the agenda is not as comprehensive as you think it should be. But are there any comments or can I take silence for agreement?

I take it that we have agreement and we have an agenda.

Then the first agenda item will be taking stock. And there, we have three distinct sub agenda items. One will be the DC booth at the IGF village. The second one is the DC main session. And then the third one will be the individual DC sessions, how that works.

Without further ado, I would like to invite Roman to give us feedback from the village, as he was the main person dealing with it and he was herding the DC cats at the IGF village, which, in my humble opinion, worked better than I would have anticipated. Roman, over to you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thank you, Markus. Hello, everyone, and congratulations first for the successful work in the IGF and happy new year to everyone. And, yes as you mentioned, Markus. The work was -- the DC booth was really efficient, and thanks to you, I believe that those two worked well. Where you can all volunteer and take some time slots and also the WhatsApp chat which we propose to keep for communication purposes, I believe it's quite efficient. Especially I know for myself or my own emails don't pass UN filters and probably some of you also get the emails delayed or sometimes it goes to the spam folder. But if you are on WhatsApp group, it means you will receive all notifications there. You will not miss them. So I believe we should continue this practice with the DC booth and allocate special rows and time slots. And maybe for the next time we can a bit in advance prepare the material to be placed on the screen or even do some joint video or joint slide show of these materials, not do it on the venue. It will require us a little bit of

coordination in advance. But I believe it's manageable.

I think this is it. Yeah, also thanks to Mark, our intern, we have this beautiful brochure which I also believe worked well. And why not keep the same structure for the next forum, maybe we will have less DCs by that time. I don't know if not anyone submits their annual reports by the end of the first quarter. And if not anyone will continue active participation in the DC meetings. And our intersessional work with clusters which we can discuss a bit further, right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Roman. And many thanks for the work, very much last-minute work it was in Riyadh itself. But in the end, the result, I was a bit skeptical when we arrived. Nothing was there. We couldn't find the booth. It was not even on the plan. But in the end, it worked well. And also the logo we had was good and also the presentation on the computer. Can't remember the guy who put it together, was very, sort of, also, again, was on the venue itself. But in the end, it was there and that's the main thing.

Are there any other comments, also suggestions on lessons learned on what we could do better next time? Obviously, we don't know yet what the venue will look like, and I think what Olivier said in the chat was a great meeting point and a lot to do with the architecture of the meeting. The village was right in the middle of the workshop. Whenever you had to go to a meeting, you went through the village and that greatly facilitated or enhanced the value of the village.

Last year, it was a nice village, but it was just not at the same venue, in a way. It was a different planet.

But I see there are two hands up. Mark and Olivier. Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Markus. Hello, everyone. Never too late, is it, to wish everybody a happy, prosperous, successful year for dynamic coalitions.

At the booth, I thought it went -- it worked very well. I should say the location of the village was excellent this year. I think it was a model for future IGFs, I have said that in my stocktaking response. I think it is really good.

I wonder if we have any sense of how interaction at the booth may have led to expansion of membership of individual dynamic coalitions. And also whether generated some thoughts about establishing new dynamic coalitions, I wonder. It's difficult to measure this kind of impact, I guess, but I think it may well have helped. Certainly raised the profile, and that would lead, I hope to stakeholders thinking, ah, that's a coalition for me to join and how to contribute and also inspire people to think,

we should set up a coalition on whatever new emerging topic, whatever.

The thought also occurs to me, those of us who were there will remember the networking stage in the centre of that room where the village booths were. That also could be something to think about for the dynamic coalitions, if that is replicated and Lillestrom in June, and in subsequent years, whether we take advantage and get a slot in the schedule for the networking stage to present on the coalitions. This is all. Okay. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Olivier and then Muhammad. Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Markus. I support everything that Mark has just mentioned. And I wondered whether the UN, when they send their recommendations or requisites to a host country, whether they have a say in regards to the setup. Whilst I was not fond at all of the acoustics of the workshop rooms, which we all felt was challenging due to their open nature and so on. I did think that having the booths in the middle of it all and also an open stage in the middle of it all actually integrated everyone in this and it really raised a profile of the booths and of the activities around the booths, rather than these things being, you know, as you said in previous occasions, in a different world, which then certainly brings us to the question as to whether, I think Markus said whether we want to actually make use of these open stages as well, maybe even on more than one occasion and just for short sessions, just to remind people about the dynamic coalitions in addition to our main session. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yeah, thank you very much. And I also support the suggestions and the comments made by Markus and Olivier, but would like to add a couple of points.

Markus' comment on how the dynamic coalitions booth at the right, right middle of the conference, helped in raising the membership for the dynamic coalitions. For die CAD, I can say I don't remember the number directly but since I as the coordinator received emails of every new member added to the coalition, I think there were about seven to 10 members, new members, those who have joined since IGF 2024. So this would be from the die CAD side.

With regard to the rooms where I would say the acoustics was one problem in some workshop rooms, there was also a problem of wi-fi connectivity of the headphones, head sets that were there. There was some issues in the connection and in the setting up of those systems. I think those could be improved. Otherwise,

it was wonderful.

In terms of accessibility, there are numerous suggestions and our participation in this meeting informs our accessibility guidelines. There are a couple of points that would be added in the accessibility guidelines in the 2020 -- and we will call that updated in 2025 we plan to update and share those with the Secretariat by early February so that we can share these guidelines with the new host in July.

Last point, with regards to the annual report, DCAD had submitted its report and it's already up there on the IGF website. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. And also from my side, of course, the best to everybody for 2025, that we may have successful year as dynamic coalitions and personally, of course, .

I think that I underscore everything that Mark said and that has been said afterwards. Two things I would like to add, I do would like us to have a serious evaluation of the merging processes of the workshops of the dynamic coalitions, whether these were successful or not. As I was not exactly happy about what the outcome is. Because we had outcomes that we were hardly able to present at the IGF with people working for a whole year on these topics. And in fact, almost nobody heard anything about these outcomes.

And I don't think that that is the desire dynamic coalitions and the seriousness of the work that has been undertaken. I think that is something that we need to look at and discuss with the MAG.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry if I interrupt you. You are already jumping. You are already forming the agenda item. Right now we are discussing the booth and the village.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I thought it was double. I think the booth and the village were excellent on the sessions itself. I had the idea that when things went wrong with the connection with the headphones, it was because of these people behind the desk were half of the time not taking it seriously. They were all of a sudden gone or they were playing a game that was interfering with the connection, in a literal sense. And when they were asked to stop playing the game, then the connection came back on. So, in other words, there was some unprofessionality with some of the people monitoring the room and that is something that, well, we can discuss, but they are gone and nobody cares anymore, right?

So, I will skip the other topic for later. Thank you. Sorry. I had not seen the agenda. It was my mistake.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yao.

>> YAO AMEVI SOSSOU: Thank you, Markus, for the floor. Happy new year, everybody, and happy to see you again. What I want to mention, the booth, sometime the equipment will not work, and we could not find any assistant to setting up the devices.

Apart from that, I think, yeah, the position of our village was very quite, I think, interesting, and, yeah, it was, personally my first in-person attendance of the IGF, was a great experience for me. And I enjoy the booth also very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Roberto.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Roberto speaking. Besides what has already been said, I think what was annoying for me was the fact that you had to put the headphones to hear what was going online. That was an additional problem, considering also the fact that we didn't have a screen in front of us. So, we had to turn our heads to see the screen behind for the people who were online. So it all comes up from the fact that we had an open space and so that we couldn't possibly have all the rooms' speakers speaking without the headphones.

So, it goes back to Avri Doria has commented, the fact of not having in front of us the return of the screen was an additional problem, especially for the first session that you are suddenly in. And then you get used to it.

About the fact of the reporting, I think the reporting by groups of the activities, I think that we had already spoken on the spot and we don't need to repeat it. But I think that we have to take serious commitment that this doesn't happen in the future.

And also, I agree with Avri, that certain things should be in the requirement. And the fact that we leave too much free hand to the organizers is -- can be a problem because they cannot possibly learn from the experience of the previous editions if they have not attended many. So, there should be a role for the IGF Secretariat in this organizing how the venue is structured. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that.

I think we have, sort of, done the round. Just a few comments. Obviously, you have to live with the rooms that are there. And last year, in Kiyota, that was a grand conference centre, was built for international conferences, but there it was not possible to have the village in the middle of the workshop rooms. So that's why it was separate. It was nice, but it was not the central for the whole meeting, as it was this year.

Now, the drawback we had this year was it was in the middle but the conference rooms were open, they had no roofs, so we

had to resort back to these listening with earphones. That was commented on. It was the third time, actually, this happened. First time it was in Vilnius in 2010, and then Baku in 2012, and new in Riyadh.

I think last year it was the best so far. It's definitely not ideal. It cuts sort of spontaneity and interaction of the participants and many points were already made and a lot of it was the lack of attention of the local technical assistants who did not do their job properly. I think Olivier mentioned it and I think you had also been very active in various sessions you were involved in telling them what they had to do. So, that is something, yes, that's the host country responsibility to train their assistants well enough. But be it as it is.

And lastly, you know, the UN provides requirements in host country agreement, but they were drafted many years ago, before actually the Internet was a factor in conferences. And, obviously, that is something that ought to be factored in in the requirements of the host country agreement. And that is something, I think, Roman in the chat promised already to take it back to the Secretariat. I don't think in no way we will have the same problems. But it's always better to have it in writing and to make it clear as an obligation for the host country. If you want to host a meeting, you have to abide by the requirement.

These are my short reactions to that, but I think I saw -- did I say Jutta's hand up? Would you like to add your comments?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. It's like you already said, so I put my hand down. I do think it could work with the headsets, and I have an example with the Republica, which is a big Internet conference, international, national in Germany every year in May where thousands of people attend and all, all sessions are held with headphones. People are acquainted with that. So they are used to it. And if the technology works and if the technicians in the background do their job quite well, then it can work out.

Also, it's a different situation to being in a room with a ceiling and where you don't need the headphones. But it can work out. It all depends on the technology and the technicians to do a good job. That was what I wanted to add.

And I do think that also the message that we can transfer not only to Norway, but to any further meeting, that it depends on the technology and also on kind of the mentality of those technicians who are working in the background to understand that they are there to serve for a good experience in the sessions and, yes, we have heard the complaints already. So, I don't want to get deeper into that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you for that. And, you know,

it's always a question of balancing the various needs. The overall feeling of last year's IGF with the village in the middle was certainly extremely positive. The downside, then was the open workshop rooms. But as you said, that depends -- that can be managed better than it was managed in Riyadh.

With that, can we go to the next sub-item of the agenda, which will be taking stock of the DC main session. And, thus, Jutta was the main architect behind it and also the person who summed it up and was in charge of the report. You are obviously the best placed person to give us the feedback on how it went. I think it went very well. Please, over to you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: There's the hand of Muhammad.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, Muhammad, maybe you have a comment to the previous agenda item?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. I think I lowered the hand, but, yes, it was related to the previous item. But since we have moved, so I can just send an email regarding that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, no, please, as you have the floor already. Go ahead.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you. Just a quick comment. Perhaps we can consider making a list of do's and don'ts on the lines of accessibility guidelines where we set the experiences just not as a requirement, but as an experience hearing for the next year's host, that what are the do's and don'ts for the IGF meetings. And these kind of technical inefficiencies or volunteer issues or such as systematic problems could fall into that and categorize and perhaps someone may learn lessons from there. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And with that, back to you, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, thank you, Markus. I am taking the opportunity to say happy new year to all of you. I am really impressed that we have so many participants today in this meeting, which shows that all understand how relevant dynamic coalitions work is, and that is what we also showcased in the dynamic coalitions main session.

Thank you to those who have not only taken part, but given their input to the five cluster groups, according to the Global Digital Compact. I do think that approach went very well. And also a big thank you to Joao, I don't think he's in this call. I haven't seen him so far. Because he was very supportive and helped us to structure not only the session as such, but also how dynamic coalitions were sorted to the five main objectives of the Global Digital Compact.

I do think it works out very well not only throughout the

session itself, which, gained pretty much attention, it was well tended by participants. I do think better than we had in previous years. So it was quite good. And also the main message that, from my perspective, was given by this main session is how good cooperation among dynamic coalitions could work when the approach in advance has a good structure.

I have heard Wout already referring to the merging process and everything that might not have been going well in all cases. I had a good experience, we had a good experience in our merged session, but that might be different for other dynamic coalitions. We will hear about that.

But I do think that was also due to the fact that it was not known in advance that the IGF would suggest the merging process, that all dynamic coalitions prepared for their own individual session, and the process for the joint dynamic coalition main session was different. It was from the beginning an approach that went based on collaboration, finding out where we have similarities, where we are trying to achieve not only our own dynamic coalition objectives, but also objectives that were laid down in the Global Digital Compact. So, I do think this is an appropriate that we and a strategy that we could follow also in the future.

Again, many thanks to those who took part in the whole process who gave their input to the presentation of the dynamic coalitions work. And, yes, over to all who are in the room to say whether they felt they were not well represented or whether they have suggestions for improvements in the future. Thank you so much.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thanks, Jutta. One small comment, which I received right after the session from the technical team, who was organizing the stage, and they said that so far it was the best session. So, it was quite pleasant because really they were quite sincere and they were happy about the content and the diversity and the messages. So, it was really some unexpected feedback we received right there on the stage, what we will do in the collective photo.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I am pleased to hear that. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Indeed, thank you, Roman. That's good news. That's a very pleasant surprise. Again, it confirms the initial reaction we had, that it was extremely well done and well prepared, well executed. And, again, thanks to you, Jutta, and to Joao, who did also very excellent work.

Are there other comments on the main session? Doesn't seem to be the case. I think everybody was very happy with that and has the same assessment.

Then we go to the individual DC sessions, and you already alluded to that and we already heard wout.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Olivier, please.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: One last thing. Just on the main session, actually, it's interesting to note that the professionalism of the people working for that main hall and so on was actually way above all of the other rooms. So we didn't have any technical problems. But I also particularly like the fact that there was an usher, there were people telling us as panelists when to step on, waiting on the side. There was an actual show being presented, which I think made it very, very professional or made it look very professional. You know, we were all escorted onto the stage at the right moment, et cetera, whilst in the past there might have been some sessions where we were just hanging about before the session was due to start and it was much less tidy.

So, I really appreciated the ushering and the guidance we were given by the local crew in putting this where we needed to go. That's all of the part preparation, of course, which Jutta and colleagues have worked on. But it's something I would like to recognize and I hope we will be able to have in the future as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's an interesting point. We had the A team for the main sessions and the B team for the workshops. Okay.

Back to the agenda item, the individual DC sessions. We already had -- I interrupted wout so it's only fair to give the microphone back to wout.

>> WOUT DENATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. I got my microphone on. I'm not complaining about the cooperation that I had with DC IoT but that went very excellent and they had their own session, allowed us to come on their session, but also had a negative experience with another DC that said, but we are not giving you the floor.

But that point sort of aside, I think what I would like us to discuss is that the DCs who come to the IGF with a tangible outcome, whether it's a report or recommendation or guideline or whatever, they need to have the opportunity to present that at some sort of level at the IGF where people have the option to hear it. And in the past we had our own session and had 10 people show up and it has no impact either.

So, how can we make sure that people know that there are tangible outcomes, and how can they be presented at a level that at least maybe a few hundred people who are present hear it and

not just the 10 who happen to stray into one of the 20 or 15 sessions going on at the same time?

And we should know up front, well up front which DCs expect to have an outcome so that we can plan for some sort of a presentation time together. And that doesn't need to be in the DC main session. But that needs, like Mark suggested, perhaps, that there is some sort of a plenary time possible to give a 10-minute presentation on the outcome. Because it's an outcome that is the work of an IGF intersessional process. And how can we make sure that we get a better platform for the work that has been done by the DCs? And I am not talking about my own. I am talking about us all.

And finally, that what also did not help is that the new section on the main page of the IGF was not working the month before the IGF. So I announced we have a new report, I announced we have a video that we are going to show during the IGF on education skills and it was not able to get it on the website. So, that's also something that does not assist DCs or other intersessional work to announce their outcomes to -- yeah, to a bigger audience than just their own DC page, which hidden deep, deep, deep, somewhere on the IGF website.

How can we organize ourselves better is question one.

Question two is do we know up front what is going to be presented in Lillestrom. And three, how can we make sure that we get a platform where we are heard so that people know, hey, there's an interesting outcome coming. I better go and listen.

So, that's three questions I would like to pose to us and have a final serious evaluation of the merging process and whether we are happy with it or that it needs to be better somehow. I know we are not going to get all the sessions back, but how can we improve ourselves.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, there are various points. I would just get back on -- well, the website is one thing I think we can -- any website for every organization I have ever worked with, there are always questions. You can never find what you want to see, usually you use Google to find it.

But I will note, Mark was in exchange with the secretary pointing out the things that were deep down. Same thing happened to me. The famous paper I like so much of our DC, was lost. I couldn't find it. It was deep down somewhere. But it was there. I suggest taking that offline. If you see something, maybe get in touch with Roman and also sort it out with Louis. I think Mark had some success already with his interventions. So, this is continuous work in progress.

The other point is as to present outcomes and I think your

suggestion is very constructive, that we ask well in advance which dynamic coalition would have a concrete outcome to present. Last year was IGF DCAD had the updated guidelines, that was in writing, they had it in Braille, whatever. But again, well, they had their own DCAD meeting but I think it deserves also a bigger stage.

And at the IGF last year, I think the stage in the middle of the village would have been an ideal stage for that sort of thing, where you can actually present, and it's also -- the location of it was actually quite useful because sometimes you get an audience that might not have gone to your meeting, but because they were already there, they listened to you. But that, again, depends on what the meeting, how the local geography will be of this year's meeting.

But this is, I think, a request we can clearly make at the next MAG meeting that there should be -- there are various categories of meetings to present something. I can't even remember all the categories they had. It's sometimes mind-boggling. But it could be a main session where you present outcomes, that we have this in mind. I think that's a constructive approach and something we could present to the MAG.

And then the last point, and Jutta already said that it was a bit, we were forced to move to these mergers, but, again, we have to wait for the result of the stocktaking. The secretary will present a report of that. But I would be surprised if we would be back to the old model where dynamic coalitions automatically get a session because of the general mood was reduced, the numbers of sessions, and if you have more dynamic coalitions, it's unlikely that automatically every dynamic coalition would be granted their own session, which is different from having their annual meeting type of thing where it can meet, and get a room for that. So this is something we have to bear in mind.

But I have talked too much. Are there other comments on this issue? I'm sure there are.

Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks, Markus. It's Olivier speaking. So, I agree with wout. It was difficult to have -- to present any of our own usually threads and standard work that we have done, including work that was done with other dynamic coalitions. We have collaborated with other dynamic coalitions before the current collaboration. So it kind of fragmented the thing in that we had an excellent session, joint session at this IGF, but that's just opened a new path and we have no idea what we are going to do for the next one. Because for the next one, who do we collaborate with if we have to do

a joint session? Do we collaborate with the one we just had now. Do we collaborate with that one or we collaborated in the past. It's going to be interesting. I do support the idea that perhaps we could have the same thing with the joint sessions, but we would also have access to flash sessions, where we can present our work. And not just one flash session, but a number of sessions. 10 minute slots at some time during the day, like the stage that was in the middle of the village of the booths and, you know, say, hey, so these are the things that we come up with the work that we've come up with in presenting the work that was done elsewhere than in the main joint session. Because yes, we are faced with questions now. That's it. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Maybe that was an opportunity. Yao and Jutta.

>> YAO AMEVI SOSSOU: Thank you very much, Markus. Also share the same concern, I can say worried about merging different DCs outcome during the session. Of course, we have already planned, if possible, another decision with the DC3 that we organized during the IGF. But the chair of our DC, Michelle, was also stressing the concern about either we should talk right now with the IGF Secretariat to mention that we really need a mechanism or a way to find possibility to own our own sessions.

And the suggestion made by Wout regarding knowing ahead which dynamic coalition has some outcome to present is, I think it's quite interesting one. And I would say right now we do have going into our DC, data driven health technology, we do have some outcome we want to present. We are actually working on the book for this year, and we already have some work already done during 2024 that we are also compiling. And, yeah, those are elements we can -- we are, actually, we are planning to broadcast about.

But, yeah, we will be -- if there is any planning in that direction, we have outcome to present as well. Yeah.

And how we can manage the different teams. I think we know up front that we are, as Markus mentioned, a likely -- likely that we are not going back to the old way of doing things where we have our own session automatically, if that's a new norm, I think it's maybe time we have time now to see which we might collaborate with and start to do some side planning in case something goes wrong. I won't say wrong, but in case we know the final decision is we have to merge sessions. And, yeah, merge sessions might also take the format of more DC working together instead of only two DCs together. That is what I wanted to add. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Jutta and then Dino.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, I take it from my own experience as

a dynamic coalition representative and as a coordinator, as well as from the discussion here in the room that there are different expectations we have when we are preparing for IGF from a dynamic coalition perspective.

And cut that to three different types. One expectation is that the IGF provides for a platform for a dynamic coalition to gather their members in that atmosphere of the global event, that dynamic coalition members who usually maybe throughout the year, although they are collaborating, they only meet in person or at the annual event. So, that is one expectation.

The next more prominent expectation is the IGF as a platform to showcase the work the dynamic coalition is doing throughout the year. This each individual dynamic coalition has produced reports, has produced studies, certain outcomes, and the IGF provides for a platform to showcase that, the broader participants.

And then the third expectation, and that is mainly related to the experience we had this last year is to showcase the collaboration of dynamic coalitions at large so that there are work that we can do together to achieve objectives, be it global Digital Compact objectives, be it general objectives of Internet governance. And I do think we need to find a strategy, a concept how we can fulfill all these three types of expectations that we have in regard of the global annual meeting of the Internet Governance Forum, and sometimes they may overlap, they may be opposed to each other. But I do -- still do think that we will be able to find a strategy how we can fulfill all the three types of expectations. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. That's a very analytical way of looking at it. And I think the first item you mentioned, the first need is to actually find a meeting space where the members of the dynamic coalition have their -- essentially their AGM. And that was accepted in Riyadh, every dynamic coalition was actually given a meeting room, and I think that is very much a baseline of what we need to defend and to keep, that we have this possibility, if you are recognized and active dynamic coalition, that you are given a room where you can meet, it's once a year, your only time.

Then the other two issues, the collaboration, that is usually then the main session. Can we find another space in addition?

And then the other one is to present your outcome, and that was very much wout's point, and that could be part of flash session, whatever. If you have a need to present, then the dynamic coalition should be given a platform.

But I think it's important to disassociate the various needs

that we say the annual meeting is one thing and presentation of an outcome is another thing, and the collaboration is yet another thing.

But then Dino, and Muhammad again, and then Mark. Dino, and you got up very early, yes. And so Avri is not on the call. We were not clear whether we would get people from the U.S. at this early hour. Thanks, Dino.

>>DINODELL'ACCIO: Thank you very much, Markus. And indeed, it's very early and, therefore, apologies for not turning my camera on.

So, happy new year to everybody. And I agree with probably all the comments that have been made so far. Personally, I have no complaints. I think that this IGF was a great success this year.

Regarding the topic of DC, having the ability to showcase, to present the outcome of the annual work at the IGF, I think that transparently, honestly speaking, everybody wants to have their opportunity to present. And I think that as already alluded to, there are many instances where this opportunity can be used, can go to the benefit of each one of our dynamic coalitions specifically.

We had the main session, and then we had the merged session, and in some cases, like mine, that's why I said I definitely cannot complain, because my dynamic coalition was able to have its own individual session simply because there are no other dynamic coalitions that were, if you will, close to our topic.

However, I think that the point is this. If everything had worked exactly as we had expected, I think everybody would have had the ability to showcase it, to present it, to share their contribution to the IGF.

However, as we celebrate our successes, I think we also need to honestly admit when we fail and when we don't deliver what we were expected to deliver. So, the main session, I think 95% went well. But specifically about my case, the first group of the main session, did not deliver as expected. And, therefore, the dynamic coalition that were included in the first group at the main session were not adequately represented. I think this is a fact.

I wrote and I took full responsibility in the chat shortly after the main session. That's to say that indeed, if we constructively acknowledge what did not work this time, we can definitely do better next time.

So, if we look not just at individual instances, opportunities, but if we look at all the opportunity that are given to us by the IGF, and in this case I'm also speaking as

a representative of the international intergovernmental governmental organization DMAD, I think there is enough, wherever possible, whether it's part of the main session, whether it's part of the merged session, we can have an opportunity to present and showcase our contribution to the IGF.

So, this to say let's be transparent about what worked and what did not work, and let's make sure in the future we try to do our best to make sure that when there is an agreement about who speaks and who speaks on behalf of who and what is the time allotted for our speaking opportunity, we try to respect those rules, those agreement and those framework. Thank you. Back to you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Dino.
And Muhammad and then Mark.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Thank you very much. In regards to expectations that Jutta so kindly short listed, I would just want to add one expectation, and that is, in addition to what he highlighted as to present to need and also with this year, 2024, to collaborate, the fourth expectation would be to serve as an Expert Group within the IGF system. And expectation is that as an Expert Group that has the repository of knowledge as well as experts to provide a source for the Secretariat and for the MAG and who so far in IGF system needs expertise related to the subject. And that, I think, is the core purpose of creating dynamic coalitions. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Mark.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I am just putting in the chat an extract from my response to the stocktaking consultation. The deadline was Sunday, as you probably all know, like me, working all weekend to put mine together.

But it's about day 0 of the IGF as an opportunity to present outputs from intersessional activities. Generally I think day 0 was a bit ill-defined in Riyadh. There were sessions that could possibly well have been part of the main schedule of days 1 to 4. So, I have made a quite provocative proposal that the day 0 really is structured as a kind of preparatory day. And the key part of this preparatory day for the IGF is for all the intersessional activities, including the dynamic coalitions to present, of course, in summary form -- they are not going to be in detail form -- the outputs from their year year's activities. These could be policy recommendations, guidelines, toolkits that need to be promoted to the IGF audience before the IGF rolls out so they know, look, this is what the dynamic coalitions, for example, have actually come up with to inform some of the sessions of the IGF.

So, my suggestion is, I think, can help with that part of Jutta's listing of aims for dynamic coalitions and getting key information out about what they have achieved and what they are delivering and what they want the IGF to pick up and the leadership panel to disseminate in its contacts with governments and policy leaders in business and so on.

So, that's -- I don't know if people think that's a good idea. It does come back to something we have talked about before, that we have time, as an intersessional process that Wout described, to say, look, this is what we have come up with over the year. Here you are. Pick it up. Take it forward. And it informs your future work as a whole IGF community. Okay. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Roberto.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Thank you. I would like to pick up one point that we have discussed on the spot in Riyadh. That was about accessibility of dynamic coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: May I interrupt you? That's the next agenda item that is planning ahead on the accountability. It's --

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. I'm sorry. I thought that was the --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, this is still here talking about the individual DC sessions here. But the accountability -- well, why don't you go on with that. You already lead us, then, into the next agenda item.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: I can wait. Sorry for the misunderstanding.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, I mean, we had -- I was going to say, I'm getting a bit nervous about the time. It's already -- we had a very good discussion and it is important to do this discussion. We normally earmark 90 minutes for our session. So, we would have 35 minutes left. But we haven't started yet on planning for '25. And the accountability is part of the agenda item, as said, planning for '25.

But have we said enough about -- I could hear you on the DC main sessions. There was a concern. The merging did not go as smoothly as was hoped for. But at the same time, there is a recognition that it may be difficult to get the annual -- the meeting as before to have an automatic DC meeting.

But the need for an annual meeting, I think, was also emphasized, and there was a comment by Wout in the chat that all of a sudden they didn't have the meeting, was taken away, and that is also something we need to defend. That at least you get the meeting slot where you can as a dynamic coalition, have your AGM, your annual meeting, and I think that was appreciated and not be taken away.

And at the same time, there is a need for being able to present an outcome a dynamic coalition may have, that be as a flash session or as Mark suggested on day 0 so that is my take on this discussion on the individual DC sessions and there are different categories and Muhammad made an important point that the DCs should also be treated at expert groups and used to the benefit for the benefit of the overall programme. And DCAT is very good example as they are an expert on accessibility issues and should should be made use of as in-house expertise, so to speak.

Can we, with that, then go to the next agenda item, which essentially is preparing -- well, we have, obviously, we have discussed on this by the taking stock, which will be the way forward in '25. And we had a discussion on the very last day of the IGF. We had a meeting with the MAG -- well, the MAG. There were some MAG members, but it was a good idea. And we had, I think, agreed, more or less, that we would keep this cluster approach as it links us to the GDC and to the GDC implementation. So we don't have to discuss at length what we want to discuss or how we want to structure ourselves, but we already have a structure in place.

And the other item that came up was, and that was made by the meeting we had on day 0 as a DC internal meeting, and that was made by Dino, that we also have to look at the accountability of the DCs. That was the point you wanted to raise, Roberto.

But I see Avri has her hand up -- or, no. Why don't I give the floor to you as I interrupted you so rudely, Roberto. So you can continue where you were going to go about the accountability.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you. Thank you, Markus. Yeah, the reason why I was intervening, maybe not really appropriate, at the appropriate moment, is because what I was going to say is linked to what Dino said, that is the grouping.

I think that there are two issues that are connected here. One is the problem that we have raised verbally in chats during the conference on the spot, that is the accountability of the different DCs.

We have also been talking about the possibility of having some sort of minimum requirement so that we limit proliferations of dynamic coalitions. And this is linked to the fact on how we group the dynamic coalitions in order to have some joint sessions.

The way it was done this past year was due to -- you know, we were, sort of, taken over by events, and so we had to make a decision, and probably, well, the grouping was as good as possible under the circumstances, but probably not ideal.

If we can manage, and I raised this point also in the meeting that we had in Riyadh, if we can have some sort of grouping by common features, by potential synergies so that we can make sure that when we have a joint session, it's really a merger, not a mesh, then that would help.

But the two things go really hand in hand. The fact of having a health check about the dynamic coalitions, the existing dynamic coalitions to make sure that we have a sort of focus that is well defined. And over that, if we can figure out some common areas and some potential synergies.

I understand that time is short, because the IGF at the end of the year, like usual, we could easily do that in 2025. Now, we are again obliged to rush solutions in few months. But this is definitely something we need to prepare for the future.

So, if we can think this time, not in terms of a one-year plan, but in terms of a two-year plan, that would help getting things organized in the long term and not to be, again, rushing and being constrained by short delays to rush things up. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Avri.

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Yeah. I wanted to talk a little bit about the clustering. I missed getting involved in the clustering last time because, well, partly we had already decided not to try and participate in the major session as a DC. So, when it came time to do clustering, didn't get involved in it. I'm not even sure where schools as sort of a cross -- you know, it's the capacity building, it's where they really fit in that kind of clustering.

So, and I think this is part of what Roberto was saying, is we need to look at those. And as the idea of having the clusters seems fine, but I'm wondering at some point if we can look at those and make sure it really makes sense and it doesn't limit us to only the topics as delineated by, you know, an external group like the MAG.

So, you know, just when we look at that. So, that was really what I wanted to ask, is that we not accept that as a complete fait accompli, but that it's something that we are going to refine somewhat. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It was not given by the MAG. It was our decision to use that clustering, use the GDC as a baseline, as the GDC is here and needs to be implemented and the idea was to see, look that that's what the DCs can contribute to the implementation of the GDCs, but your point is well taken. And I made the same point when we had a quick prep talk with Jutta and Roman, that there may be DCs that don't fit into these clusters

of the GDC. So we should maybe create an extra cluster of those who don't fit in, like Aristotle, was it Plato had the metaphysics which is behind the physics. So have the meta cluster.

>> AVRI DORIA: That was library shelf orientation.

But the GDC does include the notion of capacity building. So, there are other things in the GDC other than just the IG thematics. And there's the, yeah, the assistance. So, yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. It's a valid point. And it builds on what Roberto said. Let's take maybe a more long-term approach and see how we can regroup or recluster the existing dynamic coalitions. But I think we had an agreement in Riyadh that we would continue with aligning ourselves on the GDC. That was -- and how we do that, that's up to us to decide.

Wout. Wout, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. I had to switch my microphone on.

In the session that we have had that was a bit closed, it was this Indian gentleman, I think it was from India, that said we could gain on accountability.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Reyansh was that. I think he's on the call. And I would like him to come in, and he also has his hand up to use gaming as a way to enhance the accountability. That was mainly when we discussed, you know, one of the very objective criterion is how often does a dynamic coalition attend coordination group call, that can be checked.

But if Reyansh has an idea of how to do that in a gaming approach, which could be fun, could be an incentive. Lets listen to him how to do it. Back to you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, I think that's what I want to hear, how are we going to organize this, because I think it's fair that the dynamic coalitions that are active in general with ticking all the boxes, that they should have, perhaps, more time available at the IGF compared to others that do not tick any boxes.

So, how can we organize this. And I would like to hear the proposal again, and perhaps if Roman to come up with a process that we can organize ourselves that way and that everybody agrees to it. So, let plea stop there. Thanks, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Shall we give the floor to Reyansh. You make the proposal and we are keen to listen to your creative ideas.

>> REYANSH: Thank you. Happy new year to you all.

In terms of gamification, how we contribute, I have a basic plan as well. I will share it with everyone.

But it could be as simple as also -- there was one great point raised about how some DCs don't fit into the GDC objectives

as a whole. But one more thing is it doesn't have to be exclusive, right. It could be across all the objectives and maybe a DC can contribute to more than one objective.

With gamification, you have different category for every objective as well and then DCs can contribute, they get points. But the whole idea being I attend this call, I get some points on that and this way my DC builds up some points, there's a central system not to complicate it but easy to see and you can see where you place in the leaderboard, something along those lines. It's fairly easy to implement, of course. But I think the point would be that once you gamify this thing, you get an incentive and as DCs we have more reason to contribute and more incentive to contribute and we are also awarded for it. So, that was the idea behind gamifying how we contribute to GDC and every objective that we take on.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Can you prepare sort of a pilot project on how this would look like?

>> REYANSH: Absolutely, absolutely.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If you present it like that, it's difficult to visualize how it could look like. But I think it will be interested -- it would be interesting to see how it could work. And I for one would definitely like that.

And I see Rajendra has his hand up. But do I take it the group would agree if we ask Reyansh to present a pilot project on what this could look like and that the gamification of the DCs and their contribution to the GDC, would that be the working title?

I don't see any objection. So I think you could, maybe then at our next.

>> Absolutely.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Presentation of what this could look like. And that could include precisely the points made by Avri, among others. I think that would include that. Rajendra, you have your hand up, please.

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Congratulations to all those who were a part of organizing this IGF. It was a fantastic experience, of the last six years, I must say.

I really have a point on what Wout said, is that like call it 31, 32, what DC numbers we have, a few are doing everything possible, you know, and I think that should put us to contribute more while it is on site as well. That's the only part. I think there should be objective criteria, whether it be gamify or what other way to do it. But let's see which DCs are working, so I think it's good to rationalize them and then objectively measure their throughput and then, you know, give them the space in the

enveloped forum. I mean that would actually vote for that. That's very important.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. The objective criteria, one Roman had mentioned, submission of the annual report. His objective criterion. It's binary, either you have submitted it or not. And the other one is we have never worked on that is the active participation in the calls. But I take it here we have a core group of people who are very active, and I count, we have -- you know, we created this slot mainly for the east of Europe participants, and not for the north Americans. But we have two very active North American participants on this call. So, you know, should they be given extra points when they attend the call, which is outside their area, so to speak at ungodly hours? That could be one question.

But just saying we do have some objective criteria, and the question is how do make them more workable. Jutta, you have another brilliant idea.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, I just remembered that when it were my three years' term on the MAG, that we really had a structure to rotate the meetings. We had one in the morning. Three weeks later we had one in the afternoon. And then three or two weeks later, we had one that was for me late in the evening, from 10:00 to 12:00 a.m. And if we rotate in the same way our dynamic coalition coordination meeting, then it should be possible for each dynamic coalition to be present at least at one out of three meetings that we might appoint.

And for the dynamic coalition on children's rights, we have members all around the globe. So if I am not able to attend a meeting at 4:00 a.m. in the morning, maybe someone else might take that place. And it's just a question how we organize ourselves as a group and in the dynamic coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct. Thank you. Yes, and also it doesn't always have to be the same people. But the dynamic coalition has by definition more than one member.

Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Just quickly, I agree with the participation of number of coalitions have number of people. So in our case, Judith, for instance, could not attend this meeting so I am attending in place of her. Sometimes we both do, but sometimes one of us does. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. That's an excellent example, that you as a dynamic coalition you take care of the slot. And Avri in the chat says 5:00 a.m. is not that early. But I think it is early for most people to attend a meeting at 5:00 a.m. But congrats for you to do it. Rajendra, is that a new hand?

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: I wanted to continue based on the comment you made, amarkus, objective criteria is one is meeting. The other is the report but each of the DCs were formed with a charter. And that charter is their objective. They are a list of activities they most of us put our activities. We either represent a domain or sector. I think it has to be all facts, commitment of time, efforts, and also adding to the pool of knowledge that IGF stands for. That's what I think is important. GDC is a new category we have to work on I agree that could be one. But what was the reason why we were formed as a DC? I think measuring against our own commitment is very important.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, but, again, who does, then the measuring? Is it the self-assessment or should that be a peer assessment? That could also be the way forward, that we create the kind of peer assessment that we have a group of two or three DCs and we look at each other and, you know, it could then not hang on, is that really within your charter or is that out of scope or have you actually delivered? But there we move into tricky waters. That gets -- can get very touchy and delicate. But it's maybe food also for future discussion.

But as we have 15 minutes left, I think there seems to be appetite to revise the clustering. I mean, the point made by Roberto is very true. Last year it was done also on the basis of, well, we need more diversity in this cluster. Could we not maybe shift a speaker from here to there, just for the overall balance of the DC main session. That is, obviously, a short-termist approach and, obviously, we can revise the cluster, and also maybe then Reyansh, his gamification will help us to make it easier to do that with the -- and we see, I think we have interest in that. And let's see how that works.

I just wonder maybe also as the -- again, we cannot wait a month or so, meeting once a month. If the IGF is already in June, we have to move on. And I think it will also be useful if we as a group are a little bit ahead of the curve before the first MAG meeting will take place, which is presumably in February.

So, my suggestion would be that we continue this discussion and ideally with a pilot from Reyansh on what this gamification could look like at the next meeting. Would it be possible within two weeks from now?

>> REYANSH: Absolutely, I think I have something we can look at as a framework, and then, of course, we can build on it with feedback from everyone.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. And then one idea we also, I think, agreed on was to have meetings to discuss the substance, have substantive meetings in between. And Roman has ambitious ideas

of having substantive Intersessional Meetings. Over to you, Roman.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thanks, everyone, for most valuable comments. Good food for thoughts.

So, if we keep this idea of aligning the clusters with the GDC as we did for the main session, my proposal is that in January and February we start this webinar for the -- open for the public with the question number 1. And maybe the same people who were involved in the main session can be the first pioneers to gather additionally on several, couple of meetings and to prepare this webinar.

Also wout has raised the issue of visibility online and ability that there should be some DCs focal point for promo activities that may be a rotational position and volunteer based from month to month from those people who will coordinate, sort of, DCs media plan because we will have these webinars which need to be promoted widely, first through the official IGF channels, but second through all other networks we are all a part of.

So, I believe that there should be some volunteer each month appointed within the cluster who will be responsible for media campaigns, who will provide the Secretariat with the materials to be published on official accounts, even in some rough form. We could even do ourselves some, let's say some designing to make it in line with the present, let's say, information policy we have.

So, yes, why not we start preparing this first cluster meeting in mid-February, make sure that we have enough time for all the clusters to have this intersessional webinars open for the public before the annual meeting.

And second idea is to -- actually our approach from the Secretariat now is to try to centralize all the aspects around such clusters and our idea is also that we can let the DCs apply for the DC sessions also as clusters. So, for instance, not to have 13 or 20 DC sessions in Norway, but to have five or six in case we take Markus' idea of having one session for all of those who don't feel they will fit in one of the five clusters.

And the logic would be that we have five or six thematic webinars. We have five or six DC sessions based on the outcomes of these webinars in the annual meeting. And then after we hold all of these five to six sessions, DC sessions in the annual meeting, we have the DC main session where each of the Moderators of those DC sessions are automatically speakers or other people selected by the team of those sessions, and they report back to all the IGF participants on the outcomes not just of these DC sessions happened within the previous couple of days, but

about the whole intersessional work conducted, in this case throughout this six months or five months, to be correct,.

And also Roberto I think made a valid point that possibly two years planning will be good because, yes, you see this time it's five months. Next time it will be, I don't know, 11 months before the next annual meeting.

So, if we have some consistent work plan and we can plan our webinars already for July, August, you know, September based on everyone's availability, this will give us real consistency.

And I will remind you the idea of why we could have this more focused substantive work, because an ideal picture of the world, we would like to see ourselves as DCs, as those forefront experts and the most relevant thematic for the IGF and based on the results of the webinars, we can produce short summaries and short one-pagers, you know, with some conclusions, also which can be widely promoted, to be then forwarded to session organizers, to the MAG, who will then consider them within main sessions, other main session preparations.

So, we can make sure DCs work is relevant and in demand as the work of substantive expert groups, as we mentioned the experience of the agenda Council, like the World Economic Forum functions.

So, this is the idea. So, let me know what you think about putting more and more emphasis on this cluster system and what are the pros and cons. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I see Wout has a hand up and Muhammad has a hand up. Wout first.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. Thank you, Roman. The resident chat, excellent ideas. And we also discussed this in Riyadh and I think it's very positive way forward.

I have two suggestions also what Markus said, that we need to be ahead of the game. I would suggest first that all DCs indicate in which cluster they think they belong, because as you said, it was a bit hurried and perhaps people wanted to shift or perhaps one DC fits in two or three, depending on the topics that they are working on.

So, I would suggest that we do this inventory in the coming week or two weeks, that everybody indicates this is the cluster I want to be part of. That as Roman said, the volunteers, I think that's very important because it has to be a team effort to prepare that in many ways.

The second thing is that to be ahead of the game, I would suggest that DCs are invited to, at the shortest term possible indicate what their outcomes will be for Lillestrom and, perhaps, for 2026 already as well so if they already have plans for the

year after.

So, I would suggest that we all have that ready by the end of this month so we can organize accordingly in the next call that we have. And what Roman said, start preparing for cluster one to have their first session.

So, yes, I am very much in support. And I suggest that we organize ourselves as good as possible so that we actually have a very good plan to present to the MAG when the MAG is there and it has its first meeting. Thank you for this, Roman and Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Mind of Muhammad and then Ayden.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, thank you, Roman for these very good sessions. Just two points. One, with regards to clustering, I think it's a wonderful idea and I support the idea of getting ahead of the games. And that would clustering and early finalization of our programmes would help in that.

But I would agree with having clusters for the main session. But DCs would also -- I think there is -- there should be a room for individual DCs. And that's where the idea comes from the comment that having clusters in putting DCs in clusters, sometimes makes us divert our attention from the core work that we are doing and focus on the cluster.

So, just to keep the focus of our subjects. For the sessions there should also be a room for individual sessions for DCs where expert discussions in terms of expert knowledge could be done.

Second is with regards to clustering of two years' idea, that I think it's a wonderful one as well. But considering the WSIS review and the IGF plans for the next years. I believe it may be 11 years -- or it could be 14 or 15 months. 11 or 14 or 15 months because we don't know when the IGF 2026 would be, and what would be the thematic makeup or other changes into the IGF system.

So, for this -- we could work on this in two terms, one short term for 2025. And second, if we have an inkling of what is coming next, we can then include those clustering and all those things into our planning. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And always on the assumption that the IGF mandate will be reviewed. Thank you. Ayden, please.

>> AYDEN FERDELIN: Dr. Shabbir said much what I wanted to add, was really to say that I am not opposed to the clustering approach. I think it has value at times. But I think there needs to be a space as well for dynamic coalitions to intentionally be separate and to work independently on different topics. I think especially for dynamic coalitions that it would depend on external resourcing, having a dedicated session at the IGF makes it easier for us to justify to our supporters why we exist.

I think if we apply for an individual session, and it's not approved, that's fine. But forcing to to cluster with another dynamic coalition especially for the annual meeting, I don't see that working for every dynamic coalition.

I think that we should be trying to identify synergies, I think they can exist. I think that the current clustering that our dynamic coalition, the dynamic coalition on digital financial inclusion is in meant that we focused on the areas where we had similarities, which do exist but that's not all of our core work and not all of the core issues that we care about, because we are distinct from other dynamic coalitions. Otherwise, we would not have formed a new dynamic coalition to explore some of these issues.

So I wanted to put it out there, especially for the annual IGF, not a huge fan of being forced to cluster with another dynamic coalition but certainly for the webinars over the next few months, we can make that work and we would love to be a part of anything that is being set up. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Markus, if you may just reflect because, basically, about the same things. Why not we see how this work with first cluster webinar, and based on this experience, we understand and also consult within the Secretariat if this is a good approach to continue. I hear you and I understand the idea of having your own space.

At the same time, for the sake of efficiency, for the sake of showing that which DC can contribute with what feasible outcome, maybe for this reason it will be best to concentrate a similar profile DCs within one session and in the annual meeting. And let's say maybe, you know, it's always something new, maybe not very comfortable, but let's see what the cluster approach for the webinars, how it works. And then I'm sure in one of the next DCC meetings after that we can take a decision because we as the secretary would need a decision before we open the call for session submissions to make sure that we have the consensus before that among the DC community.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right now we don't have a consensus, so that is obvious to me.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Obvious, yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And there is still appetite to maintain the possibility of individual DC sessions, but we move ahead with these webinars.

The policy networks, I think, did so successfully last year, and that provides any kind of a model.

So the aim is that we would have our first webinar in February.

But I think it would be good if we already would have some volunteers who would like to take the lead in having -- in getting this started, because February is pretty soon. It's next month. So, we need to prepare.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: One proposal by the way would be to have the next DCCG meeting on the first week of February.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. We already said we are having two weeks from now to discuss the proposal for gamification.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Right, at the end of January.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Two weeks from now. We can send out a Doodle poll, and this time it will be the taking care of the U.S. participants. Sorry, Rajendra. It will be a little bit later for you. Again, in the afternoon, sort of, usually around 3:00 to 5:00 Geneva time I think is our usually slot. That will make it easier for our U.S.-based colleagues to join. And Reyansh would present then his, sort of, pilot gamification proposal.

And I wonder, could we also find somebody who would volunteer from a cluster for the February --

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Markus, I offered.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: You offered?

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Yes. I sent my message, I did not put in the group.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I see the chat. Already we have a volunteer for the first webinar. So, Jutta, you have a hand up.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. It's more a question than a comment. Do I understand right that, first of all, we are trying to settle whether the clustering we did for last year's main session is still relevant or whether some of the dynamic coalitions want to move to another group. And then we will have these webinars for the then set clusters?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. I think the starting point is the cluster we had last year. But it's also -- it's a flexible starting point. It should be interpreted in flexibility so it's not cast in stone if there are other dynamic coalitions who would like to join that cluster or some would like to move out of that cluster, they are free to do that.

But it will be you, Rajendra, to herd the cats and keep them together and be also open to others who knock on your door and say, hey, I would like to be a part of your group.

So, when we meet again, when we have our next call, then end of January, we could already then maybe do some further planning on that and build on that and we leave it in your able hands to get this started. Also use the tools at our disposals and emails, use the WhatsApp group. And we could then revisit also the entire clusters.

And I always, back on the gamification tools that also make it easier then to readjust the clusters. So, that will be the next step. So the next step would then to find a slot two weeks from now that is starting with last week of January, 28th of January, 29th, the week, two weeks from now.

And, Roman, can you send out a Doodle poll so we can find a slot with the afternoon, within the afternoon slots?

With that, can we --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Starting from which time? From 4:00 p.m. UTC or --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think for the west Coast, I think, yeah, 4:00 p.m. -- or 3:00 p.m. UTC will be okay.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Muhammad, you want to add something?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Before we finish up, Markus, a question. In Riyadh during the session with MAG, I heard clear willingness from the MAG members of having our MAG liaison to DCs. Any updates on that?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That is something -- Roman, is there any update? Well, we are in a difficult position right now, as there's no MAG in place.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: There is no MAG. So there is no liaison either.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So, we have to wait. I think that is also something, obviously, we need to, again, signal at the very first MAG meeting, that we really want a liaison, and I think that has broad support, yes.

But with that, can we then conclude? Can I hand it over to you, Jutta, to conclude the meeting and make your final comments? It's goodbye for me. Bye-bye.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. It's only bye-bye for me as well. Thank you so much for all who had the opportunity and took the chance to take part in this first meeting of a very short period of time in the runup of the IGF 2025. And I hope to see you in two weeks' time. Thank you. Bye-bye.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Bye-bye
(Thank yous and goodbyes).

>> Recording stopped.

(Session was concluded at 11:38 a.m. UTC)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are 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.