Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group – Virtual Meeting XIV

Summary Report

18 January 2017

1. The fourteenth virtual meeting of the DC Coordination Group (DCCG) was held on 20 January 2017. The meeting was facilitated by Markus Kummer, with Eleonora Mazzucchi representing the IGF Secretariat. The Webex recording of the meeting can be accessed here: https://intgovforum.webex.com/intgovforum/ldr.php?RCID=467a8af09b403aa5970479a8e03bd09e

2. The meeting began with a brief **look back at the DCs shared main session** at IGF 2016, which was generally felt to have been very successful. Participants took note that it will be up to the new MAG to design the programme for this year's meeting, but they agreed that it would make sense for the DC's to ask for a main session also in 2017 as well as a separate inward-facing session. The overall scheduling gave rise to some discussions (this issue will be addressed in the Secretariat's stocktaking). Different views were held in this regard. While some suggested reversing the sequence of events and scheduling the main session ahead of the individual DC meetings, others preferred keeping the 2016 format, allowing the individual DC sessions to feed into the main session. It was noted that there was merit in both options, but that there was a need for further discussion in the run-up to the 2017 IGF.

3. Two important points emerged from **DCs' thorough discussion on the surveys exercise:** there was a general agreement that on one hand, a process to garner feedback is valuable and an objective DCs still very much want to pursue, and that on the other hand, there was a need to strengthen the implementation of the surveys. One participant remarked that the questions produced by each DC were relevant, and that if enough responses could be generated through the surveys, this could go a long way toward guiding a particular DC's work, and indeed creating a mandate to focus on certain issues. The point was made that both quantitative as well as qualitative methods for gathering input on DC work could be used, and there was strong support for re-introducing the IGF's review platform, where output documents could be published for comment. It was also highlighted that DCs needed to do a better job clarifying what the objective of any survey exercise would be and what the respondents could expect as a result of their input.

4. Following broad agreement that a wider and more coordinated effort by DCs was needed to get behind the surveys and actively take part in their implementation, it was agreed to set up an **informal DC working group on surveys and feedback methodologies**. Marianne Franklin (IRPC) agreed to lead this effort. It was also agreed that the group should have as a basis the suggestions made by Jeremy Malcolm (Annex III) and the observations shared by Marianne on the call, including the need to bring together experienced researchers and data-gathering activists as part of any survey exercise.

5. In terms of horizontal issues affecting all DC, the question of administration of individual DC mailing lists was raised. Given that subscription to a DC's list essentially constitutes membership in that coalition, it was recalled that one of the agreed on principles was to keep all lists open to whoever wanted to join. Maintaining openness and fairness on lists was therefore paramount and it would seem conducive to ensuring cohesion among all DCs to adopt a set of rules or guidelines to follow. A starting point could be for all DCs as IGF-related entities to adhere to the IGF's code of conduct. Using this as a basis, some simple ground rules could be envisaged for how to proceed with any person not adhering to the code. There was general agreement that there should be a system in place providing for a series of warnings, with an appeal mechanism involving the Secretariat. There were different views whether or not anybody should be excluded from any DC list. However, it was noted that many good relevant sets of rules used by institutions already existed and could be looked at for inspiration. DCs were encouraged to share any existing guidelines they know of on this list or to send to the IGF Secretariat. The Secretariat was asked to prepare some draft guidelines for further discussions.

6. It was agreed to hold another call well ahead of the fist MAG meeting/open consultations. The Secretariat may also set up a separate call for a future discussion on surveys and DC feedback methods.

Annex I - Participants List

Markus Kummer (Co-Facilitator)

Eleonora Mazzucchi (IGF Secretariat)

Maarten Botterman (DC-IoT)

Olivier Crépin-Leblond (DC-CIV)

Jutta Croll (DC-COS)

Marianne Franklin (IRPC)

Marie-Laure Lemineur (DC-COS)

Michael Oghia (DCICC)

Carla Reyes (DC-Blockchain)

Sharada Srinivasan (DC-Connecting the Unconnected)

Timea Suto

Smita Vanniyar (DCGIG)

Annex II – Draft Agenda

I. **Wrapping Up IGF 2016 – Final Feedback on Main Session, Booth, Meeting Overall**

II. **Discussion on Surveys and Looking at Coordination in the Year Ahead**

III. **DCs' Terms of Reference and Organizational Best Practices**

IV. **AOB**

Annex III – Suggestions for Improving DC Issue Surveys *(shared by Jeremy Malcolm on DCs mailing list)*

Recommendations that I made in a previous email to this list (excuse the repetition) were:

- We could ask people to do the surveys as part of IGF online registration process
- We must have a permanent link to the survey on the IGF website - the link is very hard to find right now
- We could somehow "gamify" the survey by awarding points or stickers, or making it part of an IGF quest
- We should place a word limit on questions - some were too lengthy this year
- We should also strictly enforce the five question limit - one DC had ten questions this year
- There seemed to be some confusion about the shifts at the booth, with some slots unattended, and others where there were more people than expected
- Rather than a static booth which most people don't bother visiting, we could have volunteers roving around with iPads to get responses to the surveys (like the Imagining the Internet people did with their camera)

But a more fundamental rethink of the approach may be required. In my view, there is a good match between the DCs' needs, and the Deliberative Polling work that Stanford University has piloted in the last two IGFs. This is because we have the material for people to deliberate on, but we don't have an effective method to foster broad deliberation and feedback. The Deliberative Polling team has the opposite problem: they have a method, but they don't have ready-made materials to employ it on. Merging these two projects seems to me like a perfect match.

If we were to do this, then in tandem, we should seek support from a donor or foundation to fund this work, and should also secure the MAG's commitment to properly integrate this work into the IGF as a mainstream, supported, resourced and promoted IGF activity. (This in turn will require that we have a strong advocate within the MAG.)

It will require a lot of additional effort and commitment, but clearly the current approach is not working, so I think we have to do something. Is anyone else on board with these ambitious plans for 2017?