```
                    FINISHED FILE
              INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
            DC COORDINATING MEETING XXIX
                   8 AUGUST 2018
                   9:00 A.M. CT
```

                              ***

                              ***

     >> As you know, we have had difficulties with WebEx. We
find it's not an accessible Conference call. As for the
transcription, I think Eleanora will need to look into it
immediately, because I don't know what the details are for
setting that up, but I will take it up later with Andrea to
ensure that it's there in the future, but it is your own
responsibility, I understand, but we will help wherever we can.
Thank you.
     >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And welcome, Gerry,
in this group. I think the transcript is coming up as we speak.
Eleanora in the back chat reassured me that this was on the way
of being put up. And, yes, I think you can see it on the
screen, but I think we also have to have some discussions on how
best to display it to make it really accessible, but we can take
this -- I thought I had seen Andrea on the call, but I don't
think she is on the call. There is a call in user, I can see
that. Could you kindly identify yourself, call in user 4?
     There is somebody that is a call in user and it would be
good to know who you are, but it's not of vital importance,
definitely not mission critical. With that, could I turn to
Lynn, and Lynn, would you inform us on the latest thinking on
how to organize the main session? I had informed you in an

email report of the latest discussion from with the mix up with
the transcription, but over to you, Lynn, and I think you wanted
to inform on other ongoing work.
        >> LYNN ST AMOUR: Thank you, and thank you for supporting
the presentations. I wanted to update on the Working Group
activities as well as main sessions. Perhaps, I will do the
Working Group first because I think from the agenda, maybe we
can flow from the main session into your later agenda item.
There are two Working Groups in particular that would like to
deepen the engagement with the DCs, and in fact, I'm sure they
all do. It's only two of them that I can speak to directly, and
that's Working Group on fundraising and second Working Group on
multiyear strategic work plan. And Sylvia has just joined me as
Co-Chair. He is on the call as well. He has joined me as
co-facilitator as the Multiyear Strategic Work Program Working
Group.
        So let me take two minutes on each one of those. There are
some sort of specific requests or things we would like to just
make sure the DCs are aware of and would treat this as kind of
the opening discussion with respect to how we might work
together more deeply in the future. So specifically the Working
Group fundraising is efforts focused on attracting new donors.
I'm not sure if most of you are aware, but in fact, the
Secretariat is in a fairly kind of important, I guess,
fundraising situation.
        We are eating into the reserves that were established. We
are trying to run on a budget which is only half of what the
approved budget was at the outset of this ten-year cycle and
even at that, we are only -- that's only funded at about 50%.
So in short, we are running at about 25% funding versus the
budget, and, of course, that directly relates to staff and the
activities of the Secretariat. The IGF Trust Fund does not
support the annual meeting expenses. That is covered by the
host country.
        So literally the trust fund supports Secretariat staff, it
supports other activities of the Secretariat, whether that's
sponsored travel to MAG meetings or to the IGF itself for
individuals from Developing Countries or in fact if it were to
support in fact additional communication tools or facilities.
WebEx is donated. If we need to move to a different application
and there is an expense associated with that, that would
actually, for example, come out of the trust fund.
        So this Working Group is extremely important. One of the
things we are doing is pragmatically trying to identify
relatively small number of organisations that we could, in the
Working Group and using the MAG, reach out to. The highest
likelihood of success is when we are able to find individuals

that are interested in the work of the IGF and want to participate in that work not simply, you know, make a donation.

So, for instance, one of the Working Group members reached out to the Best Practice Forums and said are there entities you'd like to participate in your work that we could approach, inform them on the role of the IGF, on your specific activities, invite them to participate in those activities with the BPF, of course, and ultimately hopefully convince them to make a contribution as well. So we would like to extend that same offer, if you will, I guess, to the Dynamic Coalitions.

I recognize it's a little bit different, every one of these intersessional activities has a different genesis and a different set of operating practices, but I think the request is very straightforward. If there are organisations or entities you would like to participate in any of the DCs and you think that they are a reasonable candidate to bring in additional funds, please, the easiest thing is probably to let me know and I can follow this up with a short email to go to the DC list as well, and we can work together on an approach, again, which is kind of topic-based or theme-based, and then follow up from there.

So that's the activity of the Working Group fundraising. Markus, do you want to see if there are questions at the moment or do you want me to just sort of cover this and I can follow it up with emails? I do not want to take too much time up on your agenda?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Are there any questions right now on the fundraising efforts? It doesn't seem to be the case, why don't you carry on.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just a question, what kind of numbers are we looking at?

>> LYNN ST. AMOUR: You are really faint, what kind of what are we looking at?

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: What kind of numbers are we looking at?

>> LYNN ST. AMOUR: In terms of the budget?

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The budget needs, the shortfall. Are we talking 10 Euros or are we talking 10 million?

>> LYNN ST. AMOUR: The project document, and by the way, this is on the IGF website under resources, you can see all of the documents, but the project document, which is basically, you know, the equivalent of kind of a budget or high level operating plan for the IGF calls for $2.8 million a year. Again, that is to support Secretariat expenses, travel, and a lot of the sort of intersessional activities of consultants and that sort of thing, supports the intersessional activities.

The DESA put in a minimal operating budget 2017-2018 of $1.4 million, and roughly at this point in the year, we have about 400 or 500,000 in. So we are at sort of a little bit less than 25% of what is expected to be the operating budget, and right now, and this was true last year as well, our expenses are exceeding our revenues. So we are eating into the reserves. Because the IGF is a special project, an extra budgetary project of the United Nations, no member state contributions support the activities, and if there isn't adequate funding in house, not pledged or committed, then that limits the ability to engage and keep staff. They need to have a certain amount of funding in forward looking. So that's kind of the rough number.

So it was a really good presentation down at the last MAG meeting which is up on that link as well, and I'm sure Eleanora can share the link or send it out to the DCs separately. Again, we have got a good effort and a good team working on it. This is more a matter of looking at win/win, donors that participate in the work are more apt to stay and more apt to participate at a more significant level, and we are obviously hopeful that the intersessional activities are enriched by additional participation. So it's in that vein that we are saying if there are entities that you think would enrich your work and you would like to have them come in and participate in the DC, please let us know. We can look at that to see whether or not there is a win/win in the approach explaining the IGF and the value of the IGF, the value of the work and potentially a donor.

You are free to participate and approach anybody you want as well. The only reason to comment on Working Group fundraising if you think there is a reasonable chance they would be interested in contributing to the IGF Trust Fund, and, yes, it is in fact all MAG members' responsibility and the responsibility of the IGF community to fund raise as this does not, again, come from the United Nations nor from civil society contributions. I'll move onto the next Working Group update.

Sylvia is on the call as well, so Sylvia can come in at the end. He was appointed two weeks so he is finding his feet under the desk so to speak. The Multiyear Strategic Work Program was focused on trying to get a horizon for the small number of strategic efforts for the IGF. If we could have a multiple year view of what the activities are and what the goals were at various points, that would help us in terms of continuity and momentum across the IGF work.

It would also help us to again attract donors. It would help future host countries in terms of understanding what the key priorities were for the IGF. I think people come in and think that it's a blank slate every year, and to some extent that's true, but we certainly have found in the first 12 years

of the IGF that there are many topics at a high level that repeat.

The cybersecurity topic this year is not at all the cybersecurity topic it was five or ten years ago. But really having kind of a runway, if you will, for a small number of topics would actually help advance the work, and I think help us pull additional support in and I mean not just the funding and donors, but additional community support, additional partners and organisations, et cetera.

So we are in the process of trying to pull together a process that would actually work with the community, so the broad community, all of the intersessional activities and, of course, the MAG, to identify what the small number of activities or themes might be and then plan that workout. It's a little bit tricky. We obviously need to recognize that every year there is a new MAG that stood and it's up to that MAG to oversee many of the annual activities of the figure.

But with this full community exercise and full community support, I think one could reasonably expect it would continue to have the support of the community as we go forward for several years. So we are in the process of driving that process. It's just sort of a heads up to watch out for that. One of the things we are doing is trying to test what we can do to make the outputs from the IGF even more concrete. One of the Working Group members quotes one of the Paragraphs from the Tunis agenda that the IGF can make recommendations and I know that's a tricky word and concept for many people, but it has a broad set of meanings. It could mean anything from a Best Practice Forum could in fact serve as a type of recommendation.

The IGF could frame or put context to a particular topic and maybe recommend the questions that should be picked up and where they might be picked up in other entities. If the intersessional activities wanted to pick up this work and take it forward in their communities, that also is a, you know, an advice or a recommendation or a handoff or whatever words we want to use, but there are certainly things we could do to make the outputs from the IGF more concrete and more accessible, and I mean that in every possible sense of the word, not just accessible with respect to accessibility guidelines and criteria, but there is a wealth of information, but it's not curated properly. It's not accessible so we are trying to work on pieces of that as well with key messages and other things we are doing with respect to some communications.

One thing we would like to test this year for 2018 is, you know, we are not sure what the community's appetite is for, if you will, pushing on some of these boundaries of recommendations. And we are not even sure how do we define the

community? How do we understand what the community believes or doesn't believe? Which is a long way away from a consensus opinion of the community, but I think we believe that there are a lot of very knowledgeable people that participate in IGF activities and somehow capturing their perspective, their thoughts, their advice, their recommendations in quotes, that would actually help some of these, you know, more challenging topics to advance is something we all care about and something we would all like to support.

So we have asked a couple of the Working Group members to look at some of the tools that exist to see if there is a way to just get a sense of kind of prevailing opinion or differences in opinions, different viewpoints, different perspectives. All of that, of course, is also extremely useful in terms of informing and advancing a lot of these discussions. So if you were to go and look on the IGF Working Group website, you will find the charter for all of these activities. You will find all of the minutes, specifically this particular 2018 exercise is covered in something called an option paper on methodologies for the development of written IGF outputs, but you will see, I mean, it's a lot of reading and a lot of work because the discussion has been ongoing since late last year.

We are trying to crystallize this into a more concrete status and then a more concrete request for engagement. So right now this is more a matter of kind of informing the DCs that we are looking at a couple of these activities and specifically for the multiyear work program, one of the years we thought would be if we could choose a topic or two that we believe has broad support across the globe, so we are not into position development. We are more trying to assess what kind of tools exist to allow us to get a sense of what the community thinks about a particular position, then that would help us test the back end of the process. How far could we go on recommendations? How do we kind of call the community? How do we recognize the community?

And so to that extent, we are looking at, although we haven't decided, a tool called sin mine. Can I put the link in the chat room here? We haven't decided. We are in the process of talking to them. It's an online platform that would facilitate sharing of opinions on a particular position and the two things we are kicking around as possible positions, one is from the GCSC, which is the protective core of the Internet norm that has broad, it seems, global support. It wouldn't be so much to debate the norm as more to understand kind of support for it, concerns, issues and that sort of thing.

The other one that was suggested was whether or not the DCAD or the guidelines from the DCAD DC which I think should be

broadly accepted would be another one we could actually put up.
That would be a nice opportunity to work more deeply with the
DC, and document those guidelines. Put those out there, and,
again, get the community to react and see, again, are people
within the community willing to stand up and say this is
something we believe, we recommend, we advise, we encourage the
community to take up. So and one other thing in the multi-year
strategic work program. Last year we documented with great work
from the Secretariat Eleanora specifically, the, all of the
program components that make up an IGF, both the annual meeting
plus all of the intersessional activities.
     And then we tried to identify the guiding documents that
exist for those and MAG role or community role in those. This
year some of the Working Group members have put together a
really robust presentation that highlights all of the inputs,
all of the outputs and the responsibilities in kind of the flow.
We are also going to be putting that out for a more formal
consultation. So far it's just been within the Working Group,
and really, again, encourage the DCs to look at that and ask the
DCs for, you know, comments on that document, but also to ensure
that the DCs feel solicits in terms of really kind of requesting
or offering their participation in the work of the Working
Group. Markus does attend, which is great.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: Can anybody hear me?
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: I can hear you just now.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: I waited for you to finish and take a
breath. I'm on the phone and on the computer. Gerry has been
bounced off. You have to recall him.
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: So Gerry looks like he is still on, but
he has been bounced off.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: Look at your email.
     >> Hi, Lynn, yes, I can do that in the background.
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: It was, yes, and I'm done with the
Working Group update so I can see if there are any -- I
appreciate it was a lot of information, but.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: I have got the captioning, but the
unfortunate problem is that I can't read it because it's too
small, and I can't untick the scroll box because I don't have
any control and I don't have the URL to be able to change the
font.
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: Eleanora, we can hear you.
     >> Andrea, on top of the transcript, there are --
     >> ANDREA SAKS: They don't work because it's in WebEx.
     >> You can zoom in.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: It doesn't work on mine, Markus, and I've
got it up. WebEx may work with you there, but it isn't working
on mine. I have it, and I'm on the phone and I'm looking at the

screen. I can't get the, I can't unscroll, untick it, and I
cannot change the font. Trust me. I have been setting up
meetings that are accessible for about 20 years.
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: I think what Markus is saying there are
two magnifying glasses up top, one with a plus, and one with the
minus. If you click with the one with a plus, it does blow it
up somewhat.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: That it does, but it goes off the side.
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: That's true.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: That's not acceptable.
     >> LYNN ST AMOUR: Clearly not acceptable.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: No. I have got, I mean, I mean, I can
read it if I get really close, but -- and I can, but what I
want, Markus, is a copy of that, and then I won't miss exactly
what Lynn is --
     >> MARKUS KUMMER: Eleanora will post it on the IGF
website, and I had said before you were able to join that we had
issues and Gerry pointed it out on the call, and we said we are
committed to solving these issues.
     >> ANDREA SAKS: I know you are. And I have already
written quite a bit already. Lynn has read them and so has
Vincent and so has Gerry, and I don't know if you want me to go
into some of the problems and how I think they can be solved.
If I sound annoyed, I was almost ready to throw the computer out
the window because this is the very first time I have ever been
able to connect to WebEx in this fashion. I am partially
dyslexic so that is partially, if you want a portion of blame,
my fault. I could not make it work.
     I finally did because I just persevered and finally I am
using two techniques, I am using the telephone to speak to you
on because the sound doesn't work on WebEx on my phone, on my
computer, and I don't know how to rectify it because that's what
happened the last time when I was in ITU in Kara's office. We
could not for the life of me get audio where I could be heard on
the computer. The other problem is it's very complicated to
use. All of the security that you have in place is not
necessary. We are not the Department of Defense. Something
completely less, you know, problematic with a -- how many digits
did we have here? Nine digits to have a code to get on is for
this purpose is ridiculous.
     And because the email disappeared and I could not, again,
due to dyslexia be able to re-find it again to be able to get
the 163-10-1481, I just took a chance and wrote and said I
couldn't get back in though I had written down the phone number
just in case. So, again, that's my fault, but now I understand.
You only need three digits. A person can remember three digits,
but not nine.

It's not adjustable for font, and it's unfortunate. And I don't really know how to work this, and when I use another -- we use Zoom, we use Go to Meeting, which is real simple. It doesn't have everything I need on it, but I would rather see us use Go to Meeting, which is very basic, and that would satisfy the need, like I say. I think WebEx is one of the worst tools unless you are extremely proficient and don't have a disability. Did you manage to get Gerry back on? Am I talking to thin air?

>> Hi, Andrea, it's Eleanora. He is on, yes.

>> GERRY ELLIS: Yes, hi.

>> ANDREA SAKS: I have been moaning good and hard. I have got my sight and I could not get on, and I still don't have it working on my computer. God, I hate WebEx. I have hated it from the moment it ever was created. And I have complained to Dr. Pepper every year and he has done nothing, and now he is retired and can't do anything. Every year I have complained because it's Cisco that is the parent company.

>> Andrea, may I suggest we take this off line, and I think Lynn --

>> ANDREA SAKS: Sure. I have made my moan. I will shut up and listen and I'm glad to be on, because I'm only sorry to have missed Lynn's speech.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Well, it was rather run on, but it's in the transcript, and, Andrea, I mean, full support for trying to address this. We can, I'm glad to hear Go to Meeting and Zoom are two alternatives. I will need to find out exactly what, you know, in the background, but --

>> ANDREA SAKS: One of the things I tried to set up was try and get our people in the ITU Gens Barona, and the one on your side Luis, I tried to get them together last year and we could not manage it. Our boys know what to do and how to deal with this. I was hoping to put those heads together, the two technical people who handle AV, that they could somehow come to some kind of understanding or we could do a tutorial or people could learn how to use this if we are really stuck with this, but there are upgrades that can be had. I understand this is an older version that has not been updated to the newer version. The newer version might be better, I don't know. This is made for able bodied people who can see, people who are not dyslexic, not blind, probably don't have problems with this, but those of us with disabilities do.

We use Adobe Connect also, which I find really easy to see because of the contrast in the screen and there is a bottom that that two or three lines of captioning. It's done with black on yellow which is much easier to see, and that's also we are giving out the URL which is what you see in your Adobe Connect but we give out the real URL. So I can go back if it's Adobe

Connect or Go to Meeting I can go back and forth, I can unscroll it, control that, make the font bigger.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Right. Andrea, I am very familiar already with Adobe Connect as well. I think as Markus said, we can take this off line. I think it's more appropriate as we said on separate email.

>> ANDREA SAKS: I agree.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: I will have IGF address it.

>> ANDREA SAKS: I don't think it hurts anybody else on the DC to know about this, because they may have a person with a disability on their DC at some point in the future, and they will need to know.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: No. We need to fix it. That's clear. I will follow up with Luis when he returns from his holiday.

>> ANDREA SAKS: And I will talk with Getz when he return from his holiday, and thank you very much, Lynn.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: You are very welcome. This is important and it shouldn't be so hard to fix either.

>> GERRY ELLIS: Just to say I would agree with everything Andrea says. There are many organisations like the Federal Communications Commission in the U.S. and people use Zoom and various other people who do hold successful meetings. I think what we need to do is do a review out there of what technology works and what doesn't and take it from there. And to start with an accessible one and see how we get on with it, because WebEx simply doesn't work on so many levels.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Thank you, Gerry. I love you today. I love today, I will hate you tomorrow, as usual. We always fight, by the way.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: An excellent point as well, and I know we had said at the back end of the last IGF that we were going to set up a task force to advance this so I will check with Luis and we will get it moving or give it a kick if that's what it needs.

>> I was just going to make a brief comment on what Lynn said about a recommendation and outcomes. This is definitely something which is close to the heart of most DCs and it is also one of the reasons we started this coordination exercise because some of the DCs have come to closure on issues and you mentioned DCAD and we tried back in 2009, I think we called then Gerry was presenter at the main session introducing the work of DCAD, but for some reason, we never managed to get the support of the broader IGF community for that, and there are other DCs that have produced work and the struggle was always can we get a broader consensus out of that work.

So this is definitely something of great interest to the DCs. I'm sure there are many who we like to have something to

say on that, but we are moving on, and essentially the agenda is the main session and we haven't touched on that yet. Lynn, I would like to ask you to introduce that issue.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Thank you very much for the time on the earlier workshops, Working Groups. So as you know, this year it's a three-day MAG meeting. We instituted a call for issues and that was followed up by the workshop submission. Through those processes there was great alignment between the major themes in both those processes, and that left us with eight major themes. In order to really reflect kind of the community's interest in those eight themes the MAG decided we would dedicate eight main sessions, we are calling them thematic sessions to those themes. We are also very cognizant of both the DCs and the NRI a wishes for main sessions and also recognizing that a number of the other stakeholders really would like greater participation and greater collaboration between kind of the work of the MAG in some of these sessions and the DCs and NRIs.

Noting that the DCs had made a session for a workshop that fit very well with one of the themes, the agreement was that the DCs working with those MAG members that were interested in that particular topic would organize, would jointly organize a main session, and we have had discussions on exactly how that works, and what we have come up with as a representation is that any one of those teams that organize the main sessions with the DCs or the NRIs need to recognize the working modalities of those respective communities.

And at the same time, I think we all need to recognize the MAG's responsibility to the IGF community for the overall program. So we have asked the MAG members to identify which ones of the main themes they would like to be involved in organising. That process, I hope, will complete this week, again, the holiday period isn't helping us very much, but that would give us a list of MAG members that were interested in participating in the particular theme that the DCs are interested in, and that's development, innovation and economic issues with an emphasis on the Sustainable Development Goals, and basically work together to deliver roughly an 80 minute main session.

So I don't have anything more to say to that, Markus, unless there is some background or some additional questions you want to pose.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, I think that was a fair description of our discussion so far. And I'm sure there will be questions from the DC members, but before that, it seems I had overlooks Olivier who has his hand up. I cannot see the hand up on my screen, but another -- to Andrea about what is wrong with WebEx,

but if you put the hand um.

>> ANDREA SAKS: That is one solution, Markus, can you hear me okay?

>> I hear you.

>> ANDREA SAKS: I just sent you through the actual link, the captioner, bless her heart, is Becky and heard my plea of being freaked out without having the actual link for a browser separate to what you have got up here. And Ray Pecora of Caption First, thank God you use Caption First, just sent me the link, and I put it in your Secretariat, I sent it to you. In future, one of the things we could do is give people the actual link to the captioning so that they can actually manage the captioning, putting the captioning within the Web ex doesn't do anything for vision impaired people.

And it just doesn't do anything. So if you want to share that, there is also looking, I was going to give it to everybody, but there isn't something that says all participants to be able to send a chat to everyone. You have to be able to select someone, which is another flaw. I can't find it anyway, if it is there, there isn't some way to send everybody the link, but I have sent it to you.

So usually it's the same, it's always Streamtext, but I would always send that out so people can have the alternative. And I would like to redesign how, and I can do it, I have had enough experience, how we do remote participation. I wrote, and this is all I will say and then I will stop yakking, I wrote in my email that question 26 of Study Group 16, ITU went to a great deal of effort to elaborate on the DCAD, which is where it started so you can take credit for that, that's where I got the idea, was to make IGF more accessible, I then began working with others to make it better and I produced two papers and now a third one has come out, and I mentioned them in the email last night for those -- or early this morning, for those of you who were not on the email screen.

ITU has three technical papers now, one on remote participation, for accessibility, the other one is accessible meetings, and the third one is remote, accessible remote. So the ITU has taken this on board and Gerry has access to those. The new one is what Lydia Best, who you guys don't know, but it is the Vice President of the European Federation of the Hard of Hearing was the author of the third one and I think what I would like to do, because we are not supposed to produce deliverables, but the DCAD deliverable that I did produce with Francesca of G3ict was the accessible DCAD meeting document. I would like to find some way to be able to introduce those three international approved technical papers from the ITU to IGF so that they can be used officially so we can have good meetings, both remote and

on site and how to best use captioning. I'm done.

>> Thank you for that, and part of having a good meeting is follow speaker order. Olivier has been waiting patiently.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to ask Lynn with regards to the -- let me read my notes, the GCSC on the protective, the work of the GCSC on the protective core of the Internet, she mentioned it a while ago, I think it we are past a moment, if she could follow up with me, please, because I have been interested in being in touch with them for the Dynamic Coalition for Internet values. Thanks.

>> Thank you. Are there other questions related to organising the main session? This is essentially uncharted territory. We have never done it this way. As you will recall, the past DC main sessions were essentially designed for the DCs to present their activities. This year we agreed that we would be on a joint thematic main session, and the reference indicated by the DCs was some sustainable development, and there was a session designed with the title development innovation and I always forget the full title.

That was essentially what was retained and this will now be a joint session organized by the DCs and some MAG members, and I suppose the next step would be then to see who on behalf of the DCs would like to be part of the organising team for putting this main session together. Are there questions, comments, suggestions on that? And obviously Lynn, if you want to provide further guidance?

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Markus, I don't have anything more to say at this point in time. As you said, I think this is new territory. I'm really excited about the possibility, and hope that it actually it really enriches the discussion.

>> Can I ask a question? Hello? I don't know if anyone can hear me? Yes, I can see my writing. So my name is Nadya from the youth coalition, Internet Governance, and this is my first time here. Usually Israel would represent our coalition, but this since advertise departure, I will be stepping in for him now. My question is regarding whether or not you have discussed how the main session format would look like or whether this new organisation or organising team would put that in together and select speakers or what do you exactly perceive as the DC's working together with the MAG to set up the session? Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Lynn, can you take this one?

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Sure. So there is a set of pretty comprehensive guidelines for how to develop the main sessions which were actually developed over the last several years. I think that most of that is still relevant, but just a specific note that it wasn't tailored specifically to this year's

process. The format is really up to the individual organizers. The only thing in keeping with everything the IGF community cares about is that the sessions, the speakers or participants or collaborators or intervenors should be diverse so they should respect region, gender and stakeholder balance, and it allows very adequate time for engagement with the community with the participants, both online and physically in the room. And the guideline we were asking for most of the workshop submissions were sort of 50% of the session ought to be around community engagement at a minimum. Those are the two main guidelines off the top of my head.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And it's worth remembering that the sessions, the three-hour slots which we have, which essentially are dictated by the work schedules of the interpreters for the main session will be divided into two. So main sessions will not be longer than half of three hours, which will not be a full hour and a half because we need time to change over. So you can roughly count on main sessions of 80 minutes.

And if 40 minutes will be reserved for community engagements, then 40 minutes could be then for discussion among experts, but obviously you cannot have ten experts giving long speeches because that's just not enough time for that. So these are the constraints. And also the diversity of stakeholders, and that includes also diversity of point of you -- that really the main sessions should give a flavor of all of the opinions that are floating around any one given issue, so these are my additional comments.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Markus, may I come in quickly again?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, of course.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: One of the other things that would be interesting would be to look at the other sessions that are taking place across the IGF program in that particular theme and see if there is anything you want to comment on, advance, you know, there is obviously a lot of good sessions and speakers coming out as well, something that sort of ties the main session to the other thematic sessions, and then one other quick point, which is really interesting, for their thematic sessions, EuroDIG for their thematic sessions they had a short introduction from the moderator, and then they went to the audience, and I think some of the audience were probably plants in the sense they were pre-positioned, others weren't, and basically to ask the audience to comment on this particular topic or their particular views, and then they asked the experts later throughout the process to come in and try and include any comments or, you know, insight into what had come forward from the audience.

So it doesn't need to be experts first, participants second. You can weave them in or in fact reverse it.

>> Can I just ask were you referring to the plenary session on the information disorder?

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: At EuroDIG, no, I was referring to a number of the sessions that they did that.

>> Because I think the majority of the sessions you mentioned to do audience engagement, I think that was a really good tool that they used.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: It was very good. I thought it was very good.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Other comments, questions? So I suppose Lynn, we need your guidance, how many people do you see as part of the organising team?

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: I don't know if I have a strong opinion on that. If I look at experiences in the Working Groups, there are quite a number of people signed up to the list, and some of the calls there might be 20 people on the call, but consistent participation is probably about half, you know, eight to ten people. That's probably true here as well, so I think, I think not restricting it too much is probably good certainly for outreach and perhaps suggestions for other speakers and things. I don't know. I can appreciate that it gets more difficult, of course, to organize the more people, but I also think that there is a certain breadth and a view of participants and speakers that are brought in.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: As a next step, we could ask then for volunteers from the DC list to join the organising team for this main session. And programmably, we have how many DCs now, 17 if I'm not mistaken, maybe everyone would be interested in participating, then usually those who are more active will emerge in the process in any case while some others may be passive on the list and not necessarily actively involved in the organisation of the session.

Presumably also we would create a separate list for the organisation of the session and have separate calls with MAG members who are involved in this particular main session.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: I think that's foreseen for every one of the main session organising teams.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right. Okay. Can we have sort of sign off on this concept? Nadya would like to come in.

>> NADIA TJAHJA: I'm sorry, that was a previous one.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Are there other final questions, comments? So I think then we can go ahead with that idea and you will designate your volunteers. That may be the coordinators who are on this list, but that may be also somebody else from your Dynamic Coalition who may have particular

interest in the subject there is one last agenda item before coming to any other business.

        >> LYNN ST AMOUR: Was there actually a synopsis or a paper or something underneath the suggests title? If there was, I don't think that's been shared with the MAG yet, so it would be good to get it out there and put a marker down. I don't think we have anything on that at all. This is the first meeting or the first call we have since the last MAG meeting. That's essentially signing off on the very broad concept, but the session notes, the write up, that will have to develop from now forward with the MAG members who are interested in this together in cooperation with the DC representatives who would like to be part of the organising team. So is there a deadline for that?

        >> LYNN ST AMOUR: Eleanora might know better, but I don't think we have a specific -- deadline for the organising teams? Yes, it's passed but there wasn't enough sign up so we will extend it. We will see where we are on the MAG call later today.

        >> MARKUS KUMMER: This is really just the starting point for this. It's a bit slightly more complex main session as we need to have the buy in of the Dynamic Coalitions, but I take it with this call we have this buy in and can move ahead with this concept. Can we conclude with that? I mean, okay, we may be a little bit behind, but then knowing the DCs, they get into full swing once we have then the mailing list together and set up a first call for the organising team to get together. And there is a lot of brain power in the DCs, I can assure you, and if they will put their brain power to productive use, I'm confident that something will come out of it, in the chat, many new ideas on the main session. Could you also -- somewhere, I'm getting lost here on the chat.

        >> ANDREA SAKS: I have a question, Markus, about the main session, would it be a terrible thing to expose our problems with remote participation, and Gerry is quite expert at talking about it. I won't be there. Gerry is going to be taking over for me on this particular IGF, where it is some form of education to the masses. Part of the problem is that people don't know what the problems are, have never thought about it and don't know the solution.

        >> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I would be hard pressed to say off the cuff whether that's appropriate or not. I think that would need a further discussion whether it falls under the title of development, innovation. I think you can construe the case that it does, but I think it would, again, need to have support and the buy in from the full organising team to discuss the concept.

        >> ANDREA SAKS: Is Jill still on?

        >> MARKUS KUMMER: Is Lynn still on in.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Lynn, you are very good at getting these things through, I mean, we have had conversations in the ladies' room, you understand what, and having experienced the difficulty here, I think the world needs to be educated on this, and IGF is a wonderful format to do that.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: So I think that's important as well, one of the things I mentioned earlier when I think you might have not been honorable to hear was whether or not there is the opportunity to see if we can get broad community support for the DCAD guidelines similar to an exercise that was tried a couple of years ago. I think the appetite is different within the IGF community now. I think the tools are better, which would allow us to get broad support virtually so we don't need to rely on physical presence, and that might actually be a better way to both bring attention to it, plus also suggest a more positive kind of approach at the end, which would be adoption of some guidelines.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Well, we did write guidelines for you. It's for the DCAD accessible meeting guidelines. There are guidelines and I know Chengetai has given those any time there is a host for them to use.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: I was talking about broader community support for those guidelines in everybody else's set of activities and institutions similar to the exercise that was tried a few IGFs ago, but which I think failed to result in any kind of consensus or recommendation or adoption, if you will, by the broader community.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Well, the problem is with that, Lynn, is that as I said earlier, complete guidelines at the ITU. Now, I'm wondering if I can republish those as, and I have to check if I can do this, because they are available to the public, but they are better documents than the one I wrote four years ago.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: That's perfect! Again, I recognize we are over time, and I don't want to take too much time so maybe can we can take it off line. But specifically what we were trying to test were two things, one was protect the core of the Internet, and or accessibility guidelines, and see what we can do to actually get an IGF-wide opinion or assessment or recommendation or support for or advice on something, and we wanted to start with things that had broad support already in the world and test the tools and the IGF community's appetite for, if I can, kind of nominally saying the IGF believes or supports or wishes or recommends or whatever that verb is, and this was one of the area that's had been suggested.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Perfect. I will send those to you.

>> LYNN ST AMOUR: Great.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. We are a bit over time and we still have not discussed the booth given or reserved for the Dynamic Coalitions, the Secretariat has kindly reserved a booth the Dynamic Coalitions could use collectively, but I don't think we have time to go much into detail to discuss how best to do it, but the opportunity is there. Eleanora, would you briefly like to expand?

>> Hi Markus, hi, everyone. So, yes, I mean, I don't think we have a concrete plan for the booth yet, but just to remind everyone last year it was used in a kind of individual office hours way, quote, unquote, meaning each DC could sign up and reserve a block of time for them to be at the booth and represent their own coalition's work and network and talk about, and talk about their specific outputs and activities.

I don't know if we want to do that again. I think we will have to have a little more time to consult widely. I think Jutta has her hand up and would like to say something.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Remembering last year's IGF and the DC booth, I think more or less it was not very successful, and I do think we need a stronger link between the program and the DCs booth because many people didn't turn up there. They didn't know that they could go to the booth and maybe ask questions after a meeting of, after a session of a DC, and so the times that I had been at the booth, it was later time, nobody came and nobody asked questions, so I do think if we have the opportunity to have a booth, we need a concept how to make better use of it, and how to really present what the DCs have to offer to the community. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And Marie-Laure says the same and she was at the booth. And for the scribes that was Jutta Croll speaking not Cole, the previous speaker. We have the possibility to do it, but I think some more thought needs to go into it if you want to take up the possibility to avoid what happened last year that nobody comes. Then there is not much point. With that, can we close the call I'll send a note to the DC list asking for volunteers to join the organising team for this MAG session and the Secretariat, I'm sure, will organize the lists and set up a first call to get this process started.

Unless there is a final comment or question, I would then suggest that we close this call. And I don't see any urgent requests for the floor, so I take it that you all agree with this proposal and I thank you for your participation and I look forward then to your contribution for this main session. Thank you all. Goodbye.

(Concluded at 10:10 a.m. CT)

***

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription.