

DCCG Meeting #98
08 May 2025, 06:00-07:30 UTC

Transcription provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, Colorado 80132
877-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I see Avri is on the call and that's East Coast, which is what now? Very early in the morning or late at night. Yeah. Is it one o'clock or what?

>> AVRI DORIA: 2:00 AM.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, okay. That is a difficult hour. Yes. Right. With that, can we start the meeting? You have an agenda that was sent out and can you maybe post it also in the chat, Roman?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Already done.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Already done. Okay. I'm not very -- okay. Yes, there it is. Is there any additional items to be added under any other business? There is a fairly comprehensive agenda. I think it covers most of the issues. Avri, yesterday I think she wanted to discuss the...

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes. I was wondering if it's just a quick thing and I don't know if there's much to be said, but the whole thing of a DC booth and the fact that, I guess, three or four DCs got approved for one, but how do we go about it? So, I just wanted to get that in there so that it wasn't lost.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Okay. No, I mean, that's more for information. It's already well on its way, but I think Roman can then inform us under the agenda item, essentially DCs at the IGF '25 and that includes the booth. Yeah.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes, of course. So, my colleague Eleonora reached out to me yesterday or day before yesterday, requesting the logo of the Dynamic Coalitions since as last year. Instead of having individual DC booth, it'll be one DC booth as we did in Riyadh, which we all consider it, if I'm not confused, in a good practice. So, yeah, everything is in order here.

>> AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I wasn't asking about it being order, I was asking about it, so how do we organize ourselves? And that's what I'd like to see get started.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Last year.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, let's discuss more in detail on the agenda item the DCs at the IGF '25. Yes. With that, can we then approve the agenda as it has been proposed?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Well, I have a hand up, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please. Yeah, Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you. I've been on holiday, so maybe I've missed something in the past one and a half week, but in the last MAG meeting, there was a discussion on the final main session, which was on the future of the IGF and several MAG members addressed then that they would cooperate with outcomes of intersessional work. Is there any news on that? So that's something perhaps that we can discuss under any other business or under our own main session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, no, again, that's part of the DCs at the IGF '25.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: That's what I'm asking for. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. With that, can we then move on? Oh, there is a -- okay. We have AI assistant helping to take notes. That is the real people, for some reason it didn't work out. Normally we have scribes who take the notes and this time they have not been -- for some reason, has not worked out. Okay. Then let's move on and get started with agenda item -- with adoption of the agenda. Then the agenda is adopted with these amendments or clarifications. And then the first substantive agenda item would be the webinars. So, we had two webinars so far, and

I would like to ask Rajendra with many thanks to him for organizing them and moderating these webinars. I think they were very well attended. And I think -- well, Rajendra what is the note?

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP: Markus, I have a very patchy network. I'm not sure if I'm getting heard correctly. Can you hear me all?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you, yes. It's a bit patchy. Yes.

>> RAJENDRA PRATAP: Excellent. So first, thank you the secretariat for the wonderful support for getting these webinars. I think the quality of discussions and speakers was really good. What we got as a feedback during the webinars, well attended, I must say, and engaged above all. We had engaging questions and comments, and I'm looking forward to the recording so that we can create knowledge papers out of those two webinars, which I guess will be good thought leadership documents coming out of our intersessional work. And I'm also looking forward to the next two. I think one is we are almost closing on, the next one with four DCs confirmed. So hopefully we should close that in the next two days to have enough time for promotions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you for that. And Anriette, I see your hand is up.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Good morning, everyone. And for Avri, I'm not sure what time it is for you, but thanks and apologies. I was a bit late. Markus, I just wanted to say also congratulations to Rajendra for the webinars. But having now participated in the two, I do think we should think of making them slightly more focused. I think that, you know, it's good to have these very broad all over the place discussions, you know, as a way of starting the process. And I think it makes it very inclusive. But I think that, you know, to get people's attention online and to retain people's attention for these online webinars, I think we should aim to be slightly -- yeah, to come up with clearer questions and maybe narrower or more specific topics to address. Otherwise, I think we might lose some of the momentum going forward. But I'm not sure what other people think. I got some feedback that people felt they weren't quite sure what we were talking about, but on the

other hand, I think some people quite liked it being very open. So, I'd like to hear what other people think about this as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. I was also focused on the question that Anriette has put up. I was attending the second webinar when I was on the train, so I was only listening mode. And I found it bit difficult to follow the debate because I missed the (inaudible 00:07:53) throughout the process. We had 90 minutes, which was really good and many people attended. But the interlinkage between the input that came from people could have been a little bit more focused like Anriette said before. I don't want to criticize Rajendra because I really think you do a really, really good job. But there are so many people who wanted to speak in that webinar, the last one. And so, a bit more of a structure would help, I do think, to keep people on track.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And I don't know whether Rajendra would like to comment, but I mean, my point, would be this is work in progress and whatever you do, there's always room for improvement. And I think comments and constructive criticism is helpful. Rajendra, would you like to comment? Maybe he has connection problems. But just let us know when you're ready to say. And there was another point that came up in upstream that the webinar format of Zoom is not very popular with most people because you don't see who is actually attending. And I think we can have a webinar, have just a normal Zoom call and call it a webinar. But I think that is something that also would need to be discussed. There are risks involved if you have an open call that there might be people who try to hijack it. But I think all in all, we should err in favor of openness and go for open format. I don't know whether anyone would comment on that. But also Roman is the manager of it as secretariat.

So, the question, I see thumbs up from Jutta and various colleagues made the point ahead of the webinar that they would like to be in a room where they can actually see who else is there and also exchange in the chat and see also comments in the chat. Anriette agrees with that. Can we all agree that the next webinar will be just an ordinary Zoom call, whoever applies to be part of the webinar, whoever

registers will then have the possibility also to ask for the floor and talk, and the advantage would be you see who's on the call? Roman, would you be okay with that?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: It's entirely up to you, colleagues.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. I see there's quite a lot of support in the chat. And can we take it then that we move ahead like that. That we have an ordinary Zoom call, but we call it a webinar, but it'll not be the Zoom webinar format. Okay.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Markus, sorry, I had my hand up and I see Wout has just actually put that in the chat as well. I agree completely, but I think it would then also be useful for us to have someone volunteer to support the process by doing online moderation. At least, because then we can benefit from the discussion in the chat, but it would be important to support the moderator then with someone looking at the online comments and summarizing that. So, I'm happy to volunteer. I think, you know, we have Wout, we have Avri, we have, in fact, everyone on this call is experienced, so I just think that it would be good if we identify somebody who can support the moderator with the online moderation.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's an excellent suggestion. And I was going to suggest, actually, as you made the suggestion, why don't you do that, but you volunteered yourself. So, let's take it then that we have an online moderator at the next webinar, and I presume that everybody will be okay with that. Question also in the Zoom, do we have actually the dates for the next two webinars? Roman, do we have the dates?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I would kindly ask Rajendra to remind if we fixed some of the dates, like 20th or 22nd May for the third one, and June 4th or 5th for the fourth. I just don't remember where we did it. If not, this is the idea that our -- after this, DCCG meeting at least two weeks should be like in advance. So, I guess that 22nd of May might be a realistic date for the webinar number three.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And Anriette said she can't do the next one. That would be on 22nd of May. So, we need another online moderator for that date.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I already volunteered, Markus. I wrote it in the chat.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Sorry. I'm obviously not -- but there's an old saying that Swiss get up early, but wake up late, so I'm obviously not fully awake. Okay. So, we have an online moderator for the next webinar with Jutta, and then Anriette hopefully will be able to do the last one in early June. With that, can we then move to the next agenda item?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I had my hand up, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, sorry, Wout. Yes, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I'll remind you, don't worry. Thanks. Where the comment on the content is concerned as you said, Markus, rightfully, this is a work in progress. We're doing this for the first time. I think what is also the case is that they're representative from different DCs, so they each have sort of individual topic that they would like to share with the world, and that makes it fragmented. And that is maybe unavoidable from a topical point of view. But this is a work in progress and perhaps in the new cycle we can do more than just four, who knows, if there's something that we need to discuss. But then it could also be more focused because you would have less DCs participating on a specific topic. But it's something that we maybe have to evaluate when we've done all four and then see what people think and how we could progress in the future. But at this moment, I don't see a real possibility to narrow it down to one topic with so many DCs participating actively. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, that is also a little bit my point is clearly the desire to be more focused, but then on the other hand, we have to be inclusive and to be open to let those participate who want to participate. So, it is a narrow line to walk, but I think this cycle is really preparing for the IGF with the webinars, the annual meeting. After the annual meeting, I think we can then maybe also refocus and see how we want to move on. But I think overall, the stock taking of the webinars has been a very useful exercise and it has also helped the visibility of the dynamic coalitions, I think.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: If I may add couple of sense to the discussion from our perspective, from the secretariat

perspective, we would appreciate more diversity for the next -- for the remaining two webinars in terms of diversity of speakers because so far, we have repeated several of them, even though they were brilliant. And of course, since we have 30 plus DCs, that would be amazing to diversify and get as many DCs present there as possible. So, this is first, second yes, I agree with Wout about evaluation after all four webinars and maybe even drafting schedule of next month webinars because probably then we could keep at least one webinar per month with several DCs cooperating on its creation or even in those single DCs, if they're willing to organize webinar for the community and get it promoted through our resources, that I think that should be also an option for those who are willing to do it. So, yeah. I see Judith also wants to share something.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Judith, please.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Judith Hellerstein. So, we put in that Dr. Shabir is going to talk about in the capacity building. So, we're a new one. We haven't spoken in the other two webinars. So, we are interested in speaking at this one. And I know Dr. Shabir is also interested in speaking at another one, the last one. But so, we're a new speaker, and I think there are some new speakers on the list. Because I don't think DC-SIDS. I'm not DC Avri's group, the schools have spoken before either, so there are some new people, but yet there are some older other people. So, it's not all people who did the first two webinars, but I agree that we should restrict it to give the people preference, DCs who haven't done it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for your comments. Yes. I think as we said time, again, this is a first run of these webinars. First is learning by doing, I think also the points made. Yes, let's be as diverse as possible. And it's good that we have new DCs at the next webinar. So, all in all, I think we are on the right track and then after the annual meeting in June, we can then recalibrate. And then I think it will also be easier if we go forward, if we decide to have a webinar a month, then we can also be more focused as Roman suggested. With that, can we move then to the next agenda item, which is again...

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus, I had my hand on, I just wanted to go on with that debate. I do think that diversity of the dynamic coalitions being part of the webinars is a really important thing. And still, I don't think that it's in contradiction to what I said before, that we need somehow a red thread to the debate in the webinars or when in the meetings in the Zoom call, whatever we call them now, when it's not webinar style. And the main point is that there are interlinkages between the different DCs, not between all of them, of course, but still when we are talking about improvement of the Internet governance of the debate, we should showcase that also in our digital meetings, that there are these interlinkages between the work of the dynamic coalitions and not just having, okay, this DC is telling something, then the next one, then the next one. Bringing a bit more together and find out how they are interrelated.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. That's a very valid point. And I think that was very much also the heart that we tried to say bring in the linkages between the DCs. And that's part of the collaborative efforts we have over the years, I think increased. When you look back the first DC sessions, they very much had a tendency that each DC just tried to present their thing. And over the years, I think we have made huge progress by actually finding the points where they actually interlink and collaborate and have common points. So that's a point into account. Thank you for that. Now with that, can we move to the next agenda item or is there any other last comment on the webinars? And let's call them webinars and not just Zoom webinars. That's a Zoom function. The Zoom webinars are unpopular with this crowd, but it will be essentially a webinar, but it'll take the form of a normal Zoom call. Okay. I don't see any other hand up. Then we can move on to the DCs at the IGF, the annual meeting. We have already briefly started the discussion on common booth and, Roman, is there anything to add? So basically, we can assume that we have, again, a DC booth as we had in Riyadh, which I think we all agreed was a remarkable success. It worked well, and again, it showed the collaboration between the DCs and I was very impressed how was very improvised at times to begin with, but in the end, it really worked out extremely well. So that is essentially the template with following for Lillestrom. And is there anything to add Roman?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: No, I guess that the basics for the previous year's success was that we had this Google doc with volunteers and we had this WhatsApp group to also coordinate onsite activities. So, I guess that we can recirculate the Google list based on the similar pattern as last time. And everything is, I would say, going to be the same. But maybe this time if colleagues are ready to gather their video and presentation materials on the Google Drive in advance, I'm happy to set up this folder so that we do not exchange it right there with the USB memory sticks and so on. So, let's please collect all the materials before and then we'll be super well prepared when we get to Lillestrom.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I see Avri had her hand up, but has taken her down. Maybe can I take it, Roman has answered the questions you may have had?

>> AVRI DORIA: To an extent, yeah, but I have no more questions. I'm fine.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you. And as I see, there are more people who have joined, can I also ask you to add your affiliation behind your names, know which DC you're affiliated, and you can do that if you go to -- Jutta has her hand up, I think. Yes, please, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. I wanted to ask Roman whether you are going to produce again this kind of leaflet of brochure with the QR codes for the dynamic coalitions?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes. I guess that the brochure didn't change. The only changes that we need to add the new DC on emerging technologies, and maybe by the time of the forum remove those DCs which will be inactive. Those who didn't submit the reports. We're still to make this assessment exercise to see who didn't do it, then we'll give them a last chance and then if they still don't reach out, we will archive them and probably not include in the brochure.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you. And I made vouchers last year. It may be obvious to those who were in Riyadh, but not everybody was in Riyadh. So, we have to be a little bit more specific there. But as I said in my remark, in Riyadh, it was all rather improvised and we collected information on the USB stick, and Roman just said that this year as we know what the output will be, we can do that in

a more systematic way, and as you send the information needed to Roman in advance, and he will then also we had a one pager, I think in Riyadh with all presenting the dynamic coalitions with a QR code to their website. And so, it all fitted in rather neatly.

>> JUTTA CROLL: It's again, me, Markus, I have raised my hand.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you for giving me the floor. I do think Avri's question also was how we organized staffing the booth at the IGF and we did so with having like, I think an Excel sheet was produced where every DC representative could put in their name saying, I might be available at this, that, or that time. But we can do that only later on when we know about the schedule of all the sessions so that we know when we have other obligations, other sessions to attend, then we will be able to volunteer. And, for me, it was a surprise that it turned out so well that at any time there was someone at the booth and that was also due to the fact that the booth was really well attended by IGF participants. So that it was even of value for the dynamic coalitions to be there present and to give out their information and answer any questions participants might have had.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, it was also my impression, we tried to organize it a bit, but it was almost not necessary because it worked spontaneously. And also, the group chat helped a lot for just sending a quick note on WhatsApp, can you please come here and help? And it was a really very positive collaborative effort between all the DCs who were represented in Riyadh. It had a lot to do with the general outline of the IGF Village right in the middle of all the meeting rooms. And I think the Norwegians try to copy that layout. And contrary to previous years where the village was very far away from the rest of the events in Riyadh, it was really right in the middle. And that greatly helped. I think also the spontaneous collaboration between the DCs because whenever you had a few minutes free between two sessions, people walked to the booth and helped out and chatted with people. So that was, I think, part of the success. Right. Are there any more questions regarding the DC booth, which is not the same as the DC sessions?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Markus, are we going to have a Google doc for people to sign up because we have our fellows and they're going to also want to sign up and they may not be on the Google, on the WhatsApp group unless we create a booth one like we did last year?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: We can do everything. If you consider it is a good practice, yeah, we can separate the WhatsApp group again to serve the mission of coordinating the volunteers and those who met onsite, and those who want to stay in touch with the DC since we already use this group as our general communication tool, one of them. And so yes, I am happy to distribute the new WhatsApp link and the new volunteer sheet on Google.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent. With that, can we then move to the sessions? And Avri has taken it on her to coordinate the documents, and I think they moved on reasonably well. The original deadline was to be ready by 30th of April. We are now on 8th of May. Where are we now, Avri?

>> AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I had put up my hand to ask a question on the previous one, but I'll get back to that. Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, please ask the question on previous one.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. The question was, with the way it's all shared there, one of the things when we had applied for a booth, we had thought of also reaching out to some of the schools and actually trying to get a school's meeting in the booth. Now when we're sharing the booth as this, will it be possible for one of the DCs to, you know, use it for some kind of online outreach thing or does that not really work in that case?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I can't see why not. I think...

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay, good.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: You know, not -- we have...

>> AVRI DORIA: You could just schedule it basically and say...

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Between 11 and 12, it's this DC and they do their thing there. I think that's fine with everyone. Yes. But now back to the documents.

>> AVRI DORIA: Right. So, the document is still open. I can put the URL back in there, although, I keep giving it out. It was actually kind of disheartening because I just basically put in a basic skeleton and people over the course of the last, what, three weeks have been filling it out. And it looks to me, you know, as I say, I was just sort of shepherding the document and worrying about its sanity and not worrying so much about the content. But it looks like there's, you know, a set of interesting sessions there. My thought is, and I also, hopefully everybody got it, I sent out a snapshot of what it looked like yesterday, so if anybody couldn't reach the Drive doc, they at least had, you know, a Word file. And I guess it's up to this group, whether that is that the five descriptions that are there, the main session and then the four others are indeed what we want to refine and take further, you know. But the document is fairly what it is and I'm actually quite pleased with the number of people that contributed to it. And if you read through them all, you know, they're not polished, but they're all fairly decent sessions, I thought. So, thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you. I think that's excellent news. Should we maybe give a very short deadline to give people the opportunity to give it the last check and without hearing any other comments, assume the documents are ready to go?

>> AVRI DORIA: I see Amrith has hand up. And I know comments have gone in since I did the snapshot, but that's, you know, not to be worried about.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah. Amrith, yes.

>> AMRITH KUMAR: Okay. Thank you, Markus. So just an update, I attended PNAI in the morning today, so the Policy Network for AI. And this is their second session. And there they mentioned that the MAG meeting is occurring on May 13th, if I'm not wrong. So, it's encouraged to get drafts of the sessions that we want at the IGF before then. So by May 12th would be kind of like a good deadline that we could look towards to get all of these descriptions pretty

much ready. So, the MAG can take a look at the drafts that we have.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes. But I think the deadlines would even need to be shorter than -- I mean, if you give the deadline for the DCs to look at it and to provide last comments they may have, I was thinking in terms of a very quick turnaround maybe we are Thursday, maybe Friday close of business, then that we could post the document on Monday and send it to the MAG. Would that make sense?

>> AVRI DORIA: I could certainly clean it up. You know, basically if you have a deadline of Friday, then I can just do, you know, the last bit of straightening and such so that it is presentable.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That would be excellent. Can we agree on that? Give a short deadline a little bit more than 24 hours. You have one last opportunity to look at the document, and then Avri will clean it up and we can post it and we are good?

>> AVRI DORIA: Yes. If basically people have done it by the end of Friday, whatever time zone, I'd probably do the straightening up on my Sunday, since I use that as my first day of the work week.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> AVRI DORIA: So that means by Monday somewhere it would be, you know, somebody else's to distribute or whatever.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Send out an email to the whole list. Say, look here -- okay. Avri, could you send an email to the list?

>> AVRI DORIA: Sure.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Give them with the links and that they have until tomorrow end of business to provide last comments they may have. Okay. Many thanks to that. Excellent. And then there was the question, Wout, has raised again, back to you Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Sorry. Thank you, Markus. What I ask also first on the document of, let's call it, Avri's document for now. Who will be submitting it to the MAG so that it is arriving there in time? It needs to be somebody's task as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, that will be a secretariat task.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. That they agreed on Roman, that when Avri gives you the get go that you submit it to the MAG. So there's no misunderstanding.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: All right. Or Jutta and I could do that as -- but, I mean, once we have the document, yes, it needs to be put forward.

>> AVRI DORIA: Right. And the Monday is the 12th, so it corresponds to the date that others would be put out. Oh, it's Mother's Day when I'll be finishing. Well, yeah. Anyhow, so I'll clean it up on Sunday and yeah, it shouldn't be me. It should be one of the leadership or the secretariat that does the conveying of it.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. If Roman can't do that for any reason, we can do it, Markus, I think.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct. But I imagine would be that Roman does it. That's a sort of a function the secretariat has and it's a clear role for the secretariat.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Okay. So to make sure I would say that Avri, you notify Roman that it's good to go so that we don't miss out on this opportunity. Because it was unclear to me who did what. But that aside, back to my question, the first question, Markus. As I remember from the last MAG meeting, there were discussions on May sessions they were organizing, and at some point, they could not agree on the topic of the future of the IGF and the WSIS+20, etc. Then several MAG members said that, let's invite the intersessional works, including the DC to help organize that session. And I haven't heard back since what is happening there, but I think that with some of our outcomes, we could certainly assist that session to show the relevance of the IGF, what sort of outcomes and different sort of outcomes come from the intersessional work and to offer actively our participation in the organization of that main session. And I don't know what

the status is. So that is why I was asking my question at the beginning. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think the main sessions (inaudible 00:40:58), can you give more clarity?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Markus, could you please repeat? I don't know what about others? But I lost...

>> MARKUS KUMMER: You know, how the main sessions I think I was at the last, there was a MAG call, was it last week? And my impression was main session are being organized by the MAG very much along the same line as in previous years.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes. I also do not see any difference with how it was organized before. And maybe Anriette could help us better, but to my knowledge, everything is the same. And we just need to repeat this fantastic work which Jutta and Joao did together. And that's it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I mean, we are going to have the four sessions, they will be in a workshop room, and then we will have a main session. But I think Wout's question related to the main session on the future of the IGF and whether or not the organizers take into account the work or the intersessional work. And I think it will be very much and I see Anriette has a hand up.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Yes. So Markus, so sorry, just to add, I mean, I think the answer is I have not actively started working with the main sessions. I did a lot of work on the main sessions last year, but I'm not sure which ones I'll do this year. But I think that as always, main sessions are open to volunteers. So, I think at the first level, I think Markus is correct. I think MAG members are aware that they need to be inclusive of the intersessional. So that's there. But at the second level, we always need to remind them. And therefore, I do think it's important that we have people from the DCs join as volunteers to co-organize that main session. And I think then we as the DC coordinating group have the choice. We can either nominate a specific person to play that role, or we can ask Roman to keep an eye on that role or we can do it on a voluntary basis. But I do think we need to -- there needs to be a little bit of push and a little bit of pull, but certainly the opportunity for us to participate actively in

organizing that main session and proposing speakers is totally open. I hope that helps a little bit, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, I think that is also my impression that we and I like the push and pull. I think it doesn't just happen. I think we need to push a bit to make sure that the DCs are getting heard. And I can also see a question, right in the chat. Can we have a planning session for the DC main session like we did last year? I think that definitely would be necessary. And also well, it's, you know, we have to -- it may yes, but it's next month. We don't really have that much time left before the annual meeting. It's really, it is very early coming up. It's not like last year, right? It was December. But we definitely need to plan a bit the main sessions and I think also for, again, the basic architecture is the main session will be in a big meeting room and will have interpretation, whereas the other, the four collaborative sessions will be in a workshop room and without interpretation, and there'll be big workshop rooms, but the main session will be, again, a very big hall, a very big meeting hall. And yes, and question in the chat whether we can actually have all the mailing lists that have been set up and so we can subscribe to be part of the mailing lists? Will the main session also have sign language interpretation? Is a question. I think so, but I'm not sure. Roman, would you know?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. The answer is yes. Okay. And yes, Wout, we don't have much time to volunteer, so we actually have to encourage people to join the MAG calls and to subscribe to the mailing lists, and be active in the preparation. With that, are there more questions related to the DC sessions in Lillestrom?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Markus, one comment. I think that when we've decided on Monday, it would be good to start setting up individual calls. As you said, it's EuroDIG next week, so everybody who's going there is doing something else. That makes the 15th or 16th and people are back of May. And then we have five to six weeks to prepare. So, I would say that it would be good to set up teams that are going to start organizing the session, inviting speakers and that sort of thing, so that each team has a role from that moment onward. And I think we have volunteers in the Google doc. So, let's start setting up

these meetings so that we are well prepared for the session and then for the main session, we need another team probably or volunteers at these two, start organizing the main session. So, thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes. And I think would be good, we can call already maybe identify some volunteers or people come forward. I will be willing with this or with that session. With the main session, I think Jutta is not surprised if my eyes turn to her. And I would like to ask her whether she, once again would be willing and ready to take on this job. And obviously there will be all this helping you, but you have in the...

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, of course.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I would be happy to do that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: You are the natural choice because you have been able to do it so well. Excellent. And do we have volunteers for the other sessions?

>> AMRITH KUMAR: So Markus, to clarify, you're referring to the IGF sessions, correct?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. The DC sessions at the IGF.

>> AMRITH KUMAR: Yeah. So, I volunteered for the first session on AI and emerging technologies. So, the DTC will be involved with that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. So, we have one volunteer. And when we say a volunteer, that doesn't mean it's one person carrying the whole survey, I obviously ask for other people to join them and share the burden. Wout is a volunteer and Judith is a volunteer. Judith for the capacity building session. And Wout, which session are you volunteering for?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: This one, the main session. Oh, sorry. Yes, I'm on this one, the main session and I will look into for the other sessions and at the experts in IS3C to see if they're willing to join the organization. So I'll be reaching out to them very soon.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So you are volunteering to help Jutta with the main session?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct. Okay. So, we have a team there in place, and we have Amrith for the AI and emerging technology. And Judith is also willing to help. And Avri with capacity building. So with Judith and Avri with capacity building, that's already an excellent team. And Laura with session 1 and also the main session. Okay. Excellent. So, yeah. And it's not a closed teams as such, but it's good to have some people are willing to get started to set up the calls and so on. Okay. Reyansh, also for AI and emerging technologies. Yes. And not to lose track. Can we have the volunteers name in the minutes please? Yes, I think we will have, it's also in the chat. I think it's good to have these names. Okay. Then move on in our (inaudible 00:51:40) that point and there we have the ongoing discussion on the gaming platform, which my -- I mean, this was essentially a novel idea to deal with list of participants to see who participates at what meeting. And there were some questions and not everybody was happy about it, as I see, but also had some technical problems. So Reyansh, would you be able to fill us in where we are with that now?

>> REYANSH: Yes. Thank you, Markus. Good morning. Joining from Arizona as well. But yeah, so regarding the gaming platform, I think I'll be able to send a detailed email to everyone regarding, you know, how we can use it for, you know, starting out. And I'll also reach out to every DC member and everyone on this call, especially to see how we can make it better as we go ahead. But by the end of this week or Monday, I would say hopefully, I'll send over an email with instructions and a video to see how we can use the platform and going ahead, how it can help us all. I think including webinars as a part of it would be a good idea as well. But I'll, yeah, reach out by next week.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you for that. And then the other point under this agenda item was the governance framework of the DCs. We have received some feedback, but not every DC has actually sent us. Roman, can you share the link to the Google doc you have set up so that we can actually look at it? I'm not suggesting that we look at them in detail now, but it's interesting to see that some

of them have very elaborate governance frameworks on DCs. But at this stage we do realize that not every DCs may have a charter, which sets out all the rules, how they organize themselves. But Reyansh, can you send us in a few bullet points, what are the main principles? And the question I would like to, and this is actually also linked to the next agenda item, to the collaboration with the IGF strategy group. One subgroup of the strategy group was actually to look at how the Sao Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines are implemented. And that is a question I think we as a coordination group for the DCs could also discuss whether we should have a look at the Sao Paulo guidelines, whether we should see what is good for them or relevant, or can we just say, yes, we endorse them, or we can also in the government's framework incorporate them by reference, say, you know, DC so and so is cognizant of the Sao Paulo multistakeholder guidelines and is tries to implement them to the extent possible or whatever.

But the two questions asked, again, in the paper we have had since '21, was whether we should have governance frameworks in place for the DCs. And I think that would greatly enhance the accountability of DCs if they have a governance framework in place. And the other question asked was, should we develop a blueprint for a DC governance framework, which would not be mandatory, but would be a kind of template the DCS could use? They could have precisely asked a few bullet points. You should address this. You know, how you select coordinate term limitations for the coordinators and how the work is expected. How to put it mainly on calls to have mainly lists or whatever. So, the floor is open to this question. And in the chat, it's a -- this is partaking in this initiative is not part of the requirements for DCs to be regarded as active. This is something that precisely we can discuss what are the requirements for a DC to be considered active. And if we as a coordination group come to the conclusion it is mandatory for DC to have some government framework in place, then it will be mandatory. And that can be either you have one or you don't. And that's a binary thing. And I don't think it's asking for too much to have something in place that explains how you actually organize yourself. Now the floor is open. Who would like to speak? I see hands up. I see Avri and Rajendra. Avri first.

>> AVRI DORIA: Okay. Yeah, thanks. Avri speaking. So yeah, I think it's fine to require that each of the DCs

have a process document to be active. I actually would want to offer slightly different suggestion than guidelines for how to write one. I think that it's fine for the DCs to figure out their own, but I think it would be nice perhaps if we created a bare bones charter that basically, you know, the rule comes down to here's a bare bones charter you can all use and it's adequate to the DCCG's purposes, or you could define your own however you want to and leave that so that you put the requirement on saying you got to have one to be active, but all they have to do is say we're using the standard one, or they don't like the standard one, then they create their own and make it easy for them to be active by just claiming to use a standard. As opposed to, first of all, it'd be a lot of work for us to create a template with guidelines and what may be good here, what may be good there and taking all those. But like we've gone for a long time on, you know, the three opens, this required charter could be little more than that, the three opens plus two more things you got to do. You know, or some such thing and keep it simple. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Actually, you said it more eloquently what I try to say, you know. When we -- the template I was thinking of, it should just have, you have to address this or this or this. And, I like the idea of a bare bones, you know, that could be, that is the minimum you have to have, have to respect. Okay. But I suppose most DCs already do it, you know, have a, how do you communicate, yes, there are mailing lists, but, you know, that we just have it and we agree on a few points that should be in these bare bones. But I saw hang on the Wales was hand up. That's quite a few hands. Yes. Rajendra was first and Roberto and then Jutta.

>> Dr. RAJENDRA: Thanks, Markus. Markus, so working here at the DCs, I think governance is about how do you conduct your dynamic coalition.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes.

>> Dr. RAJENDRA: But the second important aspect is your contributions. You know, as we all have been involved in multiple activities and despite the ever-growing number of DCs, the engagement in terms of contribution sometimes becomes an issue. I understand it's an issue of voluntary effort, but then we should also be sensitive to the point that DCs were formed with the goal, with an objective. Are

they really sticking to the objective? So, one that is governance, how do you conduct your DC? The second thing is how do you contribute to the intersessional work and to the IGF mandate? I think somewhere, you know, even in the webinars, you know, you have seen that first two we had to repeat, and third time I said, we'll not repeat speakers. So only four, five or six DCs are very active, rest are not. So, we'll have to figure out ways to activate them. Are we missing something? I will not blame it to them in large measure. Is that as an ecosystem that we need to do something more, something different? I think the part of the strategy group would be the governance is one aspect.

Accountability or contribution is the second. Something that, you know, I think Avri put it that there is a bare bone thing that you say that you have to do this minimum. Somewhere, I feel that we are a wonderful network, greatly supported by IGF, a great platform, but I don't think we are leveraging the full potential of every DC. Objective should be at the end of the governance, is to leverage the full potential of what we can do as DCs. So somewhere along that, I think we need to go just beyond governance to create that structure. I don't know if I misplaced my objective of stating it, but when we lead initiatives, it becomes very difficult. Everything gets last moment. I think DCs are grounds up. They should contribute also. That's where we have to look at the objective of governance.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. But that indeed would be already a next step. I mean, the governance is essentially the very basis. And we are looking at, you know, the basic rules and Avri mentioned actually some time to agree on the three O's that you need to have open mailing list, open archives and open membership. And also, that we agree that you need to send an annual report as a precondition for being listed as an active dynamic coalition. Now, saying we should also agree, and I like very much Avri's idea to keep it very simple. But if you have a bare bones governance framework in place, that you accept that, and we would have to agree on what it is and what you, Rajendra, just said. We should go a step further and I think that would be the next step to take. Yes, indeed. But there are more people would like to take the floor. Roberto, and then Jutta and then Wout.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah, very briefly, because I think that Markus, you have already sort of addressed this point. I was thinking whether this template or however we want to call it could be used to also point out what are these minimum requirements that are about openness and so on. So that people who have to -- who don't have a charter but will make just the list can make sure that they address those points so that it is clear that the minimum requirements are fulfilled. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Next speaker?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, it's me, Markus

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's Jutta, yes.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you. Yes, I do think on the one hand we have the charter, the overall charter for the dynamic coalitions already on the website. And we need probably to remind dynamic coalition that it's there and that they just need to add whether they have certain points that are related to their individual dynamic coalition. Second point Roman, I do remember, I know for sure that the Dynamic Coalition on Children's Rights had submitted their report for 2024 well in time. It was a week before the deadline, and it's still not up on the website. And I'm a bit worried because I do also remember that Amy Crocker who had organized our dynamic coalition beforehand, had also prepared a kind of, it's not a charter, but a paper that has some governance points in it. And it's also not on our dynamic coalitions' website. So maybe there is a delay in setting up these things on the website. But if I go now back to the dynamic coalitions' members saying we need something more, and they are going to look on the website and see even that, that they had delivered in March. It's not up on the website. It's a bit difficult for us.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Jutta, so as I just replied to Anriette, let me double check what in whole email chains contains any documents and any request to be on the website and it's not yet there, including annual reports and so on. Yeah.

>> JUTTA CROLL: The report was sent by Torsten and me. That was not Amy because she had left the Dynamic Coalition only last year, but this year in March we delivered the report right in time. So, you must look -- I can send it

again if you don't find it. I'm just worried that the dynamic coalitions members will be a bit confused when we press them hard to produce the report in time and it's still not up there. And I'm not sure whether Amy has sent that kind of a charter for our dynamic coalitions to you. I will double check, but I don't find these two things on the website.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Please. Yes. Of course, the easiest way would be to just send me what is missing. But again, as I said, I will go through all correspondence with attachments to double check that everything is reflected on the website because I was planning to do it to ensure that we can reach out to those DCs who did not yet submit their report and kind of give them the last call because we gave them a lot of time to send their reports. And as we discussed here with Markus in case the DC will not submit the report, we probably need to archive them.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, that's my worry that we will be archived because the report is not on the website, although we send it in time. I don't know how we did the governance of these processes.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yeah, of course. It is not that we did not publish the report and we archived the DCs because the report is not on the website. It would be cruel.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, I think in the past, the secretariat has always been very careful to, again, send reminders and, you know, things do happen and things fall between the cracks. But if after three reminders the report and maybe you have sent it twice, that's also possible. But I think it should not be automatic without checking back with the DC concerned. Wout, you have your hand up and been patient.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think we are having two discussions here on the governance documents. On the one hand, there's the DCCG governance, which is the open oath etc., and the report. The other side is the governance of the internal structure of a DC. And we have different DCs, but I totally appreciate that with different aims. But the DCs that aim to have some sort of report or policy recommendations or whatever, I think for them it's doubly important to have some sort of governance to show what almost the legitimacy of their report is. How

did it come about? Who participated? Was there a process that people could respond to so that when you get the question about who are you, you can point to a process? And I think that that perhaps gives the legitimacy that we've been discussing in the past three years by now, I think. That the MAG is not able to give, but at least we can give it ourselves to point out this is a process where everybody could participate in and it was an open process, etc.

And that that is part of your internal governance structure if your aim is to give some sort of a report to the world. And as a DC IS3C has that document, although I think it was still called DC-ISSS at that time when it was made. But we have a document showing this is the process we go through before a report is published. And that gives, I think, the internal structure to DC to come up with something that can make a difference in the world. And that is what we are discussing with the MAG and with the WSIS+20, what is actually the outcome of the IGF, how effective is the IGF? And that's the sort of questions you need to be able to answer in my opinion. So, I would suggest that this is some sort of requirement if you want to have serious reports going out into the world. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, thank you for that. And that is precisely the point, I think why we're addressing this issue. I think it falls under the heading accountability and also credibility. And, you know, you have a serious process in place on how you produce your outcomes. That it's not just one person who draft something and say, this is the result of, but no, it should really be the result of a collective work. And yes, as we know, and I think they brought agreement on that there's a huge (inaudible 01:12:01) and there's no one size fits all. And again, that needs to be recognized. And I think Avri has made very much that point. Of course, the DCs can go a little bit further and have their own, and I said when I introduced the item, I noticed some of the DCs have indeed very elaborate governance frameworks in place. And I think that greatly adds to their credibility. So, we know they have a serious way of working together and producing their work. And question now is do we agree to make it mandatory?

And I think as a next step, I think it would be very good if we could maybe produce, agree on the bare bones elements that framework should contain. It should describe the process or how to reach an outcome, for instance. But

it should describe how you communicate. Do you have monthly calls or whatever? Usually for the DCs (inaudible 01:13:20) annual generating for the DCs where they're together in-person, but during the year, you know, how do you communicate with each other? Do you have monthly calls? Do you have bi-monthly calls, or do you just do the work on emails? Everything is legitimate, but I think that just made it clear so an outsider can actually look at it and see, okay, that's how they work together. And Anriette, you still have your hand up.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Markus. You know, I think we need to not lose site here also of, you know, what is the purpose of what we are trying to do? I feel we may be trying to clump too many things together. I think as Jutta said, there is a basic charter, there's some basic requirements. I think those are very important. And it's important to remind DCs of that. So, you know, that's one thing that we need to retain. Then I think, you know, Markus, what you described to me also sounds really important in terms of DCs making it clear how they work and how people can participate in them. I think, you know, I want to respond a little bit to what Wout said about the outputs. I don't think -- you know, I think DCs produce outputs in different ways. They produce their annual report. Sometimes their annual report is also their publications. I think sometimes DCs, because often you have individual institutions that are active in a DC would produce a publication that is then presented as an output from that DC.

But that publication itself will make clear what its genesis is. Did it emerge from, you know, for example, I'll use the one I'm most familiar with, which is the Dynamic Coalition and Community Connectivity, where we have a Brazilian member and we have ISOC that are very active. And sometimes they would produce a conference output that goes under the DC banner. But in fact, that conference output itself will publish its, you know, who authored it, how it came to be compelled. I don't think we can expect a DC governance structure to provide the kind of credibility or legitimacy for every output that comes out of a DC. I think that takes us into BPF or policy network terrain. And that's exactly, you know, what DCs are not supposed to be. They're supposed to be more open on that.

So, I'm just -- I guess I'm proposing here that we need a governance structure for consistency, for clarity, but I don't think we can impose on DCs through the governance structure or we can -- I mean, it obviously creates more clarity about who DCs are and where they come from. But I don't think we can use the governance structure to verify their particular outputs or create particular credibility for their outputs. What we can do is explain who they are, how they work, and how to participate in them. So, I'm advocating, I guess, for a little bit of caution here and keeping things as simple and low barriers to entry as possible.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Sorry, Markus. Anriette, I totally disagree with you, sorry, on this, with all respect. But if a DC wants to submit some sort of report with policy recommendations, etc., through the IGF system, I got the question, who are you from government? And then I could answer, but we went through this due process to get to this report. And then they said, oh, do you? But that puts it in a different light. So, in other words, there has to be some sort of accountability if we want to use our reports to be influential through what in the end is the UN system. And if you get the question, who are you, instead of telling us this and you don't have a good answer that you can point to, it makes it irrelevant what we do. And I think yes, there's a difference with the BPF and the policy network, but the only difference is that you have a MAG member that is representing you. And that is something we don't have. And that's something I've been advocating for. But there is a thin line.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Wout, can I just clarify here? I think that if a DC is publishing policy recommendations, I think that document needs to clarify what the genesis is of those policy recommendations. I don't think you could -- you know, no person who reads those recommendations is going to click out and go to governance structure to see, you know, what the legitimacy is of that process. And every DC might have policy documents that come out of different processes. It might be a collective DC output, or it might be an output of a DC member that was produced in consultation with the participation. So, I absolutely agree with you about that, but I think that needs to be embedded in the DC outputs rather than in the DC's governance

structure. I think what we can put in the governance structure is advice that when the DC produces any kind of outputs, that it creates clarity on what the process is that led to those outputs. Sorry, just jumped in.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: That we agree there, but when somebody asks, you can point to the process and yes, we can put that in the report. So, I think that we are agreeing more than I thought at first. So sorry about that, Anriette.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I was just going to say I think that we are not that far apart. It's just the question of how to wrap it up and how to sell it in a way. And my suggestion for summing up this discussion would be that we maybe build on Avri's suggestion and produce a few of these in forms of bullet points. What are the part of the governance structures? And Anriette suggestion is that any output should document the process, for instance, is a very elegant way of making this point. You know, you can either have the process in your governance structure, that's a possibility, or then make sure that any output actually reflects how you reached this conclusion. I'm turning to Avri. Avri, would you be willing to work with me on a short paper to produce this bare bone struck? Okay. Sorry for putting you on the spot. Okay. Excellent.

>> AVRI DORIA: I've learned if you open your mouth, you end up on the spot.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah. That's basic principle. If you want to have a quiet life, don't open your mouth. But your suggestion I think was very helpful in the discussion on the whole, was very helpful. But I think, you know, what we do have on the website is really not that very much, and I think we need to go a step further. And then there is also, then the next step agenda has signaled and we still have another agenda item, and that is how we cooperate with this MAG working group on strategy that has created some subgroups. And is -- there was, is Amrith still on the call? He made in chat. He said he has to drop off because he has school early. Are you still on the call, Amrith? Doesn't seem to be the case. And yes, and Anriette makes the point. It's aligned with the Sao Paulo guidelines. Yes. That's also the question we have to address how we look at

the Sao Paulo guidelines. But the four subgroups and Wout, I think you were heavily involved with the subgroups of the working group on strategy. And Amrith made the point that he felt his role should be taken over by somebody else. Now who else is involved with these subgroups? Wout, you have I think followed it closest.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. And then because my holiday, I missed one meeting of this working group and previous one because I had another appointment. But there are some activities in the groups I think that you are representing us in group 4 on the Sao Paulo guidelines. Markus, the ones that I'm in are pretty quiet at this moment, and apparently Amrith is not. And as you could see he's still going to school. So, he's fairly young. I said that I could help if nobody else would like to step in and I think that Marc Ravel (phonetic) does one and I haven't heard from him. There's a lot of activity going on at this moment. So, I think that most groups are sort of dormant at this point, but that maybe has to do with the IGF being so close. But on the other hand, we want to present something at the IGF as groups. That was the aim that we -- that most groups have. So, I was speaking to Chris Buckridge this afternoon on the groups that he's leading and see where things are and what I can do to assist from a DC point of view. So, I hope to have more news very soon, but at this moment things are pretty quiet actually. But if nobody else wants to assist Amrith with this question in the DC chat of yesterday, the day before yesterday, then I will be willing to step in. But if somebody else volunteers, then I'm happy to take a step back and give the floor to somebody else.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I have to say, bye-bye. Thank you so much. Bye.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Markus, I can just -- I had my hand up but I know we have to leave. Just to quickly respond to the working groups. This is working group strategy, correct, Markus? Is that what we are talking about?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's essentially the subgroups set up by the working group strategy. Yes.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Okay. So, I can update that because I'm active in one of them, and that's the one that is convening the event with the UN agencies to talk about

WSIS. I've also had a one-on-one discussion with Amrith to follow up on his questions. Essentially, it's all organized. The announcement should be going out. It's a discussion with UN agencies about WSIS and GDC follow up and implementation and how the IGF can be involved. All we really need from the DCs is to be represented in the discussion and when there's a general discussion about how the IGF can, firstly is active in WSIS review processes and secondly how it can support GDC and WSIS follow up. We just need voices to say this is how the DCs are active. So I don't think there's much we have to do unless Roman could compile some information for us by putting out a call to DCs to find out how they are involved. If they are involved in WSIS follow up and implementation that would be fantastic to have that. But if not that, it's primarily a session where we'll have the different UN agencies speak, share what they are doing, and then we as the IGF community comment, share and come up with creative suggestions about how to be actively engaged.

So, I think we should take it, again, we don't -- we need to be there, we need to speak, we need to participate, but I don't think we need to prepare anything formal at this point. But having the information available on how WSIS is being dealt with. I think I'm looking here at Tracy and Maureen, for example. I know that the SIDS, the small island developing states WSIS is a big thing for them. So, if there's maybe an activity there that can be reported on that would be fantastic. So, I hope that helps a bit.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. That helps a lot. Thank you. Are there other comments on that agenda item? If not, are there any issues anyone would like to raise under any other business?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I think I have one question there, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: In the MAG meeting, there were a lot of stats being shown as usual and there was one that was missing. And I hope that Roman can enlighten us somewhere in the coming days is that one of the questions was, is your proposal related to intersessional work? And I have no idea what the answer is compared to the sessions that were selected. So, if we don't learn about that, then we don't

know if it was of any influence in the selection process. And that is something that I would like to know. So, of the workshops and other sessions that were selected, what was the linkage to intersessional work? Any intersessional work and not just us. So, is that something that can be looked into, Roman? Because all the other topics were quite explicitly presented, but it's really something I want to learn. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Roman, can you answer this question?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I didn't totally understand the question.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: One of the -- in the workshop proposal format there was a point, and I think it was Leto who raised it last time for the first time and it was strengthened in this year's form that it gives you points if you (inaudible 01:28:54) proposal to intersessional work. And Wout would like to know, is there any way we can find statistics of how many of the workshops selected actually at this point and were related to intersessional work? Personally, I doubt whether that's possible.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Well, I will be able to raise this question next week when I'm in office. This week, I'm on leave. So let me come back to you if I know something. Okay. So, in case I learn something other than no, I will email you. Okay?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Yes. I think that needs some looking into, yes. I think you would need to discuss with colleagues who are closely involved in the selection of workshops. Thank you for that. With that then do I take it we have exhausted our list and there's no other questions at this point?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I see Olivier his hands up, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, Olivier, please.

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello. Yeah, just a quick question. It's Olivier speaking. I missed that part. I came a little late. The next workshop is going to be on the 27th -- 22nd, I believe. Is there a date for the one after that? Because that would be group 4.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, correct. We don't have, I think. It was about 4th of June as far, but it's not fixed, I think.

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right. That was it.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: The third webinar is 22nd and then yes, 3rd or 4th of June for the last webinar. By the way, Olivier using this opportunity to speak to you, we are moving about the IGF music night with the host country. Can you please share this rider of the artists, which you shared last time? Maybe it changed somehow. So, they are now requesting it from us, from the secretariat. So, thank you so much.

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'll get the mailing list. I'll tell them about it, find out who's coming, and then I will also send you the rider for the instruments and stuff. That usually doesn't change, it just depends on the people that are playing. But we'll see. That's it.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Do we have a band, Olivier?

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think you're one of the main people on the band, aren't you?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: No, I know we have the drummer. That's the most important.

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: The drummer is the important thing. We're going to try to find out.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: IGF music mind. Well, thank you for that. Good to know.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And we need Roberto as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Of course.

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think Roberto is coming. I think, as far as I know.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. I will come. Excellent.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There you go, Roman, you've got the band.

>> OLIVIER MJ CREPIN-LEBLOND: You just need a drummer. That's all.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Perfect. What a great ending of this session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So, we end the session on a high note on the music night. Excellent. Well, thank you all guys for participating and for a constructive discussion. With that, I think we can conclude our call and I wish you an excellent rest of the day and of the week. Bye-bye. See you, all.

>> AVRI DORIA: Bye, all.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thank you, all. Have a good day.