

## RAW FILE

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION  
DCCG MEETING #85  
JUNE 12, 2024  
12:00 UTC

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
719-941-9557  
[www.captionfirst.com](http://www.captionfirst.com)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's Markus here. It's 12:00 PM Central European Time. Not many people on the call yet. I suggest we wait a minute or two before we start the meeting. And I hope you can hear me.

Great to have positive feedback. You can hear me. That's a good start. I see people are slowly joining the call. Let's wait another minute or two. Okay. Let's get started.

Let's get started with the bad news. Jutta can't be with us in the beginning for the DC Coordination Group. That's moderately bad news. The really bad news that Celine can't talk. She has lost her voice. I had a prep call with her and I confirmed she is only in whispering mode. We will not put that on her and ask her to take the floor. She prepared the meeting perfectly, as always. And she also sent me some background notes from the update from the Secretariat. So I can do that on her behalf.

But let's start the meeting in an orderly fashion. You have been sent a draft agenda, which is fairly standard. Maybe Celine, can you post it in the chat just for those who don't have it in front of their eyes. Okay.

That's been done. So -- maybe you have actually preempted me. I don't know. Do we have any comments on the draft agenda, or can we approve it as proposed? If there is no objection, then I take it that we have a general agreement that we approve the agenda as proposed.

So that brings us to the first agenda item, that's updates from the Secretariat. Again, I'm just going through the notes that Celine has kindly shared with me. Maybe I would suggest that she puts these

notes in a separate email to the group with all the links and so on, so that we don't have to wait for the summary record of the meeting.

Let's go through them quickly. The first point was there was the WSIS Forum high-level event. Sessions were held by the IGF Secretariat in advancing the GDC principles on WSIS lines and building a digital future which was attended to by the host country. Both event where is well attended. And also the IGF had a booth at the WSIS Forum. That, again, was very successful and well attended.

There were participants from the different segments of the WSIS Forum high-level event, also from the AI Summit for Good going past the IGF booth.

Then the other point in regards to intersessional work. So the Policy Network on meaningful access held its first meeting only yesterday. And the recordings are available. And the next meeting will take place end of July.

The first meeting of the Policy Network on Internet fragmentation will be held on 19th of June, that's exactly a week from now. It's also 1400UTC. Again, DCs are interested are welcome, encouraged are to participate. They can register. And you get the link for registration. Celine sent out the notes.

And the next Policy Network on artificial intelligence multistakeholder working group will take place on 21st of June from 11:00 to 12:00 UTC. Again, DCs are welcome and encouraged to participate in that meeting.

The first meeting of BPF on cybersecurity has not yet been announced. It is yet to be confirmed.

That's about Policy Networks and the BPFs.

Then the workshop evaluation will move forward in a new phase as of 14th of June. MAG members will proceed with group evaluation. The suggested lists of selected proposals will be presented and discussed at the second open consultation in MAG meeting two weeks from now.

And also, the IGF Secretariat is currently finalizing the initial screening of all IGF session proposals, that includes really everything, open forums, workshops, lightning sessions, and DC sessions. And they will soon be published, all proposals received on the website.

Lastly, the second open consultation MAG meeting will take place two weeks from now, from the 26th to 28th of June in Geneva with the open consultations on 26th of June. Currently, there are over 400 registrations. Presumably not all of them will be on site. But there will be many online participants. And the registration platform is still open. And, again, those of you who have not yet registered, we would strongly encourage you to do so now.

I don't know, have I left out anything? Celine, you can shout or give signs. I take it it's fairly comprehensive.

So next steps essentially will be for interested DCs to register for upcoming Policy Network sessions. And the IGF Secretariat will publish all received IGF session proposals on the IGF website.

The floor is open for any questions or suggestions, bearing in mind Celine's limited capacity to actually engage orally. You can always ask questions in chat. So there don't seem to be any questions

or suggestions. I take it that was fairly self-explanatory.

That brings us then to the next agenda item. That will be the intersessional event at the open consultations at MAG meeting. Again, Celine has (Audiobreakingup) some messages saying that intersessional event was included in the draft agenda. And there was no objection from the MAG members. So we can take it there is a tacit agreement that it will go ahead.

The session will be on 26th of June. That's two weeks from now. From 3:00 to half past 4:00, 1630 central European time on the 26th of June. It may not be as long as many of you would have hoped for, but it's still better than nothing. Again, Celine has sent out a concept note on the intersessional event. I don't know, again, can you maybe share the link on the chat to remind people of what is -- again, at the high level, if you take back a step, the high-level objective was essentially the better integration of all the intersessional work into the mainstream work of the IGF.

There have been many comments in the past at various levels that there was always general appreciation for all the work done between the sessions. That is all the components of the IGF family, DCs, of course, but also the NRIs, and the BPFs, and the Policy Networks. But the comment has also made that more could be done and more should be done to integrate them better and to bring all this work together.

So the aim would be -- the overarching aim will be really to integrate all intersessional segments of the intersessional work into the shaping of the overall program. And also then, as a starting point, to inform the broader community on all the work done.

So the current proposal will be that's in the event instruction seeing here that the IGF will -- the Secretariat will prepare some background on all the elements of intersessional work, give a brief introduction on the DCs and on the NRIs and the BPFs and Policy Networks, and then we would look forward to how we can contribute to the shaping of the program. And that has, again, two elements. We already have updates from the Secretariat that all the DCs are encouraged to engage in the other parts of the intercession work. That is mainly the Policy Networks and the BPFs where if they have anything to contribute.

With the NRIs, that is a little bit more complex, because that depends on the geographical position of where you are. But nevertheless, all this is possible and strongly encouraged. And we had tried in the past, but we were never really that successful. But the main thrust then this year at the intersessional event should be where we actually can contribute to the forebrought themes and also maybe we could help then shape also the main session's signal to the MAG, here we are. We have something to contribute. And we stand ready to do so, not in the way as asking for a space but saying, look, here we are. And we have something to provide. And we stand ready to do so. And we have a lot to offer as such.

And to do so then in the intersessional event maybe have some clusters. Obviously, we have -- I always forget the number, because there are always new numbers on the DCs. I think it's well in the 30s by now. 32. Yes. Okay. So obviously, we don't have the time to give each

DC space to have a substantive presentation of their work. We would rather look forward to clustering some DCs who have related aspects which actually relate to the forebrought themes and see how we can group that.

Again, it would need some preparatory work and maybe best done through maybe a Doodle Poll where DCs can sign up to which theme they feel most closely related to. And we have the themes listed. I think there are broad enough as umbrella themes to allow for DCs to recognize themselves under these umbrellas and to rally behind these broad themes.

Now, I don't know whether I've been clear enough. Anything else I should say, Celine? Wout has his hand up. Celine, you have the opportunity to make your comments in the chat. Over to you, Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Good afternoon, all. I should be in view now. So thank you, Markus and all. I've got a question that in the proposals form there was the question, do you relate to any intersessional work or a question like it? How has that been answered? That's something we haven't heard back on. Has there been any form of interest in the forms or a question that was not answered? Perhaps that's something we can learn from, how people submitting proposals look at the intersessional work. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Now, I don't know whether Celine has the opportunity to answer that in the chat. I'm not trying to force you to take the microphone as I know it's difficult for you to speak.

>> CELINE BAL: I'm going to make it short. I'm sorry for my voice. We have received the data. And it's a good point. We can show that during the intersessional event how many organizers are actually part of the intersessional IGF work so that it strengthens the case that it is an ongoing work throughout the year, and that the experts are part of the community and ready to support the overall IGF program. I hope this answers your question.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And your voice is actually much better than it was earlier today. Yes, I know it's difficult. Mark, you have your hand up. Please?

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you, Markus. Thank you, Celine, for the concept note. Good luck with getting your voice back.

I just wonder what the structure of the 90 minutes will be? Will it go through the themes one by one, the four themes and then explain there's BPF on this and a couple of DCs doing this relating to, I don't know, human rights or improving governance? Is that the structure? Because the 90 minutes will fly by very quickly. But to get a kind of comprehensive but not deep dive approach that communicates the essential messages, look, there are these four themes and there's a hell of a lot of work going on around the year through various entities, be it DCs or Policy Networks or DPS. Where the NRIs fit in, that's a different aspect, isn't it? Crucially important. What is it 160 or whatever it is, 170.

I just -- if I was trying to structure the agenda, I would see it quite challenging to give everybody their fair shout in terms of what they do. Anyway, any further thoughts on the structure would

be useful to know as we prepare.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. You're right on. It is challenging. 90 minutes is not long, and there's an awful lot to be presented. But the idea was to give a short overview from the Secretariat on the breadth of all the work carried out. And then I think the next step will be exactly as you have suggested, to go theme by theme, see what collectively intercession work could contribute. Again, your comment on the NRIs are different in essence as they are not focused on one issue area. By definition it's broad as an overall IGF, but they have also done some preparatory work on how they could contribute. And they have thematic sessions. And they're presumably, again, (?) shepherding the NRIs, has been doing so very efficiently for close to ten years by now, I think. She would then -- I think she would be able to provide the NRI contribution to these themes, depending on how the collective discussion has advanced and evolved so far.

So that would be the brood structure. Okay if you have a 15 minute or so introduction from all the components of the intersessional work, DCs, BPFs, PNs, and NRIs. That's fairly dense. Then we would have an hour plus left. And (?) would have to leave time open for questions and have an interactive discussion. So four themes. Then there would be maybe 15 minutes for each of the themes where we could present the result of the prep work of all these clusters and see what we can contribute and leave some time open for Q&A for each of the clusters.

Again, the overall aim really would be to show there's a lot. The intersessional work contribute collectively and that we are here ready to help shape the main sessions and the rest of the program of the IGF.

Anything else to add, Celine? Have I said it adequately?

>> CELINE BAL: I'm going to share something in the chat.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's in a very concise way. Yes, there will be then also a paper summing it all up. That will go also as an input. In two weeks' time, the MAG will not have started the discussion on the main sessions. So whatever we come up with would be an input into the discussions for the MAG when they do prepare the main sessions. And we said that at previous call that we would really that a DC being able to present their outcomes at a main session, be that five or ten minutes, would maybe be more impactful than a separate DC session. So that is also part of the overall plan to create higher visibility for DCs along the other intersessional work.

Comments? Questions?

Are we all in violent agreement? Mark, please?

>> MARK CARVELL: It sounds like it. Or the lack of sound suggests we're all in agreement. Yes. I hadn't realized there was this tangible link to the main session planning, which I think is excellent. I think that the document, the outcome document summarizing informs the MAG, this is who you can call on for contributions to the main session. That's the idea. When will that process of deciding who has the opportunity to participate in a main session? When will that process be? Is that later after the summer?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. Well, first of all, I do remember there was a session, I was part of the BPF on cybersecurity. I think that was in (coughing) the 2017 meeting. There was a main session on cybersecurity. But there was no connection between the two. That is obviously a weakness we tried to avoid precisely by having this connection with the main session.

But to your direct questions, the main sessions, the discussion will only start after this meeting. So we're fairly upstream with providing input into the planning of the main sessions. And it will be the second prep meeting, the second open consultations MAG meeting. We don't have a concrete date as far as I know. But I think it was considered to be in August, if I'm not mistaken. But, again, Celine, please jump in. Do we have a date or what is the general idea? You can also say it in the chat.

There will be the -- with the preparatory meeting for the main sessions will be the second -- it will be the third MAG meeting at open consultation because the first one was in February. This year it was decided to have, again, a third meeting. So we are actually -- timing is good for us to provide input. Please, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: The main sessions will -- the preparation of the main sessions will start at the second open consultations in MAG meeting. And right after, there will be a kickoff where all the various main session groups starts the organisation.

It is up to the MAG.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: You said the second, but it will be the third meeting?

>> CELINE BAL: No. In June, it's the second.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It will start two weeks from now?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes.

>> CELINE BAL: This is correct. Because at the second you can have a look at the agenda. (Cough) Apologies. They want to identify the number of main sessions that they want to have and also the topics.

And after that, they meet into groups. So each main session will have a dedicated MAG members working group. From year to year it changes. So either they open up the organisation to the wider IGF community, or they keep it closed. But from the past years they've always opened it up. So that might be an opportunity to join one of these working groups.

You may be just an observer because the final decision will be taken by MAG members, but it's perhaps a way to really contribute to the shaping and making speaker suggestions or topic suggestions. These kind of things. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. So sorry for the confusion. I thought it would be the following MAG meeting. In any case, the open consultations where we have the intersessional will be ahead of the MAG meeting, it comes after the open consultations, the subsequent two days. So we are still ahead of discussion by providing the input. And that is, I think, the main sequence of events to bear in mind.

So we will have on the first day, we have an opportunity to shape the discussions on the main sessions with this intersessional meeting.

Okay. Are there any other questions or suggestions? Mark, please?

>> MARK CARVELL: Just to -- sorry. Will you, Markus, be reporting to the MAG the main points from the outcome of the intersessional meeting given that the MAG is going to start their thinking about the main sessions during the June consultation -- June MAG meeting, sorry.

Secondly, forgive me for not knowing this, will there be a main session on each theme, each of the four themes? We don't know. It's for the MAG to decide. Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Good questions. It's all very helpful. I don't think we have given any thought on how to feedback into the MAG meeting. But your suggestion would make much sense that we could have this kind of reporting mechanisms. And I will be happy to do so if you agree that I should be the person to do it.

And on the main sessions, I think, yes, that's up to the MAG to decide. But if you have four main themes, my humble take would be it would make much sense to have a main session related to each of the themes, whether you want to keep the exact wording of the main themes or whether, that's up to the MAG to decide.

Anything else would, to me, at least seem to be awkward if it was something completely from the main themes. What's the point of having main themes if you don't address the main themes at the meeting? As a working hypothesis, I think we should focus on these four main themes and see how collectively we can contribute to these main themes.

Any other thoughts, questions, comments? And it's all very helpful. Because there are sometimes silly details you haven't thought of. And people say there's no such thing as a stupid question. It helps you to think about things you may have overlooked because they're so obvious.

Do I take it we have a broad agreement on the general picture based on the concept note and our discussion? Honestly, I think it will be definite, and interesting input into the MAG meeting for the following days.

There are various questions in the chat. I'm very bad at talking and managing sessions and reading the questions. The DC main session, yes, that's another issue we will have to address.

We haven't spent much -- I don't think there's a separate agenda item on it, DC main session, but you may as well take it up in this context. I would strongly support that we, again, ask for a main session. But obviously we would need further work on the concept of that.

In the past we always tried to find a broad umbrella, a broad roof in which we could recognize ourselves, which is sustainable development or whatever. My question is, should we maybe this time -- well, first of all, do we all agree that we still want a main session? I presume from all the DCs present I think we do have a collective desire to have a DC main session. And I see -- thumbs-up from Wout. Then we would need further discussions on what the item should be.

One thought we had that is discussed with Celine earlier, maybe we should go for a more focused theme, instead of a very broad umbrella theme and find something that could be of interest to broader audience by making it more -- I'm not going to suggest we focus on artificial

intelligence, because everybody does that. But have something a little bit more narrow than in the past. Or should we continue with a very broad umbrella theme? That's one question we would need to discuss.

But, again, time-wise, by when should we -- would we need to have closure on the theme of the proposal? Celine, you are more attuned with the timelines of the Secretariat. We don't have to have it ready in two weeks' time, correct?

>> CELINE BAL: I'm going to write in the chat if it's okay with you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Let's look at the chat. And then there was the other question on whether -- again, that's in the agenda, whether or not we should have a joint booth. The proposal was made. And there was some interest by some Dynamic Coalitions. But the response was not overwhelming.

And I do remember there was, I think in the IGF in (?) we had a joint booth. And the -- shall we say, the interest was rather underwhelming by Dynamic Coalitions. The booth was empty most of the time. That's the big challenge. Do people actually find the time? Are they willing to send somebody to the booth? I still think it would be a worthwhile exercise to do so. Celine has actually volunteered to produce some flier from the Secretariat to present to Dynamic Coalitions collectively. Obviously, with input provided by each Dynamic Coalition. I think that will be an excellent opportunity to attract attention of the broader community to the Dynamic Coalitions.

But, again, the challenge is always finding someone who is willing to spend some time at the booth. So obviously, we would need to have sufficient number of people who indicate their willingness. We all understand you may not be able to commit yourself to a schedule, yes, I will be there on Thursday morning between 10:00 and 12:00. Then once the final schedule arrives that's the session you have to be in. So that's a tricky issue. You have the final staffing plan ready. But in order to be able to have sufficient presence at the booth, we need sufficient number of people willing to be there, give an understanding that there may be limits due to conflicts, scheduling conflicts.

I see some comments in the chat. Okay. Ayden says, I would be willing to spend some time. It's understood. Nobody's asked to spend -- we have 32 Dynamic Coalitions. If each of them spends two hours, I think, it will -- Ayden says not more than four hours. That's already fine. Maria says okay, would be happy.

My suggestion would be then -- I take it there is, on the whole, very positive reaction among the participants at this call. But we do need to maybe send out a Doodle Poll to see that we have a critical mass.

Wout, did you have a hand up. Audio that was all I have to say. I think the next step would be to send out a Doodle Poll. I take it that based on this brief discussion that there is some interest and in order to see whether we can actually pull it through, I would like -- not like to repeat what we had in Jalisco that we had a booth and it's empty most of the time.



Again, if you have a flier from DC. Obviously, each Dynamic Coalition would have the opportunity to present their fliers and posters. And if you actually then agree to have somebody there, it would not be there to promote your own Dynamic Coalition but just to explain in broad high-level terms what the Dynamic Coalitions are all about. And then, of course, you can present your own. The idea is not to mainly promote your own Dynamic Coalitions but to explain collectively what we are. Over to you, Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I'm sure we can find someone who can be there for a couple hours as well. If we're not in the forum already, put us in there. To get intersessional work better well known in the whole community, we do have all sort of high-level tracks. We have Parliamentary tracks. How about having the option to present work that's being done intercessionally. Perhaps not individual work but a message what exactly is going on between one session and the other of the IGF that people understand the higher value.

People at a higher level understand the added value of the IGF. I'm not sure if we've tried that in the past to show -- just to give the Dynamic Coalitions and Policy Network, for example, the opportunity to present for five or ten minutes on a high-level track to show our impact, potential impact? That could help the standing of the IGF a lot further than having it in the background. So would that be an option to discuss? Because I think the Secretariat is involved in the organisation of these tracks, to have the option to actually do that. Over to you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. I think that's an excellent suggestion. I don't know if in the past it was the Secretariat maybe alluded to or presented the intersessional work, but by including representatives of the intersessional gives it more flesh to the bone, so to speak. To me, that would be an excellent suggestion worth considering. Obviously, it's up to the Secretariat to flesh out the program. But I think that is something I would strongly support for the Secretariat to consider. I presume there would be no objection from the other members of the group and support that going forward.

Other questions, comments? I take it -- there's in the chat quite a lot of support for the booth. So let's conclude that and go forward with it and ask the Secretariat then to finalize a list of commitments by Dynamic Coalitions to be ready to support it, always depending on scheduling.

Mark, you have your hand up.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Markus. I just wanted to go back to the Dynamic Coalitions main session and what that would cover. A couple of options or suggestions occur to me. Firstly, with a look ahead to the IGF+ 20 review in the UN as part of the WSIS+20 review. Maybe one option for DCs is on the theme of what do the Dynamic Coalitions contribute to the IGF as a sort of compendium of messaging about the value of the IGF. What value do Dynamic Coalitions contribute to the overall impact may be the word I'm looking for of the IGF with a sort of look in anticipation to the UN considering the future of the IGF. That was the first thought.

The second one was to relate the main session to one of the main themes of the IGF this year and how do we decide which main theme? Maybe you could do a poll of all the Dynamic Coalitions as to which of the four main themes they would vote for. And by voting for, they would commit to contributing on the day in the main session.

So what are they? Innovation, human rights and inclusivity, development SDGs, and sustainability, and fourth one digital governance. So the Dynamic Coalitions would elect to choose one theme. And then we set about identifying who would participate and speak at that main session. Or trying cover all four main themes. Maybe that's too ambitious. How much time do we have? Is it 60 or 90 minutes?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Presumably, 90 minutes, I think.

>> MARK CARVELL: So by choosing one of the four themes, then that would allow a significant portion of the DCs community to go into that theme in some depth. That's why I was thinking initially of electing to choose one of the main themes by a poll or survey of the Dynamic Coalitions as to which theme. Again, those are a couple of ideas into the arena for consideration.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. They're both interesting suggestions. Presumably, there may also be a MAG generated session on WSIS+20, I would have thought. And the other one is would the MAG give us a main theme to orchestrate? It's an interesting suggestion.

We could ask, based on a survey, we will be willing or keen to actually deal with this main theme as a main session. So it could be definitely an approach if we argue it well with the MAG. Who knows? Maybe they'll say yes, go ahead with it. Definitely worth considering.

What do others think or are there other suggestions? The WSIS + 10, if the MAG will have a session, they would not necessarily be duplication. We could have to discuss it with the MAG, with the other main session, but look, here's a DC angle to it. So I think that could also be definitely an option.

Other comments, suggestions?

>> MARK CARVELL: Markus, I'm sure there will be a generic WSIS+20 session. But if the Dynamic Coalitions have more space in the program to convey what the coalitions are doing to providing impact to the IGF. To me, that seems to be a stronger message from us in addition to the more --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I agree.

>> MARK CARVELL: The MAG would take to the WSIS+20 agenda. Anyways, it's just up to people to decide if it's worth doing or not. I thought at the WSIS+20 high-level meeting last week or whatever it was, Anja spoke very well about the Dynamic Coalitions. It was the session on the IGF in doing the WSIS+20 high-level forum. So that was very helpful, I thought, and Celine's help with that, I'm sure, much appreciated.

And it helps raise the profile of Dynamic Coalitions significantly, I thought in Geneva.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks. I agree with you that would not need to be a duplication if there's another session. We can clearly have

a special angle on the Dynamic Coalitions. And I see that meanwhile Jutta has joined us here. Bad news, Jutta, Celine can't speak. She can speak, but only with difficulty as she has lost her voice. And she's about to refined it.

But we are discussing right now -- I think we have a broad understanding on the intersessional session we're going to have in two weeks' time. We're discussing now the DC main session. Again, we collectively agree that we should ask the MAG for giving us a space to have a DC main session. And right now we are discussing what could or should be the themes?

And one suggestion was, maybe on WSIS+20, what Mark suggested that the other one was maybe focusing on one of the four main themes approved by the MAG at its first meeting. And the discussion is still open. But as far as I understand, we don't need to have a conclusion now of what we should propose, but we can -- we agreed that we will ask for a main session. But we could also present a few options to the MAG of what we thought could be possible themes for a DC main session.

Other comments, questions? And is there anything in the chat? I strongly recommend to people on the chat to also take the floor and make your point orally if you have a voice, that is. I take it most people who are on the call do have a voice. Okay.

(Silence)

No other comments right now? Celine in the chat, there's no strict timeline regarding the DC main session proposal. But it would be good to have a concept theme for the virtual MAG meeting to be scheduled some time end of July. Definitely.

But my suggestion was that we -- when we ask for a main session in two weeks' time at the MAG meeting open consultations that we maybe already could present possible options for themes, so that we show that we are really trying to be integrated in the program.

Jutta, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Just a first thought. If we are going that path, that we try to have a session to one of the four main themes in the Internet Governance Forum 2024, then we could probably ask Dynamic Coalitions to say where they saw their work themselves to one of the four themes. To try to get an image, a picture whether we are all under one of these four themes or maybe we are sorted into all of the four themes to get a bit of focus out of the work of the Dynamic Coalitions.

I do think that most of the coalitions already have prepared their own workshop or session in the course over the last month. So probably they all have already thought about in which of the four treks their work fits best.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. That's, as always, very straightforward. It links very much with what we discussed in preparing the intersessional where we're trying to look under what clusters we can actually group the Dynamic Coalitions. That, again, puts the bawl back in Celine's court. That we need to have some -- send out some maybe a Doodle Poll or whatever, as simple as possible, please fill in the form where you fit in. And very much along the lines of what Jutta suggested.

And if you have any concrete points to make, you can always do that later in an email when you send out such a form or whether that's a Google doc or whatever works. With the Secretariat you have the intellectual and bureaucratic capacity to handling this in an efficient way.

I don't know anything to add? Yes, Wout?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think that a few themes have come forward which would fit a 90 minute session perfectly I think by now. But we are discussing on the one hand the WSIS+20. That's the future of the IGF or we give another five or ten years. We're discussing how Dynamic Coalitions are supporting the main themes of this IGF. And then we're looking at individual Dynamic Coalitions, which does not fit the 90 minutes main session.

In my opinion, in the 90 minutes, and I think that's been supported by what has been said so far, is that we can show the added value of intersessional work for the IGF. I think I said that before. But that will maybe be the most important topic that we have to share at this moment to show the added value of the work that's being done intersessionally and that many, many people are not aware of.

If we can get that message across, the IGF will step up its value as well. So in my opinion, that should be the logical way forward, that we don't look individually but look as a collective and show what this collective is adding to the whole of the IGF.

So that would be my suggestion. I'm just wondering what other -- Mark talks a lot. I talk a lot. But we're in the same Dynamic Coalition. What do the others think?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. I think you summed it up nicely. It's not about individual Dynamic Coalitions, but collectively about their worth. Again, I would turn it the other way around. We should actually by adding -- making a substantive contribution to the IGF program, that the implicit message would be how rich the contribution is, the intersessional components make to the work.

We don't say, look, we are important. We say, look, this is what we contribute. Then people should understand, yes, these guys have something to say and to contribute. It's a fine dividing line. We put ourselves in the centre but we put the work in the centre of our contribution. Does that work? To put it that way?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: I think we're talking about the same thing. That's what I meant by taking away the individual Dynamic Coalitions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's good.

(Overlapping Speakers)

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Look at the substance.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's good to have the discussion to make sure we're all on the same track. Let's not have, shall we say, an institutional discussion, like BPFs are more important than PNs, whatever. But just look what each component can contribute. And they all can. And take it from there.

Dazzle the people with the substance of our work, so to speak, instead of saying, look, we are all very important. But just show the rich contribution collectively we can make.

We have traditionally in the past few months or so, because we realized an hour was a little bit short. We always have fairly heavy agendas, so we reserved an hour and a half for our talks, but we can also stop a bit earlier. I see already Ayden is jumping off. As I said, we don't have to fill the 90 minutes if we agree that we have a common platform for going forward. We can also stop after one hour. And I think Celine has a lot of work to prepare our intersessional meeting.

But if you have any questions, if you feel clarification would be helpful, please say or write so. And we can address any questions you may have. Wout has his hand up.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Just on procedure. Because next week is EuroDIG. So most of us will be away for the whole week. And then a week and then there is the MAG meeting.

As we still are not totally clear on what we're going to on the afternoon of the 28th, I think it makes sense to have a meeting the week of the 23rd or something, so that we can discuss actually who is going to do what. Does that make sense?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hang on. The open consultation's on the 26th.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: On Wednesday. So that only gives us Monday and Tuesday.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's two weeks from now.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And then, again, some people may be travelling to Geneva on the 25th. I think in practical terms that would only leave the 24th for --

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Or 21st, a Friday.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That may be too early. I don't know. Again, the Secretariat has to do the heavy lifting.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: We need to contribute something. At this point I don't know what I should contribute or whether I should contribute anything.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think it will be mainly filling in forms where you see yourselves fitting in. But, again, Celine, can you see how you see it?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes. Sorry. So if we meet again before, it would have to be the 24th. The 21st I can't.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. That's the answer. It would still be helpful. It will give us some 48 hours in between or so. Shall we fix it straight away? I think, again, 12:00 UTC seems to be a convenient hour. It's okay for the people in the US, and it's also okay for the people further east. And we could fix a call that we can review then of what we have received on feedback from all the questionnaires and soon and have a call on the 24th, 12:00 UTC, central European summertime.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: It doesn't work for me. If we could do it at 1330 or time. So 11:30 UTC, it could work. But then I have to drop off after an hour. But then Mark will take over.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: 11:00 UTC is a bit early for the East Coast or would later in the afternoon be okay.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: 1530 onwards CEST is okay. So it's 1330 UTC.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's still acceptable for people further east. Let's go for that. 1330 UTC. Okay.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. We agree on that? With we regroup together and fine-tune our fiddles going on to the open consultations. Okay. With that, can we conclude? Do you have what you need, Celine? Anything else we need to decide? No. You shake your head, that is no to anything else? It means yes to you have all you need. Oh, Mark, please?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, I just going back to deciding the concept for the DCs main session. I think Celine is right, if we try to define that concept ahead of the July virtual MAG meeting, was it in July, it would help. The ball on this doesn't sort of drop. That we get the process under way. Can that also be added to the agenda for the June 24th meeting?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah.

>> MARK CARVELL: How we take a decision on the concept for the main session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right now, my aim would be, if we can go into the MAG meeting with presenting a few options. This has been discussed. Maybe get an early feedback. If it can't go further, fine. It would be nice if we say, yes, we would like a main session again. We discussed various options. And these are the options. And we will work on the options. But early feedback from the MAG will be appreciated. So I think that could be also a good way of saying, look, we are open to dialogue. If you think this is not a good way to take, tell us now. Then we won't pursue this avenue.

You will have another two weeks almost to think about it or maybe have other options come up with. Yes, then we could develop further. But let's put it on the agenda also of the meeting on the 24th. Okay.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yep.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. With that, can we -- thank you, all. Close the meeting. Sorry. Is there anything we should address under any other business? It doesn't seem to be the case. With that, we have to come to the end of our agenda. And I'm happy to close our meeting. And thank you, all, for your active and constructive participation. And we wish Celine good health and improvement of her voice. Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Bye-bye. Have a good day, all.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus. Bye-bye.

(Event concluded at 13:11 UTC)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.