

RAW COPY

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM

DYNAMIC COALITION (DC) COORDINATION MEETING XXXV

MARCH 20TH, 2019
10:00 AM TO 11:00 CST

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
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 or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

(Audio Issues.)

>> It's not mandatory that maybe has been mentioned before but if there's any updates, new developments in regard to your intercessional work or the upcoming agenda just let us know, please.

Should we go through the list or would you like to volunteer

or say, yes, I have is to report something? I'll give you a few seconds just to decide I don't see anybody who's volunteering to give us an update.

(Pause.)

>> So nothing new from any of the dynamic collisions. I'm wondering about that.

>> Sorry, it's Eleonora from the secretary. I see Carla in the chat who said she would like to give a quick update. Carla from the DC Blockchain.

>> Okay. Wonderful, Carla. You have the floor. Please go ahead.

(Inaudible.)

>> No, Carla, we can't hear you.

>> Carla, it's Eleonora, it looks like you're not connected to audio. Let us help you in the background to get connected and in the meantime, maybe we can move on to someone else.

(Pause.)

>> I don't see anyone else who's volunteering to give us an update, but Carla is now connected to audio.

Carla, would you like take the floor, please?

>> It looks like she's not connected yet, but I see that Luca was looking for the floor.

>> Okay. So the audio for Carla is still not working but Luca has the floor. Go ahead.

>> Good morning, everyone. Sorry for joining with 4 minutes of delay, but I saw the first item was already almost done, so I hope

I'm still on time to provide a little bit of overview. I see also Nikolis is on the line, and he will update the OCPR and our mailing lists and our own best practices that are finalized. I will let him explore this.

I wanted to provide a little bit of update with regard to -- well, the fact that we have started discussing with the dynamic coalition net neutrality the program this year, and we have two suggestions: One is to evaluate the impact of social metric on elections and the other one is to focus on the compatibility of network slicing and mainly of 5G and IoTs application with the framework, and we are discussing this right now on the mailing list.

The other one is the -- the other update is with regard to the dynamic coalition on community connectivity, so we had a proposal for a session that has been accepted last week that has been collaborated through the mailing lists, so we are going to meet there to organize our outcome for the year.

We also have some very good feedback with regard to the outcome -- our outcome of the last year. I can share, if you want, with you the downloads of the community network manual that we have been presented last year which instructions on how to build community networks. It has been downloaded more than 5,000 times in the past months and 3,000 times only in the last two weeks of November after the IGF, which is to me a very, very positive feedback. A very positive feedback -- I'm not sure has already been achieved previously, but I would be curious to hear this is the fact that the

manual was a joined publication involving the ITU, which is a UN agency, of course, and we are currently discussing with ITU, which is also a partner in the session that we are organizing. We are discussing farther initiatives to discuss and implement community networks, so this is very positive for us.

In light of this positive outcome, I was actually a little bit baffled for the main session -- for the sessions, and they said those were for the eligibility requirements. Those are automatically assigned a time slot -- only those who participated to main section rather than being those who produced outcomes, and I was a little bit curious to know what is the rationale of -- first, I wanted to understand the qualification if this is the right, so if only those who participated to the main session rather than those who produced concrete outcomes have this automatic eligibility requirement fulfilled. And if my understanding is right, probably it is -- it may be wrong -- my interpretation may be wrong, but if it is right, what is the rationale of, say, punishing those with concrete outcomes but decided not to participate to the main session, so I would like to know what is the rationale for this. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, Luca for -- for the information and the update on the dynamic coalition and also for your question. To be honest, I'm -- I'm not sure I can answer your question, but I -- maybe I can hand over to the secretariat with regard to that rational, and I don't think there was any intention to punish dynamic coalitions in any way, but over to Eleonora.

>> I'm very happy to speak of this because, yeah, there's a little bit of a misreading there. Certainly, any DC that has produced an outcome over the past year is eligible to hold a session as well as any DC that participated in the main session and in connection with that also produced an output, so I apologize, Luca, if the language is a little bit unclear but there should be no concern there for -- for your DCs or any -- or any DC that has -- that has produced an outcome or output.

>> Thank you very much for that clarification.

Sorry, can I just suggest -- to clarify because the formulation may be really misleading. The phrase I'm referring to is the one that states DC which had produced outputs over the course of 2018 to participate in the main session may be considered as having fulfilled these requirements. I would say the DCs that have produced output over the course of 2018 and have participated in the -- and that may have participated but is to participate that was a little bit misleading. I'm sure you will find a better formulation, but I just wanted to flag this possibility to misinterpret it.

>> Sure, sure. We can clarify. I think --

>> Thank you very much.

>> I think the key sentence is actually the one right before it where it says the DC should provide the secretariat or in this case the secretariat is also well aware of certain outputs. The secretariat with a activity, and from the secretariat, I followed the activities of the DCs that you're involved in, Luca, and I'm aware of the outputs,

there are sometimes very significant outputs that have been produced.

>> Thank you so much, Eleonora, for the clarification. I do think we missed to explain at the beginning of the meeting that the meeting is recorded just to let you know, and then I do think, Luca, you mentioned also Nicolo should contribute to the dynamic coalition, and I still have Carla on the list and Nick for the DNS issues for the dynamic coalition. Should we start with Nicolo?

(Pause.)

>> Okay. So I see Nikolis also not connected to the audio, then maybe we try again with Carla.

Carla, are you ready?

>> Just to give you an -- a piece of information, it could be meaningful in this moment. I was also not able to connect with audio when I used Mozilla Firefox and actually Cisco system works very well with chrome but very badly with both browsers maybe Nicolo and Carla can't have audio they are using Firefox.

>> Nicolo asked if it might be an issue with Mac, and I can confirm I'm using it with Mac with safari, and it works very well, so safari is fine, so maybe we can go ahead with Nick first on the DNS issues. Dynamic coalition, are you connected, Nick?

>> Yes, I am, Jutta. Can everybody hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear.

>> I apologize for the background noise. I'm trying to move to a quiet location here. I think that's better.

So thank you, again, everybody and thank you for the time. I

wanted to give some brief updates on the DC intersign and where we are before as we push into the spring timeframe.

So the first thing is that one of our big outputs that we're trying to produce by the end of this year is to produce a global survey private sector, and I briefly mentioned on our last call but where we are right now is we're getting very close to finalizing exactly who the consultant will be that will actually help us produce the survey and get the questions together, and that's kind of our main focus right now of making sure that we can produce that output document, so beyond that, the DC society has been extremely busy since the Geneva meeting. We are in the midst right now of working with a few other well-known experts in the field of universal acceptance. Roberto Gaetano and Hanuria Nocali we will be holding a session that was approved. We'll have that session on day 0 and everything that we're going to be doing at that session, we're going to be tying it back to the global IGF in the fall in Berlin.

So the other point that I was going to mention with respect to that is one of the things we are pushing very heavily, obviously, is that when we have our DC session, we were going to make sure that it falls under the category of inclusion, and I want to make sure everyone is aware that we'll focus on that.

Beyond that, the only thing that I would highlight for the group is that we're also currently working right now with some of the organizers of CEIDG. We'll potentially might have a universal and IGN acceptance session during day zero of CEIDG, so a lot going on.

I'll pause there and stop to see if anybody has any questions. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Nick, for that short update on the new dynamic coalition on domain name systems issues to be correct. I see in the chat that Eleonora, Nicolo and probably also Carla still have problems to -- to join in, so is there anyone else who wants to give an update on the dynamic coalition? Someone who is connected to the audio?

>> Hi, Jutta, it's Nadia, I don't know if I'm connected to the internet now.

>> Yes, we can hear you, Nadia.

>> Lovely. This is Nadia from the youth coalition on internet governance and one project that we're just starting is providing access to the deaf and hard hearing to EuroDIG and, hopefully, if our coalition is doing well with the partners, the local partners that we have here, they will help us reach out to Germany to find local partners to support us during this -- for the internet governance forum.

So what we're doing is -- we're trying to create a narrative in which we invite the deaf and hard-of-hearing to come to EuroDIG to participate because unlike many conferences as you know they're live captioned. People can also follow remotely, so you have the opportunity to -- if they -- if they have questions, they can sit in the session on their computers and ask the questions online and use the remote moderator to convey their messages or they can speak themselves and read what is happening on the screens. We think that

this is unique and gives them a new type of access, and we want to give that option available and work to see if we can get a lot of people to come in, so we have worked with locals who have built the narrative, but we're asking the entire international committee that's interested to submit part of a video, so the narrative that we're building is to actually sign to the sign language community and tell them, hey, you're super welcome to come to EuroDIG dig with the IGF. Your input is also important. Talk about the issues that you need to be on the agenda and come and see what's going on, learn about internet governance, and we're excited to have you, so, yeah, we're trying to find people who would want to learn how to sign maybe one sentence of a short narrative, so that we can create a video that we can send out in the Netherlands and the wider environment and invite them to come and participate.

So if you're interested to maybe sign something or if you're interested to help us spread the message, please let me know. I'm very happy to kind of engage everyone in this. We think it's very important.

>> Thank you, Nadia. This is really a very important issue that you have brought up.

Have you been in contact with the dynamic coalition on accessibility on this regard? That is my first question.

And the second question -- or it's not a question but a statement. I could link you directly to the deaf and hard-of-hearing community in Germany because I've been working with them on several

occasions. Still, I do think that they will ask for sign language interpretation at the internet governance because usually the deaf community -- they usually would not agree that the -- the transcription is very helpful for them just due to the complicated language, and that is very difficult for deaf people to follow in reading what was said when it's typed on the screen, so -- I'm pretty sure they will definitely ask whether there could be a sign language interpreter provide.

But again back to you, have you been in contact with DC on accessibility?

>> Hi, Jutta, I sent an email, and I don't know if there's anyone from DC accessibility but I'm happy to talk to them further. I haven't heard back yet. We're just starting out. We're trying to figure out how to build the narrative and if we actually get all the people to come to these events, and they have their presence there, perhaps in the future we will be able to find accessibility for people to do live transcription but -- but we need to make sure that they know about us, and they're interested and have the numbers, and I think we need to start somewhere, so that's what we're trying to do, and it's extremely helpful and thank you so much for offering to help us to reach out to the German community, so, and we'll try it out at EuroDIG first and, hopefully, we'll be able to do that as well and bring you to participate and feel. Hopefully the technological terms won't be too difficult for them to understand and start somewhere and build up from there on.

>> Okay. Thank you, Nadia. I have now Carla, Nicolo, and also I think Elena Perotti. With the short amount of the time I think we need to speed up to go through our whole agenda.

Carla, please, you have the floor.

(Pause.)

>> It's Eleonora. Carla is connected to audio now, but I think she's still having an audio issue, maybe connected to her microphone. We will continue Luis, and I to try to help her, but in the meantime, I also see that Nicolo is connected and wanted to make an intervention.

>> Yes, okay, and, Nicolo, and I now have Maarten on the list and June on the list, so Nicolo, please.

>> Hello, so I hope you can hear me.

>> Yes, we can hear you.

>> Yes, you can. Excellent. Thank you for your patience.

So just a quick update on our side. We had a consultation process. We developed some best practices on safeguards for resolution on online platforms. That was work that we developed throughout the last year, and we had -- after the IGF we sent around a new document, and we have a finalized document, and we'll aim to present that at the IGF. In addition to presenting some papers that we are soliciting through a corporate paper that was also the result of a consultation, a collaborative process, to decide what the topic would be again we contracted an academic journal, and we were able to get a special issue for -- from the education that will be slated

to come out before the IGF, so it will offer the dynamic coalition session as a platform to showcase some of the papers that we have solicited in the RF and show the best practices that we have developed in the special issue and that will give greater visibility to our world not only in the IGF community but also throughout the academic circles and, hopefully, we will enlarge and reach out that way.

I just wanted to make a point that I gather from transcript that was made by Luca, I was also concerned about the phrasing of the requirements for the dynamic coalition. I understand also from looking -- from the transcript, I haven't heard it directly that this was it was a misreading so, hopefully, we will be able to get our --
(Inaudible.)

>> Since we had a best practices and report last year we very much look forward to having this opportunity at the German IGF.

>> Thank you, Nicolo. Thank you so much for your input.

So I'm not sure Eleonora, have you now access to the audio? Did you speak?

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you.

>> Great.

(Laugh.)

>> Hello, everybody. Very nice to speak with you all. Yeah, I'm here in a representation of Michael Gia who couldn't make it today. I represent the association of newspapers and news publishers. I

just wanted to say that together with the center for international media assistance and the global forum for media development we're working on -- on a coalition on sustainability of journalism and news media. And our documents are almost ready, and we expect to be all set by the next MAG meeting, which I will attend, so I'm working on being involved in the whole process, and we're also thinking of submitting our session proposal to -- for the next international -- for the next IGF.

>> Thank you, Elena, and I hand over to June, and then I have Maarten from DC IoT.

>> I represent the IRP coalition. I'm here because Minda is not able to attend. I'm new to it, so there's not much that I can tell you apart from -- we had a meeting recently, and we haven't decided about having open meetings. At the moment we are well represented, Africa, Latin America. Minda is the lone chair, so we agreed to do specific tasks. She sent a list out to us, and we volunteered to do specific things keep the coalition going.

Marianne is giving us updates on EuroDIG, and we're looking forward to getting human rights into the IG agenda. We are already in countdown on the IGF on submissions, and we're looking forward to joining the IGF in Berlin.

I myself has decided to join Robert with the coordination of the educational resources guide and the smart cities workshop proposal. Other people have volunteered for other roles so, hopefully, Minda will be able to join me next time and give me a better

update. Thank you.

>> Thank you, June, so then I hand over to Maarten Botterman.

Maarten?

>> Hey. Thank you.

>> Really quickly just a preparation on Berlin. We do foresee an open forum network at EuroDIG day zero and panel session at IGFU is in July, which will be an opportunity to check where we are base on the progress input from EuroDIG. The focus will be responsible IoT in terms of more secure. And the ethical specific will get specifically looked into. What does ethics mean in the context of IoT, so that's the update. I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> Thank you, Maarten. Jutta is back. I thought you monetarily disconnected, so go ahead.

>> Yes, I just read in the chat that Carla has switched computers, and we can give it a final try, whether it works now with her audio and, Maarten, thank you for your update. Questions may be in the chat.

>> This is Carla, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you. Wonderful!

>> Yay! Okay. The Blockchain dynamic coalition is currently working on four separate tracks. The first is related to an output with regard to Blockchain-mediated organizations trying to help traditional organizations interface and integrate with the Blockchain world with tools to achieve specific regulatory or policies better, faster and cheaper with potential benefits in terms

of reduced regulatory burdens.

The second track is roughly called illegality, which is intended to refer to the idea of finding ways to bridge the chain of Blockchain and DCs that are eager to interact with the world to engage with the Wilder world while maintaining their status as an entity without a formal legal structure.

The third track focuses on dispute resolution, so researching and coming up with paradigms for managing disputes with decentralized autonomous organizations and other Dows and other legal entities and through private arbitration, alternative dispute resolution systems in a way that would be recognized by the sort of formal or sort of traditional legal system.

And then the last is looking at liability issues, mapping, the liability and responsibilities that could be incurred when interacting Blockchain based systems with deployer or decision-maker. We are working on an inperson meeting at the end of April once we have details, we would be happy to post them on the calendar. I think that's, basically, our -- our update for now.

The goal is to have some kind of output for each of those tracks even if they're intermediary outputs, or in spots by the end of summer or early fall.

>> Thank you, Carla, for this very valuable input, and it would worth trying to bring you in audio to what you had to say with the dynamic coalition meeting. Thank you.

So I don't see anyone else on the list who thinks it's necessary

to give us an update, so I would like to come to -- to the second point on our agenda, which is the IGF calls for dynamic coalition sessions and also for workshop proposals and I do think we have had in the beginning the question from Luca that was already clarified by Eleonora that there was some potential for misinterpretation in the -- in the -- in regard of the requirements for dynamic coalition for reapplying for the session sinusoidal think that's clarified.

Since I'm working with the working group on the workshop proposal this year on the MAG, I can explain a little bit on the call referral workshop proposals but first I would like to see whether there are any specific questions in regard to the calls that are now published now on the IGF website. I'll give you more time to consider, and I do think, Eleonora, has just put the link into the chat room. What we can explain is in an attempt to make it more comprehensive for all applicants for the program, all calls have the same deadline, which is April 12th, so that's -- I do think the week before Easter time, yes, have you made yourself already acquainted with the calls for the proposal center? Do you have any questions?

(Background noise.)

>> Looking through the chat whether there is anybody --

>> It's Eleonora. Sorry, you actually, unfortunately, do not have the ability to see people raising their hands. Nick had his hand up.

>> Okay. Thank you, Eleonora.

Nick, you have the floor.

>> Hi, thank you, Jutta and thanks, Eleonora. I just had one logistical question just kind of recalling from last year's IGF in Paris. For the actual DC session is it set already for 60-minute changing it to a 90-minute cycle? Thank you.

>> I can jump in on that.

>> Yes, please, Maarten.

>> I did raise the question at the last MAG and expressed expectations at the DCs that they would like the 90-minute session, but the MAG didn't make a decision the chair decided to propose that in the light of the overall architecture of the Berlin meeting so a decision will be taken at the late stage, and I put out the claim, and I argued both in Geneva and in Paris in the last two meetings the duration was shortened mainly because of lack of space and slots. As far as I understand in Berlin there will be no shortage of space, so it should be possible to accommodate the traditional 90-minute slots. Again, no decision has been taken, thanks.

>> Thank you, Marcus, I appreciate it.

>> Jutta, we also have hands up from Maarten and Luca.

>> So I will come to Luca in a second, but I just confirm for the Berlin meeting the IGF in November. There will be no limitations to space, and we know we have one day more, and we have a day zero, so I hope that we will have the opportunity to dedicate 90-minute slots to the dynamic coalitions. It will probably be discussed at the next face-to-face MAG meeting at the beginning of April with this -- which is under the third point in our agenda.

Luca, you have your hand raised?

>> Yeah, thank you, Jutta, I just wanted to have another clarification with regard to the team because I find it quite curious there are only 3 superteams under which the session proposals should fit, which are governance, security safety and resilience. I wanted to have a clarification because in my reading from perhaps maybe I have a very special reading of the paragraph, it seems to me the team of the proposed session should may only -- should fit and can only fit into one of those three. If that is the case, I find it a little bit -- well, it could be easily fit into the inclusion with regard to the dynamic coalitions I'm representing here, but I wonder if teams like democracy, taxation things that are quite relevant, where should they fit. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Luca, for the question. Maybe I will be able to bring a bit more clarity with this issue, so the 3 main themes when discussing the first face-to-face MAG meeting in Geneva, and they were such based on the call for issues that out earlier to the community and from the input to the issues the MAG derived the three main themes and with regard to your questions my answer is twofold. The three main themes is where the workshop proposals should fit under, and all 3 of them have been explained by a narrative, and it may fit under one of the 3 themes. That counts for the workshop proposals and if you try to send an application for a workshop, you will need to decide which of the 3 main themes you will submit your proposal.

For the -- for the dynamic coalition sessions, the answer is a bit different. It's not mandatory to fit under the 3 themes. It's more like an offer to dynamic coalition to consider whether -- what they are dealing with fits under one of the 3 themes, and this is all with regard to the overall common understanding that the more concise the program of the IGF is, the better it is.

Sometimes -- and that counts also for an IGF we have more space and more -- where we have more space and time than last year's IGF.

People who are near the IGF ecosystem can get a business list in this overwhelming program of 10 to 12 different strands of workshop sessions, and so on, and so on, so the attempt was to give a bit more thematic structure to the whole program, and that is why the MAG decided to ask for workshop proposals under one of the 3 themes for the dynamic coalition sessions, it's like an offer. It can give you orientation, but it's not mandatory to fit under that, and especially with regard to the issues that you have raised, like democracy questions, probably hate speech, fake news, and so on. This is under safety security stability and resilience when it came through the core issues.

Does this answer your question?

>> Well, yes. It answered the question -- I mean, the fact that the goal is to streamline proposals. I may have suggested more 3 broad themes but again -- I mean, it's a different perspective probably, and, yes, it totally answered the question. Thank you.

>> Okay. Thank you.

Eleonora, I can't see hands. Can you -- can you help me? Has anybody raised their hand to speak?

>> Hi, Jutta, we don't have any hands raised at the moment.

>> Okay, so I can explain a little bit on how the procedures will go on now, and you may have seen -- when you have looked at the call for workshop proposals that the criteria for the evaluation have already been announced. We decided that it's given a bit more a variety of criteria. Last year we only had 4 criteria, and it's now up to 6 criteria. It's policy questions, and this is also with regard to the idea to have a program that is focused on the policy debates in regard to internet governance. We have relevance with regard to the issue the workshop will be dealing with and also with regard to internet governance overrun, and we have performance, diversity, the content of the session proposal and the interaction with the participants, so these are all the 6 criteria that the workshop proposals will be assessed against, and we will see what the outcome is.

Any further questions to that?

Just give it a few questions whether you'll consider whether you'll ask something.

So if there are no further questions, I do think we can take the last 15 minutes of our call to speak about the upcoming face-to-face MAG meeting for the Geneva on the 8th. The Geneva is starting on the 8th and the MAG meeting is starting the 11th -- so during this meeting discuss some of the issues that have already been

raised during this call, and I do trust in the secretariat that we will have minutes that cover all the issues that have been addressed, and we will discuss them also then during the face-to-face MAG meeting.

I do think I've also spoken about the expectations for the program to have it as concise as possible and enable people who take part in the IGF to find slots to address the issues and be able to speak during the sessions as well since we put a high relevance on interaction during the sessions.

Probably at this point, I'm not sure, Markus, you had already explained would you like to step in and explain a little bit more. On the dynamic coalitions on the agenda for the IGF and for the meeting in Geneva?

>> Yes, thank you, Jutta, yes, I would like to draw the attention of people on the call to a separate process. I don't know whether some of you have followed. There's a working group discussing the overall strategy for the IGF and the DC, obviously, is also part of that strategy, and I think that paper will be on the agenda of the April meeting. It may be -- Eleonora, can you make a link of that paper available in the chat. I would strongly encourage you all to read the paper and weigh in. It also relates to some of the questions asked by Luca and Nicolo and sort of the overall role and architecture and there seems to be a tendency in that paper to deal with the DCs as like other workshops, but I have to admit I have not read the paper myself. It's just somebody alerted me to that but please read the

paper and weigh in on the discussion if you feel it misrepresents the DCs and also weigh in, in any case. I think it's important to make your voice heard in any discussion on the overall strategy direction the IGF should take in the coming years. That was all I wanted to raise at this point. Thanks, Jutta.

>> Thank you, Markus, and thank you, Eleonora for putting the paper in the chat.

Markus, maybe one question -- maybe I didn't get when you started speaking. Who produced that paper for consideration? Was it produced by working group?

>> If you ask me who was holding the pen, I would not be able to say so. I know the chair -- the MAG chair was actually chairing the working group, but I don't know whether it was -- who was holding the pen for the paper, but it was a result of that working group with input from the broader community but again I don't know whether the dynamic coalition was represented in that group.

>> Thank you, Markus, for the explanation.

So with regard to the making the voice heard, it's always question whether dynamic coalitions would be able to participate onsite in the next face-to-face MAG meeting especially when it comes to a discussion on this paper. It might be very useful to be there and also to make your voices heard, so -- I suggest that if you have anything to recommend on that or some of you have already decided to be at the MAG meeting -- I understand the secretariat is still working on the agenda, so the agenda is not yet out, but it's -- it

will be out soon. We have the next workshop MAG meeting next week on Wednesday, and I do think we will have the agenda at least by the 27th of March.

>> Hi, Jutta, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you.

>> Sorry, it's Eleonora from the secretariat, I just wanted to quickly jump in on that. Almost certainly there will be a draft agenda that the MAG will review at their next virtual meeting before the face-to-face meeting and although the agenda is still being finalized, I think we can expect to see on it a lot more discussion that tries to focus on strategic priorities for the IGF as opposed to mostly the minutia of the program. Although there will be discussions of the program including possibly, you know, durations of DC sessions and that kind of thing, but I think the strategy paper that I shared in the chat will give DCs a good idea of the direction that the discussions in the face-to-face meeting may take as they try to focus on questions about, you know, stronger IGF outputs and/or outcomes and stronger engagement in the IGF from, you know, underrepresented groups and high-level participation. A lot of big strategic questions, I think, will be on this agenda, but this is a tentative forecast because it still has to be, you know, reviewed by the entire MAG, but it seems like the discussions in the MAG have been building up to kind of meeting in April.

>> Okay. Thank you, Eleonora on the agenda and also on the discussion of big strategic questions during the meeting. I do think that's

very helpful also for dynamic coalition representatives to decide whether they will join the meeting -- the face-to-face MAG meeting or not.

I do see a comment in the chat that is from Nick Smith, so I see dynamic coalition on DNS issues will be present at the April MAG meeting, so maybe those dynamic coalitions who are able to join can just let us know also probably viable lists whether they will be in Geneva or not.

That was it to the agenda points we see, so there is a question to Markus to Luca.

Markus, have you seen the question or shall I read it?

>> Yes, thank you. I have seen it. No, Luca, maybe I was a bit oversimplifying but again I have to say I just talked to someone ahead of the call, and I haven't read the paper myself, but the impression the person I talked to was that the paper seems to equate DC's like the other workshops putting everything in the same mold and not giving due importance to the DC's separate track but again please accept my apologies if I've been oversimplifying, and I strongly encourage you to read the paper. Maybe we can also continue the discussions of the DC list. I think it might not be a bad idea if you have a kind of consolidated position be that a correction or whatever to make sure that the DC's voices are heard when we talk about the future strategy. Thanks.

>> Thank you, Markus, for your explanation.

So last point in our agenda is any other business? Anything

to be said on this point? Anybody who would like to raise their hand and speak?

Since I can't see your hands, just go ahead if you have anything to say.

>> Jutta, it's Luca, just take advantage of this last 10 minutes to be sure that the paper to which we are referring is the one linked on the strategic multiyear work program because I've just did a cursory look to the paper, and these are only mentioned in increasing cooperation with MAG DCs and collaboration DCs, so I'm not sure I can identify the part where the DCs -- if that is the paper, I -- because I also want to be sure that the link that's been shared is exactly the paper we should consult. If that is the paper, I only see DCs mentioned in 3 points. With increasing cooperation with the DCs and with the MAG.

>> Thank you, Luca. I need to turn to Markus for answering your question or maybe also to Eleonora whether it's really that paper that Markus was referring to that you have put in a link.

>> I also turn to Eleonora but what I would also suggest we could pursue this on the list and to make sure that we circulate the links to the right papers and even if it's so in the paper on the future strategy, I think the DCs is a future space but, sorry, Eleonora, over to you.

>> Thank you, Markus. Thank you. I can confirm that this is -- this is, in fact, the paper that the chair has shared with the MAG for them to consider, and that results from the discussions that -- in

the working group that she led over the course of the last year on a multiyear strategic work program for the IGF.

>> Okay. Thank you, Eleonora.

Okay. Thank you, Eleonora for the explanation I do think it's a very good idea we try to continue the discussion on the list going carefully through the paper from the multiyears to the strategic work program working group and to see whether we can maybe have some concrete questions what this paper does mean for dynamic coalitions in the future and if there are -- if there are any more behind that then the issues, Luca has already pointed out because I agree with Luca from these mentions of dynamic coalitions in the paper, I wouldn't draw the conclusions that the MAG is on the path trying to consider dynamic coalitions the same as like workshop proposals. I can't gather that from the paper so far but maybe we can have some discussion, and then some concrete questions that can be put forward for the MAG for the next face-to-face meeting.

Having said that, I do think we are near the top of the hour, and I don't see any request for the floor in the chat, so I want to thank you all for taking your own time to join the call, and I hope you got something back for investing that time, and I hope to see you all -- either in Geneva or at the beginning of April or in our next dynamic coalition call. Thank you, bye. Is and thank you to the secretariat for all your support. Thank you.

>> Thank you all. Goodbye.

>> Goodbye, everybody.

>> Bye-bye.

>> CART PROVIDER: Bye.