

## Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group – Virtual Meeting IX

### Summary Report

4 August 2016

1. The ninth virtual meeting of the DC Coordination Group (DCCG) was held on 4 August 2016. The meeting was facilitated by Markus Kummer and Avri Doria, with Eleonora Mazzucchi representing the IGF Secretariat. The Webex recording of the meeting can be accessed here:  
<https://intgovforum.webex.com/intgovforum/ldr.php?RCID=f72acc81d03fd6cd509024383b8a1de6>
2. The Secretariat briefly shared that the IGF website was in a “transitional” mode, as a new site would be launched soon, and in the meantime some out-of-date or missing information on the DCs page would be added.
3. Avri briefed meeting participants on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Open Consultations and face-to-face MAG Meeting, which took place 12-14 July in New York. She confirmed again that Dynamic Coalitions would get a main session slot at the 11<sup>th</sup> IGF but noted a final decision had not been taken on the length and that a 3-hour duration was unlikely, especially in light of tight competition for space in the programme. The strong suggestion made by the MAG was that DCs take their hybrid session model and dedicate the first ‘vertical’ segment, in which DCs each give a brief substantive overview of their work, to a 1.5 hour -main session slot, and use a further 1.5 hours in another place in the programme for the ‘horizontal’ segment. The second segment could be hosted in another large room with interpretation. It was commented that this arrangement might in fact be preferable to having one long session, as two sessions would draw more participants and attract people who would not commit 3 uninterrupted hours. There was widespread support for this approach from DCs on the call.
4. A general question was asked on the perception of DCs by the MAG and others in the IGF community. Avri explained that the MAG was supportive overall of DCs’ work, and especially of recent efforts to coordinate DCs and find more commonality among them, while noting that a few on the MAG remained ‘skeptical’ of the independent, bottom-up nature of their organization. Markus added that this was discussed in a more in-depth way at the IGF Retreat, which took place in Glen Cove, New York on 14-16 July. He remarked that similarly to National and Regional Initiatives (NRIs), there tended to be two schools of thought on whether these IGF groups should be left to evolve on their own, or should be more under the jurisdiction of the MAG and subject to stronger oversight. On the topic of allotting time to DCs for a main session, he explained MAG members may feel more compelled to do this for groups like Best Practice Forums (BPFs) which do receive strong oversight by the MAG and have outputs produced by the IGF Secretariat.

5. Markus gave an overview of the DCs main session format, including use of an 'agent provocateur' (AP) as moderator for the first segment. There had also been strong support for using Twitter to engage participants. Avri informed that the MAG and IGF Secretariat, coordinating with the Mexican Host Government, were looking into the feasibility of a Twitter wall in main session rooms and a possible moderating or filtering tool for the tweets received.
6. The main session background paper required of DCs was discussed. Markus explained that this paper should in a way complement and supplant DCs' oral interventions. As was indicated in previous coordination meetings, the paper should be available as advance reading material for the session and not exceed 5 pages. It was also noted the paper should be distinct in style and substance from the 'activities reports' DCs produce and offer content that is more interesting and thought-provoking. A deadline will be set for this paper, and only those DCs which meet the deadline will be included in the main session programme. Any DC, however, may still participate in the 'horizontal' session.
7. The issue of how to run the main session within the time constraints (likely 1.5 hours), with some 15 to 10 DCs making interventions, was raised. It was remarked that the interventions facilitated by the AP/moderator should not have the ambition to expose a particular DC's work in-depth but rather the DC's central thematic problem or issue in a clear way. A number of other suggestions were made in this context: that interventions be more responsive and react to the tweets generated before and during the session as well as to the Idea Rating Sheets (feedback sheets on DC work); that the interventions both address current challenges and be prospective or future-looking; and that DCs be grouped loosely according to related themes. It was finally suggested, given how short the time anticipated for each DC would be (approx. 3 min.), that the AP/moderator simply ask one question (that the DC must answer, which is relevant, and that the DC has chosen) and then open up the floor to participants. This would spare the DCs from doing any 'reporting out', allow the pre-prepared substantive reports to speak for themselves, and facilitate 'open forum'-style exchanges with the participants in the room.
8. It was agreed that the subject of whether one AP/moderator or several moderators expert in the different DC areas were needed would be further discussed and taken up on future calls.
9. The issue of some DC coordinators not being sufficiently representative or inclusive of their members was brought up. The lack of inclusiveness was also reflected in the communication on their mailing lists, or scant evidence that they were organizing substantive meetings. At least one coalition, it was argued, was created with too few participants and weak multistakeholder support. Participants agreed that these issues and other issues relating to "Best Practices of DCs" would be highly relevant in the horizontal DC session at the IGF.