RAW FILE

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION

MARKUS KUMMER

MARCH 23, 2023

IGF DYNAMIC COALITIONS COORDINATION GROUP (DCCG)

COORDINATION MEETING #70

12:00 P.M. CT

*****

*****

>> He was blind himself but he was an excellent navigator
through the digital world. And he was very gentle person but at
the same time, a very strong advocate for the cause.

I don't know if we have on the call people who knew him personally and would like to say a few words.

>> Also Gerry Ellis, 2009 IGF, he also did some presentations. And later IGFs, I think the one in Mexico, if my memory doesn't fail me, he'd also given a presentation there. And he'd brought his guide person. He used to travel with a guide person to these meetings. So he was active in the dynamic coalition. Health and safety. So he was active in a couple coalitions.

>> Thank you. And yes, thank you. I met him for the first time in Geneva IGF 2017. And since then, we were in contact. I always found him a person who was forthcoming, ready to help others. At the same time as Markus said, very strong advocate on accessibility. Particularly digital accessibility. I understand that most of his life he has been working on the cause. He worked with a number of banks as well to make the digital environments and financial sector accessible for people with disabilities. We definitely will miss him. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I see you have your hand up.

>> Yes, from my side, I had the pleasure to meet Gerry, but we learned each other to know personally better at the IGF in Mexico. I also invited him personally to come to the Berlin IGF. And I really appreciated his advocacy work for accessibility and usability. And we will all be missing his very strong voice in this area.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Is there anybody else who would like to say a few words? If not, I think I can say we collectively send our condolences to his family and we will remember him fondly, as I said earlier. He was not only a strong advocate but also a very gentle person and personal contact. May he rest in peace. Thank you all.

With that, can we go to our regular business and look at the agenda for today's meeting. Ryan, can you put up the agenda and share your screen. And please, Eleonora, why don't you say it?

>> You're on mute.

>> Hi. Hi, everyone. Sorry about that. Yeah, I was struggling to find my mute button. I just wanted to say, I only had the chance to meet him in person a handful of times. But what struck me from those brief interactions was just really the genuine warmth and affection he'd for other people. And it's rather rare to

encounter in professional settings. So yeah, it was just something very lovely and disarming about him. And I was very sad to learn of his passing. Just thinking he was an ounce as kind and open as those with his personal life, those closest to him, as he was with all of us, then he really must be very sorely missed by his family. And I just shared in the chat, the little question that he always ended his emails with that I think captures really the sense of mission that was in him. And I think it is inspiring. So thank you, Markus, for setting aside this time for us to remember him.

 >> MARKUS KUMMER: Totally agree, what a nice person he was indeed. And he will be sadly missed. Ryan, can you share the agenda? Yes, it's up here on the screen. We had sent out this agenda. So agenda item one is adoption of the agenda. Is there anything you would like to amend to add or to delete from this agenda? It's actually a quite rich agenda as it is. I feel we may not have time to do justice to all these agenda items. I count to three and see whether there's any objection. Doesn't seem to be the case. So I take it the agenda is adopted as proposed. And that brings us to the first agenda item. Feedback from the MAG meeting in Vienna. We have general feedback. We have Eleanora from the Secretariat kindly offered to give us general feedback, but we also have our MAG liaison on the call. And we have Lisa who is considering to be a co-liaison and as MAG members, they might add to your feedback Eleanora. Please, go ahead.

 >> Thank you, Markus. Oh, I actually did not know that I was going to give a general overview of the MAG meeting. I thought I would be here more to answer any questions. But ting most important decision to come out of the MAG meeting and Lisa and MAG members can confirm this are that the theme and the eight subthemes of the IGF 2023 meet having been determined. So the overarching theme is the internet we want empowering all people. And the eight subthemes are, I will just read them out, AI and emerging technologies, avoiding internet fragmentation, cybersecurity, cybercrime and online safety, data governance, inclusion, global digital and operations, human rights and freedoms, sustainability, and environment. So a number of themes. However, the MAG felt that having actually a healthy number of themes would be useful in the process to sort the proposals for sessions that the Secretariat receives and that the MAG evaluates, specifically workshops. And that since having this number of themes will be actually helpful for structuring the

program and getting people a sense of which track in the program they might want to follow.

Another than that, there was good progress made on everything to do with planning for the call for sessions. So we are, I believe, on target for having that call on or around the first of April. And what should be of specific interest is that the call for DC sessions will be made at the same time. We plan to call for all of the sessions at once on that date. So DC can do their own session proposals for 2023. I don't know if those on the call are familiar. But there was a lot of space dedicated to general discussions about the direction, the relationship to other -- to wider, global processes and agendas, like the global compact or the proposed, quote, unquote, digital compact. And the review coming up in 2025. But I see Adam has his hand up. So probably would like to fill in a bit.

>> Yes, thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That was a very succinct summary. Adam, please.

>> Yeah, thank you. Thanks. Thanks, Eleanora, for covering all of that. Saved me scrambling for papers that I wouldn't have had access to actually. Two things I'd add as the MAG whip typically keen to highlight the importance of diversity and people across the whole of the sessions and the IGF this year. Particularly, I think, gender balance. Very concerned whether it would be a desire to have a 50/50 balance of women and men. We're not sure if that would be accurate to say 50/50, but it's going to be a very strong theme. So like people to reflect that. And diversity aspects, of course.

In terms of the submissions, I hope the submission form, if you're considering putting in a workshop or other activities and other sessions, you will find the form easier to use than previous years. And there's greater emphasis on content related aspects. So it's very logical. We want the concessions. So that's the idea behind that.

Another than that, I think that's it. Diversity, gender in particular. And we'll be focusing very much on content sessions that we think when we evaluate are good and will be interesting to participants. Thank you

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Alisa, as a MAG member, do you have anything to add?

>> Maybe one final point to add to this is that we also put a lot of emphasis on being there or at least half of your panel to be there in-person. And one moderator to be there in person. So please bear this in mind when you hand in a proposal that you will have people to be there. And maybe as I'm, well, kind of the taking the floor now, I would like to briefly introduce myself.

So I work for the ministry of economic affairs and climate policy in The Netherlands. Been doing, well, been working in the field of internet govern action for approximately 2.5 years now. And also active in ican as the representative. And well, I started in the MAG last October. Sorry, no, that was November. And if you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And with that, you have already taken us to the next sub-agenda item. But before going there, I would ask are there questions from other participants?

>> Yes, I had my hand up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please, you did.

>> Yeah, sorry. We had in the DCCG, we had several comments from last year that the form used was not accessible for persons with disabilities. And I was wondering if that was checked this year to make sure that the form was easily accessible? Because we had several persons who said last year's form was not. And then my other question, not in the form, I think that is very important, but what some of the problems that was in Poland was that some of the sessions who were remote were not using one of the -- using English or even French language. They were using Spanish which is not an approved language. And they had no translation. And I think that needs to be very pushed into the program that all sessions, unless you're going to pay for translation, need to be in the English language. And I think that's a rule from, what I understood, from MAG member, but it wasn't emphasized before. So maybe you can clarify that. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I think we pass that on to make sure, I think, the MAG liaisons will take it back to the MAG. The first point you made is obviously something that is very important. That the forms should be accessible. And that's a task we can give to Ryan to take back and to Eleanora to take back to the Secretariat really. A strong emphasis on making the workshop forms accessible. And the other question about, I think there are

a lot of problems with hybrid meetings. And I do remember that Adam was in a working group on devising hybrid meetings. I don't know whether you would like to comment, have anything to say on that, but I think what she said, I think, the MAG realized that it's all very good to be hybrid, but we need to have a strong component of people present on-site. Otherwise, if people are just online, it doesn't make for an interesting meeting. And the language thing has always been with us. Spanish is, of course, a U.N. language. But if we don't have the founding for having interpretation, then it doesn't work. And the working language is English as you already said. Adam, I don't know, would you like to jump in here?

>> Yeah, I think the idea is that hybrid means hybrid. And that doesn't mean all in person or all online. It may be all online because we provide online services for people to join remotely, join the meetings online.

So yeah, that's the basic principle. And as you said, Markus, if it works better when you do have a mix of people. The all-online sessions tend to look like a broadcast where you don't get the interaction. And if people aren't attending in-person, then they tend to only participate fully, of course, in that one session. And the idea behind the IGF is a forum for dialogue and discussion. And we haven't yet found a means to enable that for online participants.

Anyway, it's not going to exclude people. There will be possibilities to have people who will be speaking remote. But we do ask or will be asking that people balance that participant across their session.

On language, have to take that away. Noting that Japanese is not a U.N. language. And they are the host. But I don't know what plans they have in place for that at the moment. I think it's too early to say. Yeah, I don't recall. So we'll take that away. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, on that, if they pay for interpretation, they're free to do that. And past hosts, I remember the Brazilian, for instance, they provided for Portuguese interpretation. And that's fine. But if they pay for it. But the problem is, obviously, it's not resource neutral having interpretation. Points all well noted. Thank you, Judy, for raising these questions. And can we then go to the question of the MAG liaisons to the coordination group? Sorry?

>> I have my hand up, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry, I didn't see that. Yes, please.

>> Just a quickly, I agree with Adam that it's hard to get a
meeting when everyone is away and there's nobody or there are
very few people in the room itself. So the chair is running
things remotely, et cetera. That being said, we did that in our
DC. And what we had to do was have a local moderator so. It's
really important at that point that you have at least one or two
people that are active locally that will engage the people in the
room as well. That's the secret to then having a good meeting
that takes place, both online and in the room at the same time.
Because yes, it's absolutely impossible as a remote moderator to
see who is in room. I tried. It failed miserably.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: All good points. And in the chat, you see
Ryan asked you to identify yourself in the chat who you are and
which DC you're respecting. He's relatively new, well, now been
here for a few months, but nevertheless, he doesn't know you all.
So it's useful for the summary record to know who you are. So
please kindly put in the chat your name and which DC you're
representing.

And with that, can we then go to the next sub-item, the MAG
liaisons to the DC coordination group. And the MAG, to have
official liaison to the DCCG coordination group. And as Adam made
the point that it is difficult sometimes if it's just one person,
it will be helpful to have a co-liaison, to have two MAG members
so if one cannot make it, the other can. And we have Alisa
introduced herself. She has not yet agreed to be the second
person. She is here on a trial basis. So I urge you all to make a
good impression on her so she agrees to take on this role. And
let's hope she'll be then with Adam, the co-liaison. And that's,
I think, useful to have two MAG members who follow the work of
the MAG. Adam, you have your hand up?

>> Yeah, it would be great to work on this. But the main point,
meetings have to be scheduled earlier. I was due to be in
Brussels today but I couldn't make. And I that Brussels meeting
has been scheduled for six weeks so. If you're organizing
meetings a week before, you know, I'm not going to be able to
join. And the clashes for this meetings have been, I don't think
I've -- I think I've made one this year. It's because I've
already had scheduled meetings. So if you arrange earlier, we'll
join. I think that's the --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Point well taken. And any other business, at the end of the meeting already decide when the next meeting should be. And we hope we can do that today. So -- very valid point. Thank you very much. So hopefully, and I think it will be use to feel have a more official, more formalized liaison role.

And then there was another ask we had to the MAG that was a proposal to hold an intersessional meeting to discuss all intersessional components. That was one ask we agreed on to put that forward. And the MAG accepted that. And asked us to work out the formalities. I already checked with the Secretariat what's possible and what is not. And what the Secretariat proposes is to have one-half day of the next open consultation devoted to discussing these intersessional aspects. That is how better to integrate all the intersessional components of the IGF that is coalitions but not only, they're also the policy networks and the NRIs and that we would work together with them. And obviously, we will need to have well-prepared agenda and work on that agenda. And I hope that the DC coordination group would agree with that proposal that we have, just devoted half day of the open consultation where we can have a deep dive on these issues.

I don't know if anybody would like to comment. Yes, a hand is up

>> I just gave my thumbs up for the idea.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, that's a thumb. That's an easy one. Yeah, obviously, we will not sort out the agenda on today's call, but the idea is that we will set up a kind of steering committee to prepare for this session. And we obviously with the Secretariat, with represents of the NRIs of the BPFs, and the policy networks. How best to do that, and we do have, again, a very solid basis, that is also the paper we have produced. Was it, I think it was '21, yes, on what we could do to investigate for future work with the -- for the DCs. And that has been the basis of our collective work. Let's look at the various options the paper had presented.

>> Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to say, hosting this intersessional meeting, I would like to stress that it would be important or at least in my opinion, I do think it would be good that quite a few of the DCs will turn up. And hopefully in-person at least. So we would really get to have a meeting with you. And understand what problems you are encountering or what you would want to understand from the MAG or what you would want us to do

for you. I think that would be, well, really beneficial if you would be at the meeting itself.

 And not sure on how you always do this meeting, but is there an option that we would put the agenda in the chat and switch off the shared screen so we could see each other? While having this meeting? Thanks.

 >> MARKUS KUMMER: We can do that, yes.

 >> I can do that. Yes, thank you. I will stop share and send the agenda through the chat.

 >> MARKUS KUMMER: And let's encourage people to turn on their camera when they take the floor so we can see them. Yes, Mark, please.

 >> Yes, thank you. Internet standards and safety coalition. And I just wanted to remind us really of what this opportunity is for the dynamic coalitions. And really reinforcing the point about as many coalitions being actively present. You know is important. So why? What is the opportunity? And the opportunity, which has underlined, under scored this proposal all along is that awareness raising of what dynamic coalitions are doing is important for the IGF community. In the past, a lot of what's been going on in the year-round activity of the IGF has been pretty much hidden from view. And not much understanding of how actually a lot of it does intersect in a very positive way with the whole IGF mission.

 So awareness-raising is important. So this is a kind of halfway point in the IGF calendar, if you like, this is the progress of the dynamic coalitions that have been active on their specific areas of focus. And secondly, this is what these dynamic coalitions anticipate to deliver at the IGF. So right, flags are being raised. Dynamic coalitions are doing this and this. And then thirdly, really, the opportunity for identifying where not so much duplication is happening but where constructive corporation could be fostered more through awareness across the whole IGF ecosystem. And that includes not only for us to connect with BPF activities and policy network activities but also the NRIs. So there's that as well. You know, to combat this silo situation that's often characterized IGF year-round intersessional activity, nobody's really known where linkages could usefully be developed.

And actually, a fourth objective, really is to gear up the leadership panel on what the IGF dynamic coalitions are doing and what their outcomes could form in terms of opportunities for advocacy by the leadership panel. So it's important for the leadership panel to be actively present, represented at this intersessional meeting. So they get the clear message, look, this is what dynamic coalitions are doing, and some of these are going to produce tangible outcomes and material for the leadership panel to promote in its advocacy role. So that's why the message to all dynamic coalitions is take part in this intersessional meeting. It's going to serve your best interest. It will serve the best interest of the IGF ecosystem community more broadly. And it will serve the interests of internet stakeholders worldwide through advocacy. Thanks.

 >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Just I don't want to spoil the party, but your hope that the leadership panel would listen to that meeting may be a bit too much in terms of expectation based on the experience in Vienna. There was a short interaction between the leadership panel and the Secretariat. And first of all, there were not that many members of the leadership panel actually there in-person. And the interaction was at a very high level. And I think very little in terms of substantive discussion. But let's never give up hope. But just, you know, expectation management. Wout.

 >> Yes, thank you, Markus. People may not have followed the consultation and MAG meeting that I was present there on behalf of the dynamic coalition. But Markus presented our request to the MAG. Quite well. And I think that basically we scored on all points where we want to have interest. And thank you is important to note because the interest from the MAG in the work of the dynamic coalitions was definitely present. And that may have been a difference from a couple of years ago where people just looked a bit glazey-eyed. I think we got the points across and the fact that we had the intersessional meeting, our list of activities has been shared with the MAG and perhaps even the leadership panel. The leadership panel did recognize the work of the dynamic coalitions. And I was able to speak with Vince. And he assured me if we got our messages very crisply in sound bites that he would definitely take them along. And that leadership is available to be some sort -- the door to others behind the leadership. So they were open to do introductions where really necessary. So in other words, we've made connections that have not been there before. And whether they are present in our session, the invite we can

do. And perhaps one of them is able to show up or liaison is able to show up because there are people in the MAG who work for people on the leadership panel. So that is something that could be addressed as well. But I think we have got our messages across together very, very well. And I would like to compliment Markus on that because he really stood up for the dynamic coalitions. And that is something that is commendable.

So that is message also wanted to share with everybody. So thank you for the opportunity to speak

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And obviously, all the points made are very important and very relevant. And I'm not sure how many representative dynamic coalitions will be physically present in Geneva for the next intersessional meeting, but obviously, it will be a hybrid meeting and they'll be able to participate online.

And yes, let's prepare the agenda. We have some time. We don't have the dates yet. Do you have anything to add? When can we expect, I think it's July. For the open consultations.

>> Hi, Markus, sorry. So we have not announced the dates yet. But it is looking like July most likely 10 to 12 July.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. And let's make sure that as many as possible can be physically in Geneva. And the others hopefully will be able to join online.

With that, we can go to the next agenda item.

>> Sorry, Markus, I just thought of something and stuck my hand up late. What's the intention of the intersessional meeting in the sense of what time do you want? Is it going to be the dynamic coalitions meeting separately from the open consultation and the MAG? Noting this meeting is -- well, from the MAG's point of view, ait's where we do our final evaluation and selection of workshops, et cetera. So it is an important and busy session. So I'm wondering what's the intention behind? What are you going to do?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, this is something, this is definitely a work in progress. And there again, we will rely on the MAG liaisons to help us. But as I'm thinking aloud, I think also what both Mark and Wout said, I think it's a good opportunity for the DCs to present themselves and to interact with the MAG and the other components of the intersessional work. Just with the broad

objective, how better to integrate the intersessional work into the mainstream of the IGF. And how we do that, I think, it will be helpful if it's with the MAG, not in a separate session. But that's my personal opinion. That needs to be discussed.

And definitely, we don't want to take time away from the MAG. But in Vienna, we had very long sessions, a presentation of other organizations including the U.N. pension fund which did not really add that much, I think, to advancing the program of the IGF. And I think there is time, it is the open consultation. And it will be just a half day of the open consultation that is the proposal will be devoted to this intersessional aspect. And how we do it, that will be open for discussion. But it should definitely not take away time from the MAG work. I don't know, does anybody else have ideas or comments on that? Can we leave that open for the time being? And leave that for further reflection? And as we said, we need to then prepare the agenda and in close cooperation with the Secretariat, after all, they establish the program and the MAG chair of course. With that, can we then go to the next agenda item which will be the contribution to the GDC. We discussed that on various occasions. And Mark kindly agreed to drive that process. So with that -- oh, Alisa has her hand up

>> Sorry, my yellow hand doesn't seem to be working with the wall behind it.

Yeah, I just wanted to say, well, depending on what you really would want to discuss, I think we should look at the time that needs to be allocated to it. So not processing half day if you don't need to or if you don't have the substance to really fill half a day. So I would first want to hear what you really want to present before talking about how much time should be allocated to the DCs presenting or having this intersessional meeting. So maybe first look at what you want to present. And then we could maximum say half a day, but, well, on forehand saying half a day, I think that might be much. But if you have, if you really have a lot to say, then obviously I don't want to cut you short.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, half a day, it's three hours really. It's a sessions are three-hour sessions. It's not really that long. And it's not just about the DCs. It's also about the best practice form, policy network, and the NRIs. And we had in the past tried to, for instance, when I was involved with the best practice for cybersecurity, tried to have sessions with the NRIs, but it never really worked. And that's basically here an

opportunity to look on how to improve. And also I think it will be important that we have MAG involvement but maybe the MAG doesn't need to be there for the full session. That we can have part of the session would be devoted for interaction with the MAG. And we could have just, again, thinking aloud, it would have two hours where we are among ourselves, intersessional components. And then one hour where we actually interact with the MAG. But that will be part of the preparatory process and the Secretariat has given us strong message, it needs to be well prepared. I think that is what the point you were making. And in a way, it goes without saying, we cannot just say give us three hours and fill it with blah, blah, we have to make some conscious effort to have a constructive session. But thank you for the contribution.

 With that, can we go to Mark for the contribution to the GDC?

 >> Yes, thank you, Markus. Yes. First of all, quick update. The timeline we were working to in our proposal for a coordinated dynamic coalition's input into the GDC stakeholder consul takes has changed. The deadline set by the tech envoy for their online questionnaire survey in consultation was extended recently to the 30th of April. So come forward by another month. And there's also an overlap with the deep-dive schematic consultations by the co-facilitators, the ambassadors for Sweden. So the timelines all getting rather -- they're changing. And the whole process of stakeholder consultation is undergoing additional, has additional opportunities. So anyway a part from that, turning to our specific questions for our consultation, you remember we basically asked the responses and inputs from all the dynamic coalitions on three key points.

 Firstly, which schematic areas in the tech envoy's consultation would your dynamic coalition anticipate responding to. Secondly, what additional schematic area, which tech envoy asked for, invites proposals for, and is question eight, what additional area would your dynamic coalition propose? And then thirdly, a more generic question for the opportunity of the dynamic coalitions to participate in the GDC preparatory process, the consultations and then when it moves into the General Assembly, how potentially could the dynamic coalitions help the member states as they finalized the global digital compact and it's launched at the Summit of the future next year. And then subsequently, when the compact will be put out to stakeholders

for implementation, to land it, if you like, in the months, perhaps years subsequent to the Summit, what role would you anticipate the dynamic coalitions having?

So the end of the month, to-date, we've received six substantive responses and I'm grateful for those dynamic coalitions that did take the time to look at our elements of consultation and to provide written responses. Very much appreciated. Six responses doesn't mean I have enough raw material to develop a thematic input as the response to the tech envoy's consultation. I don't think. I've discussed this with Markus, and he agrees.

All of the responses made very good points about the role of the dynamic coalitions in this entirety DC process. So my proposal now is to focus on that final element, the role of the dynamic coalitions. The opportunities for them to participate actively, to successful, meaningful compact that is going to actually achieve greater impact and results in the implementation phase.

So my proposal is to continue with the consultation for a further period. But with that specific request, not on the specific themes of the tech envoy's consultation nor on the themes which are different in some respects of the co-facilitators deep-dive consultations. Not on those. My invitation for the dynamic coalitions is to give us your further thoughts on how the dynamic coalitions can engage and participate and contribute to the entire GDC process. Right through to implementation following the Summit. And my proposal is to give a deadline of 10thof April for all the dynamic coalitions to feed in their comments, views, proposals on that specific question, the role of the dynamic coalitions in the GDC process. It's open, of course, for the individual dynamic coalitions to submit their own inputs directly to the tech envoys consultation process. And I would encourage the six DCs who responded, and I think mine are doing that anyway, to proceed to do that, to submit directly to the tech envoy consultation through their online platform.

But let's aim for a coordinated dynamic coalitions' position on the role of the dynamic coalitions in the GDC process, the preparatory phase, the development phase, and the implementation phase to the Summit.

So those are my -- that's my proposal for you today. And back to you, Markus. I have covered everything.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, that was a very comprehensive and I think the proposal makes sense. I think some DCs already have submitted their proposal to the tech envoy's office. And that makes much sense, those who have made substantive contribution, do it so so work on a collective contribution which is more process related. Does that meet the approval of everybody? I don't see any hand up. So I take silence for agreement on that. And let me work with this deadline. And as you said, presumably now this is the very last deadline, the 30thof April and will not be extended yet another time.

Oh, Adam asks in the chat, Mark, can you call out those who have commented in terms of substance?

>> Thanks, Adam, for the question. DC digital health, DC jobs, DC environment, DC IoT, DC accessibility and disability. That is six, I believe.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> Dimension environment? Yeah.

>> Didn't you get something from children's rights? I'm pretty sure Amy sent something in.

>> I haven't seen it, I have to say.

>> Okay, I have to check with her. Thank you.

>> Right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, well, thank you. And then the next agenda item is the status report of the DC work that was basically the Google doc Wout had prepared and some DCs had filled in. It's quite impressive to see the ongoing work. And we would strongly recommend -- there was some technical hitch with it. I think somebody by mistake had deleted all the input, but he has been able to rescue it. And Ryan has worked on a document. And he will share it again with the list. And we would like to encourage you all to fill in the ongoing work so that we have a broad overview. We mentioned it in Vienna and the MAG I think expressed all of the interest that they would have access to this document. And I think that will be an important building block, also, for the intersessional work.

And also that may be, again, Mark, can you also give us the deep dive consultations? It's also, I think, something that dynamic

coalition should be aware of and is actively participate the process of these deep-dive consultations.

>> Yes. As you may have seen, these are led by the member state co-facilitators of the Summit, Rwanda and see den, the ambassadors for Rwanda and Sweden. It's a series of eight deep-dive consul takes on specific themes. And they'll be held at two-week intervals and they start on Monday, on the 27thof March. With the one on digital inclusion and connectivity. There's a link, if you go to the website, you will find the link to register. And that invites you to either indicate that you want to speak or simply register to attend. The next one is on internet governance on the 13thof April. So that is an example of a different thematic, a much broader thematic heading compared to the tech envoy's consultations which focused on internet fragmentation, as you may recall. So 13thof April, internet governance. 24thof April, data protection. 8thof May, human rights online. 25thof May, digital trust and security. And AI and other emerging technologies. 9thof June, global digital commons. 14thof June, accelerating progress on the sustainability development goals. That's, I think, the opportunity to bring the whole compact process within the orbit of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Which I think was the point, an issue that that was always underlined by the Secretary General when this whole set of proposals was initially developed and is our common agenda report. The relevance to sustainable development goals.

So that's what's happening with the deep dives. As you may have seen, the co-facilitators are circulating guiding questions. And the questions for the Monday deep dive have now been circulated. So that's to help focus the interventions, as I understand it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Walt has a happened up.

>> Sorry, I lost my screen. Sorry.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That happens. We don't have that much time left. So let's be aware of the time. Walt, please.

>> Yes. Thank you, Markus. I was waiting for Mark if he wanted to speak. So you've mentioned the list that I made. And that it's sort of disappeared from the Google doc for some reason. I've just sent Ryan a contribution that was put in there by DC. So there's new information already. And I've asked Ryan to open a doc on behalf of the Secretariat so no longer --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, no, that will be concrete follow-up of today's call. Ryan will send to it the list and all DCs to fill in as appropriate.

>> Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. And I think the -- thank you also Mark for giving a long list of the deep dives. And I think we would definitely like to encourage the DCs to involve with these deep dives and participate actively whenever there's an issue that is of your specialty of your remit. Obviously, internet governance seems to be a remit of every one of us as we are part of the IGF family.

But with that, we have still few items and one item is I had said that already in the chat. The question of the use of the U.N. emblem. That came up. But it was just one of the DCs had actually submitted a contribution with the U.N. emblem. And the question was then asked: Are they allowed to use the U.N. implement? And the answer is clearly no. And I will send the official guidelines of the use of the U.N. emblem to this list. But clearly, dynamic coalitions are not entitled to use the U.N. emblem.

And the other question is: Are they entitled to use the IGF logo? That is a little bit less heavily regulated. I think their call is to still out. And I think the Secretariat is checking on that. But I think you can when you sign off, say that you are an IGF dynamic coalition. So-and-so. But you have to leave out any reference to U.N. or U.N. as some of you have done in the past. So that clearly is a no-go.

Wout, do you have anything to add?

>> Thank you, Markus. I asked the Secretariat on these publications. And that I indicated that we have not used the logo on our first report. But that we did enter a discussion on how can official reports of DCs get more recognition from the IGF. And that is something that indicated that was willing to discuss with us.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Still under examination. And still something it's part of the discussion if an output of DC is an output of an DC, it's not an output of the IGF so to speak. But that's part of a broader discussion. But right now, I think more flexibility with the IGF logo and name whereas the U.N. is very, very clear.

That's a no-go. So please refrain from using the U.N. emblem. Which is --

>> That is totally clear, Markus. What I would suggest is that we invite to have the discussion.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, it's also -- it's also --

(Overlapping speakers)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: This is work in progress. And then another work in progress, we have very little time left. But Ryan has been working on the charter of the DCs which we have been discussing. I hope you have a few more minutes left. Can we go a little bit over time? I would like to give Ryan the opportunity to present a bit what he's been working on. And also ask for guidance when appropriate. Ryan, please, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Markus. And thank you in advance for giving the extra time. So the charter that I've worked on right now really benefited from the individual charters of some DCs. So I would like to thank DCs that already have this developed like the isc3, the sustainability and the ycg, youth coalition on internet governance. And the charter has benefited from the language of the different DCs and in addition to that also a report done by the consultant last year highlighted DCs work and processes. And the role of DC in future of the IGF.

So I've incorporated some of the languages and key questions at the report as well to develop the charter. And so far, it's been mostly done. And I would really invite all DCs to comment on it. And I will share the document after the end of this meeting. And I hope the charter will give clarity to some of the common principles that are agreed on for all DCs, for the future of the governance mechanism. So the charter so far divided into two main sessions and the first one a lights the organizational history, structure, and the mission of DCs. And a point I would like to mention is in the missions part, I added language to suggest DCs embrace of partnerships with the broader IGF community including the NRI, the bft, policy network, as well as the leadership panel.

The second part which is the main session and where I was able to interpret some of the key questions in the paper included levels of engagement of DCs and building minimum requirements for DCs to be active.

So in addition to the basic principles like the three O which is open membership, open mailing lists, and open archives, I have worked on the definition of membership. And dividing them into two main categories which could be full membership or observers.

And this part is also mentioned from the report. And I thought it would be helpful to sort of give this differentiation. And the differentiation is this: The full members would be those who are active participants that are active in all DC activities that they attend DCCG meetings, and they respond to DCCG and Secretariat communications and correspondences. Observes would be those who only want to receive updates without further engagement because we are aware that some DCs, they are in this status. And emphasized that both members should be treated equally and no penalties applied to observers. Something along the line so that you don't really -- we don't exclude DCs that merely want to participate just to keep stay updated on the activities.

And to add legitimacy of the membership status, the DCCG and Secretariat can conduct an annual review up and date the list regularly to reflect the active DCs that are in the group. So that would also be helpful to answer the earlier question about DCs that are active and how they participate.

Other issue that addressed will be the minimum standards for the DC. This is still an open question for you all. And you can continue commenting on it after the meeting. And I added that another than the annual report submission which is the requirement of all DCs, there needs to be other activities or publication from the DCs such as the annual IGF, I'm sorry, another than the annual IGF session, it is necessary that DCs themselves at least have their own meeting once a year. So this is still an open question for you all. And I would like to know what you think about this because I understand that, again, DCs are voluntary engagement but to the recent discussions for the common principles and deeper engagement of the DCCG, it will be good to have some minimum standards in terms of the activities, the types of activities conducted by DC. So these are the main progresses that I've made in the charter. And I thank you for your attention. And welcome any feedback from you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Ryan. We don't unfortunately have much time to discuss. Although I think there are very maybe strong opinions on some of these issues. But my suggestion would be that circulate the draft to this list. And then we can garner comments and take it from there. And you could leave some of the

issues open, say, should we do this or do that if there are alternatives and let's wait for the feedback.

There have been quite a few questions in the chat. I noticed there was a question of what do we do with the DCs that don't comment -- well, I think we have, if Mark prepares the collective contribution based on the comments he received, I think then we give it out again for comments to all DCs and we will take silence for agreement. And go with the lowest common denominator. That would reflect, I think, the work Mark has done based on the input received. And also, a comment about -- just the Secretariat establishes clear criteria for recognized but that is also ticking the box thing, the website, have they produced an annual report, have they held a meeting, but that gives a strong indication. And we have done the same with the DCs but now with the charter, there's a question of whether we should go a little bit further and that is all contained in the report. Ryan referred to the report produced. And we have all worked on collective based on interviews of all DCs. And they are the basic questions are all in there as further issues to be explored.

Apologies. Can we ask Luis this. And who approved the charter? The charter, again, would be a model of charter as not -- we would work on that and see what we can approve and whatnot. That is a first draft. Is this the way we want to go. If not, then you say which way you want to go.

Can we leave it at that? And we take it into written procedure and Ryan will share it with you all. And we will take it from there. And you can shout what you like and don't like. And take it from there.

And Avri says she's confused. And she guesses its her nature. I don't think it's your nature. But maybe we were confusing. But essentially, we're presenting a draft and asking for comments. And we see, that will not be a mandatory charter. It will be adopted by each DC. But it will a model charter which could be used by those who don't yet have a charter. I hope a little less confused. My apologies if we confused you.

Can we find the date for our next call? May I suggest the -- what did we say? The 18thof April? 15:00, you tc. In Europe, you have come into summertime. I think the U.S. already in summertime. Do we have useful if we can fix that date. And my proposal is after some initial consultations, 18thof April at 15:00utc. doesn't work for Wout.

>> I would suggest Markus, in the working group strategy, they have a meeting every two weeks at the same time. And I think that could work for us for the rest of the year. And then everybody could put it in the agenda. And for 18th, for me it does not work. But perhaps for others it does.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Do we increase every two weeks?

>> Every four weeks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Every four is fine.

>> Every four weeks at the same time basically. And then it should work. But Tuesdays for me impossible usually at 7:00.

>> But at the same time, that wouldn't respect people in other time zones. So I do think we need to change a bit.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, the afternoon in Europe, well, do we have DCs if Asia Pacific actually? That's the afternoon time in Europe works well for the U.S., for the whole of Africa, and also for Asia up to, shall we say, India, Hong Kong, but not to -- well, okay, it's a bit late for India already. Yes, that's a good point. So midafternoon usually, let's say 3:00 in Europe is the time where you have morning in the East Coast, and again, Europe, the whole of Africa, and then it's also still reasonable for India whereas I take it, right now it's a bit late for India. Do we have somebody from Asia Pacific in the DCs? I'm not even sure. I mean, I know --

>> We do, but they're the (indiscernible) people. But they could be -- usual through sids representatives are in Asia Pacific but they could also be in the Caribbean. It all depends. But they're not active as much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, okay. You could say they're not active because we don't accommodate them time-wise.

>> Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's a good point as well.

>> On the other hand, we have the doodle poll. So if they have not responded, then they're not active. That is something that Ryan can see if somebody from Asia Pacific.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Shall we agree we send out a doodle poll, find a time for the week around I would say, four weeks from now. That will be --

>> And send it out today.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Starting, well, let's say tomorrow, at least. Yeah. But for the week, starting 17thof April. Okay. We encourage Ryan also to be a bit broader with the time slots, to be more inclusive for other regions.

>> Could we also have a doodle, so one for the month of April, one for the month of May. And maybe one for June? Or -- I already have it a bit further ahead. Because it's just a nightmare for me to plan something a week ahead or two weeks ahead every time. If I would want to do this. I guess that's the same thing for Adam.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: One proposal was we always have it on the same day every four weeks. The same time slot. Like the group on strategy does. Which will be another option. But we agree which day of the week. And then use the same day for April. You may have some said, Tuesday don't work, others may --

>> It's only 7:00 so, if we do 15:00 here so, 13 of utc that will be fine any Tuesday usually. Only 7:00 that I'm really not available.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. We are talking about 15:00utc which will be 5:00 but we could also make it earlier.

>> 5:00 would work as well. But 4:00 here, that's fine. But not at 7:00. Here.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, let's send out a doodle poll. And thank you for going into overtime. And we're talking about the week starting on April 17th.

>> And there's one other -- any other business on the intersessional we have in July? I think is good to start preparing that as well. So that if Ryan, if you could ask all DCs who is interested to participate and designate to organize it, then we have a group that can start work. And then we can make a proposal.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's not under any other business. That's under intersessional. Started preparation straight away. Okay, with that, thank you all for going into extra time. We have some homework. Thank you.