        >> Chair: Celine had shared the draft Agenda with us. One is
the draft Charter and update on the intercessional event and then
the open consultations of the MAG meeting and the fifth Agenda item
would be the main session proposal. We said at the last meeting we
would like to really focus on that this call. And the last one will
be any other business. Can I take it that you all agree with the
Agenda as proposed? As I can't hear any objection, I will take it
that you agree and it is assumed that we adopt the Agenda as it was
proposed by the Secretariat. Thank you for that.
        With that, the first Agenda item -- first substantive Agenda
item would be the draft Charter of the DCs. Here we see it on the
screen. Again Celine has shared a version. This is not a drafting
session. Look at how it is evolved and supposed to incorporate all
the comments written comments before. Celine, I hand it over to you
and you walk us through the draft Charter as it is on the screen.
Please.
        >> CELINE: Thank you very much for all the comments that we
collected and received in the past weeks. This is really to let you
know we have taken into consideration absolutely every comment shared
by you. Because this is supposed to be a common Charter that we are
working on as a Dynamic Coalition coordination group, right? So
again, the history of the DCs and the principles, that information
was taken from the website, it should be clear. Going to the common
guidelines of the dynamic Coalitions. Those are the typical basic
requirements so open membership, open mailing list and open archives.
Until now, every single DC that wants to be created needs to abide
to those three main basic principles. So it means every single of
the DCs that are actually published on the website do have them. When
it comes to the annual report submission, we have taken into
consideration that the deadline of the 31st of January might be a

little bit tight because it is the end of the year, end of the previous year. Some may be on vacation, et cetera, et cetera. We extended this deadline to the first quarter of the upcoming year. Yes?

This was also something that has been proposed by one of the DC coordinators. The next point is we want to make it clear that after a period of two consecutive years, a D.C. will be listed as inactive if they haven't been able to submit an annual report. Something that is a basic minimum requirement, let's say. Good.

When it comes to attendance for the DC we made it clear, those expected to attend the DC are the DC coordinators, but we encourage other members to attend if they wish to do so.

Good. And as for the membership Governance, we haven't changed anything to date, because everyone was agreeing to this already before. Same for the Mission and vision of the dynamic Coalitions. And again, we wanted to let you know that this document is really a living document that we will review once per year. Just to make sure that they update -- that they reflect the new realities that impact the DC's operations and address any outstanding issues of concerns that members may have with the Charter. Along the year. Um ... you have received earlier the -- you received earlier the PDF document. And Markus, in case you don't have anything to object with, I would suggest if no one has any final comments by the end of this week, we take it as approved?

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Celine. Yes, I think as you have said in your introduction, it has been with us for quite a while and has undergone various stages of refinement. Some objections, some people found it too prescriptive, that has been taken into account. That is really a fairly flexible framework that it provides for the Dynamic Coalition. It should ensure more coherence that we real all really abide by some common standards.

I see some very positive comments in the chat. So far, no objections. I think your suggestion is right that we really should make it clear and give it also to the list, give them a few more days should there be any last objection or whatever. But I take it from the very positive reactions we have here on the chat that we're on the right way. I think we can go ahead as you suggest and I will take it that people on the call would also agree that we give those who have not been on the calls when we discussed, it give them a last opportunity to look at it and voice on any objection they may have. But I hope they will not. And if you don't hear anything, we assume that we have tacit agreement from all Dynamic Coalitions and then it will be a common document that will be posted on the website.

Can we go ahead as proposed? Do I take it -- the chat discussion, the quantity and quality be ongoing. That is clearly as also Celine said, it is going to be a living document. We can always review it every year.

>> CELINE: I believe Alisa has her hand raised.

>> ALISA: I would like you to bring it forward to the MAG and present it there when you are looking towards the next Agenda item. But whenever you're going to present towards the MAG, the ideas on

DCs, I think it would be really good to show this document and email it to the MAG list.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that. Yes, while we will have the opportunity for the open consultation MAG meeting two weeks from now. We can do that in person and I think your suggestion is very well taken.

So next week hopefully then it will be formally adopted once we have no objection from the MAG list and we can then formally also present it to the MAG (audio skipping) as an example of ongoing work.

I think it is really -- I would like to thank you all who contributed. It is for all the DCs a big step forward to come up with this common framework document. Thank you all for this.

With that, I think we can conclude this discussion on the draft Charter. And we go then to the next agenda item, the intercessional event update and feedback. And Celine has already started the work shepherding the various Working Groups. Please, Celine, give us an update.

>> CELINE: Thank you very much Markus. This is to give an update about the short intercessional event scheduled to help July 10 during the open consultation day from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Geneva time.

So we have had an intercessional event kickoff meeting last week to start with the discussions because we're considering the tight deadline, let's say, to finish the various Working Group input. And since yesterday, we started meeting the individual Working Groups so they can start organize themselves. So they are based on the eight subthemes that are also available on the website for this year's RGF, and the aim is to bring all the main participants registered for the Working Groups to work together. Have synergies among the international work community. So it is not only about DCs contributing, but also policy networks, best practice foras and the NRIs. And we have the most let's say popular Working Groups, which are the one on Cybersecurity, cybercrime and online safety. Only one very popular is on digital divides and inclusion. There are two other groups which are less populated. We're still looking for some interested persons who would like to contribute and share their expertise.

Those groups would be the one on human rights and the other one on data Governance and trust.

So if you're part of this meeting and still interested to contribute to those two, that would be very nice. By the end of the week to let us know, let me know and the IGF Secretariat that you would be interested in taking part in this intercessional event.

So in case you have questions you can ask them now about the intercessional event.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: If you will allow Celine one comment, I think it would not only be nice if you showed your interest for those issues which so far have not been very popular, but I think it is also beneficial for the DCs as a whole, as a group to show that we can contribute to all the main themes chosen for this year's IGF. If there are items

where we don't seem to be making a strong enough contribution, I think, shall we put it, that will be less positive. I think it will have really good impact if you can show the DCs collectively can make input, provide input to all the main themes.

That is my brief comment to underline what you have already said. But we're open for questions and comments.

I see Amy's hand up.

>> AMY: Thank you, Celine. Apologies if I missed this, I can look in emails. The date? In terms of we can certainly speak to the first two you mentioned. It could be possible through the members of the DC. I'm assuming that would be okay. It doesn't have to be just us as the representatives, it can be anyone from the DC that can speak to the issues, I assume.

>> CHAIR: Correct.

>> CELINE: Absolutely.

>> AMY: I can go back to the group, there is interesting work on children's rights and that is part around the business of freedoms and things. So I can put it to colleagues in the group and come back to you.

But the other dates -- are the dates in an email or somewhere obvious I can find them? Apologies if you have shared them.

>> CELINE: For the intercessional event itself. I will share it again. But it is on July 10 and the intercessional event is scheduled from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., Geneva time.

>> AMY: It is online? I assume.

>> CELINE: Online and in person. But participation will be for both.

>> AMY: Okay. It is coming back to me now. I will ask around and see. I can't guarantee, I am happy to contribute if we can. I agree it is good to be involved in the different areas.

>> CHAIR: There is little time left. The idea would be also that the various Working Groups come up with a substantive contribution to the chosen theme. So -- I mean, it is not impossible. But there is very little time left. The deadline is very short.

Are there other questions, comments?

>> CELINE:: Maarten has his hand up.

>> MAARTEN: Participation is limited even if there are more than 10 parties that expressed interest. It is five or six that show up.

Second is because there is very little time per theme, which I can imagine having eight themes, have an hour each, that is the whole day. Good to focus on what the issue is. And just a suggestion as part of tools to the discussion so far, add an extra slide in which you put in the hypertext links to the substantive work of your specific DC or network without us having to go over it during the 10 minutes that we have. With that yeah. Looking forward to see it grow. Obviously, people that volunteered to lead it will have interesting tasks. And people on the call that normally promise to help. After that it would be sent to the full group and there is short period for feedback. That's it, right? We'll do the best we

can.

>> CHAIR: Yes. I think unfortunately, that's it. There is very little time available to do it. And you obviously are right in pointing out that you have to be very focused in the very limited time you will have for providing input. But it could be also useful for the MAG discussion that will follow on the subsequent days when the MAG will have to discuss the main session. So it is a first input of people dealing with the issues.

Yes, it would be nice to have more time. But let's make the best of it as we can. Other comments, questions? I can't see any hand up. What I can say, however, is one participants has just a phone number. Just for the summary record, it would be helpful if you can also give your name. Doesn't have to be now. In fact, that goes for all the others. Some of them have already said so in the chat who they are, which the Dynamic Coalition will represent.

Frederick said he represents UNDESA. He cannot say that. I think we have been through that time and again. You are IGF Dynamic Coalition, you don't represent the U.N. as such.

>> FREDERICK: Can I respond please. I was connecting myself and I didn't control that presentation. It was on my thing with Zoom. It change. I get back. It is in my computer which I am using.

>> CHAIR: If you can check that and control it. That would be most welcome.

>> FREDRIC: What I said I was contributing with the U.N. Global Compact, SME, I presented it to health technology. It was an important focus because we were talking on Africa on SMEs and discussing in that Sector, with the co-Chair of the future of our civilization, it was a good opportunity to present the global initiative from the President in China on the civilization, security and development. I think the partnership with the center for international knowledge.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. But that's really not part of our.

>> FREDERICK: Continuing my work. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: My brief call on all of you, if you haven't said so in the chat. It is just for the benefit of the Secretariat that you say which Dynamic Coalition you represent. (Audio skipping)

With that if no further comments on the intercessional event.

>> CELINE: Amali has her hand risen.

>> AMALI: With data, health data is a huge amount happening, and will explode in terms of volume of data. I am wondering if we should make a small contribution, send a message that can be read out or something like that. I think it would be very interesting. We're absolutely concerned about the quality of data. And the way data is transmitted between systems and so forth. We can be helpful there, if anyone is interested. Contact me.

>> CHAIR: We're not here -- (audio skipping) just say if you make a last appeal to join the Working Group. You can make your input in the relevant Working Group. Alisa?

>> ALISA: Yes thank you. I was wondering as Celine mentioned the BPFs and the policy networks and getting them part of this

session. To what extent are they informed and are they involved and has for example, also the MAG been informed? I'm sorry. I have been out of the office quite a bit. So still catching up on some emails.

I think it would be good to have them informed as soon as possible on this.

>> CHAIR: They have. Thank you. They have been informed. They all have their respect of mailing lists and all have been invited to join. Celine?

>> CELINE: Yes, so the IGF Secretariat has done some extensive promotion, let's say of the intercessional event, to ask for interested people to register for the various Working Groups. That was done throughout the NRI community and also the policy networks and Best Practices Forums as Markus said through mailing lists.

When it comes to the MAG, the intercessional event was shared with the Chair of the MAG, Paul Mitchell, who was really accepting this proposals and thought it was interesting. And shared with the MAG through the mailing list. And now it is on the Agenda. So basically, it has been brought to the attention of the MAG already several times.

>> ALISA: Okay. And can you say something of the participation rates from policy networks and of Best Practices Forums? I'm trying to figure it out looking at column C. But it is not completely clear to me.

>> CELINE: The rates, I have to say, I wouldn't know right now. One of the criteria in the concept note is at least one Working Group needs to include at least two different intercessional work communities. So for example, a Working Group that is only made out of DCs would not be a valid Working Group. You see?

>> ALISA: Okay.

>> CELINE: So in column C of the registration list, you can actually see that there is quite some people who registered from the NRIs for example, and then also the same goes for the policy network. And obviously the DCs because we have been doing a lot of promotion among the DCs for example, here on this call.

>> ALISA: Uh-huh. Okay. It might make it easier if there would be another column which would clearly state whether they are kind of representing a DC, a best practice Forum or policy network or NRI. I think that would help to see to what extent we have an equal participation from all these groups. Thanks.

>> CELINE: Thanks. Perfect.

>> CHAIR: Excellent suggestion. I think that is a segue to the next Agenda item.

Open consultations, MAG meeting, draft Agenda. The MAG will discuss the draft Agenda tomorrow. If there are no more comments, questions on the intercessional event ... once again, may I conclude that all of you -- you just consider again whether or not you or representative of your Dynamic Coalition can participate and be part of the various Working Groups. And the more DC representatives we have participating, I think the better it will be for the impact of the event altogether.

But if there are no further comments required on this Agenda item, then I suggest we move to the next one.

And with that, I think again, over to you Celine to introduce the Agenda item.

>> CELINE: Thank you very much. For ease of reference, I will post the link to the Agenda of the Open Consultation MAG meeting here in the chat. I can also share my screen. This is just for your information. It is posted on the website. Tomorrow, we'll have a virtual MAG meeting where this Agenda will also be discussed.

So after tomorrow's meeting, we'll hopefully be able to let you know about the final draft Agenda that has been discussed. And again, we assigned two hours to the intercessional event. When it comes to the intercessional event itself, we'll make sure to allocate enough time to the various Working Groups and also depending on how large this Working Group is, and then you can also see for yourself, how the remaining MAG Agenda is basically a lot of time will be obviously allocated to the workshops that the MAG members are reviewing. But then we'll also discuss the main sessions.

And again, you can see it for yourself. But I suggest that once the draft Agenda has thoroughly been discussed within the -- for the MAG members, we'll let you know once it's been agreed on.

Markus, would you have any additional comments when it comes to the Agenda?

>> CHAIR: Well, the Agenda obviously I think it has been more or less approved on the mailing list. But I think the MAG may still wish to discuss the details. I think we'll -- will only be formally approved after the MAG meeting tomorrow. We'll see if the MAG wants to make adjustments or not. But I think it is fairly mature as such in the state of preparation that we can take it that we will go ahead as proposed. But I think we'll know better after the MAG call.

Are there questions to Celine?

>> CELINE: Alisa and Wout have their hand raised.

>> CHAIR: Alisa firsts.

>> Alisa: One more addition. Chengetai sent the draft yesterday. Without -- it would very much be sure be 0ful if you can ensure that we get the documents in advance so if you can send it today, it is still very much not in time, but maybe some of us could manage to read it ahead of the meeting.

So that would be the Excel document and the Word doc, I think that would be very much helpful.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm sure Celine is taking note.

>> CELINE: What do you mean the Excel and Word?

>> ALISA: The registration so we have an idea who is coming. And the intercessional event, the note.

>> CELINE: I'll ask them to include it in the Agenda.

>> CHAIR: We have Wout and Bruna.

>> WOUT: Thank you Celine on the document. Some compliments. I spoke with a few MAG members, some -- I won't mention names -- were complaining, with this session we're taking time out of the MAG meeting. I would like to stress if that argument comes up tomorrow

that we're not taking time out of the MAG meeting. It is the open
consultation. Apparently there is some confusion. Please take
that into account. I will not be at that meeting tomorrow. Thanks.
     >> CHAIR: Thank you for that. Your comment is correct. It is
not taking time out of the MAG meeting. It is a new approach to
essentially also in response to comments that have been made by
various corridors that we should work closer together the various
components of the intercessional work. And Bruna.
     >> BRUNA: Thank you, Markus. All that was sent to the MAG last
week was the concept note for the event. We don't have a lot of
information on the organization of the event. I'm one of the
co-leads for the policy network and implementation. I myself have
not received a lot of information about that, which is okay, because
I assume others are helping with that. It is good to share as many
information with the MAG as you would like to, because as you said,
we're going to discuss this tomorrow and it will be part of the Agenda.
And especially if there is a concern about how much time we're
allocating for this meeting so on. It is good to know better about
the strategy, who is going to be able to speak, who are the ones
organizing for the event, so on, so forth. All we had is the concept
note, with the email that sent us notice about the call for tomorrow.
     So there is not a lot of history apart from Celine's
participation on the last call. It is to clarify the level of
information we have as of now.
     >> CHAIR: Thank you.
     >> CELINE: Thank you, Bruna. Apologies Marcus. Good to know.
I will make sure Chengetai is aware of that and will send the documents
ahead of the meeting.
     >> CHAIR: Thank you for the comments. It is all well taken.
Gives you extra work, I'm afraid, Celine. But I think it is fair
enough to have as much information as possible ahead of tomorrow's
call.
     With that, do I take it that we can go to the next Agenda item,
which in many ways is the main Agenda item for today's call? We said
we would devote most time to brainstorming on the main session
proposal for the DCs for this year's IGF. And we did some sort of
previous brainstorming. And we thought that -- I said "we" that is
Celine and I that it will make sense to focus on the DCs contribution
to the GDC and also see how best we could do that. And Celine, you
have prepared some sort of draft framework? Would you maybe share
that with us and also share your thoughts with us?
     >> CELINE: Thank you, Markus. For now, it is a skeleton. I
thought we could use this call to make a brainstorming session let's
say for the main topic that is such that the main session could
actually have. Basic idea would this main session could be different
and distinct to the individual DC sessions. I want to make sure
everyone on the call is aware the DC main session is not something
guaranteed.
     It would still have to be approved by the MAG as a main session.
Comparable to the year before. But creating such a main session

proposal might help to showcase something.

So again, one of the themes that could be relevant to this year's DC main session could be for example, the DC's contributions to the Global Digital Compact as a community. That is just a mere suggestion. Could it be something else.

Later on, we can then discuss the title. And as a format, description, the co-organizers we would ask for volunteers, preferably from various and different Dynamic Coalitions, we can make a suggestion of speakers once we have a title and description. Onsite, and online Moderators and Rapporteurs can be suggested at a later time.

Maybe we can use that call to collect various ideas of topics.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the introduction. Who would like to break the ice?

>> AMY: I can break the ice. As a brainstorm, I saw on the chat we can do it on Global Digital Compact as a community. Oh, it is transcription or something. Anyway. Sorry ... I think it would be interesting to do it on a theme that is kind of ... a theme such as artificial intelligence or something. You know looking at the list of DCs something that is relevant from different ways and different perspective for every DC. Throwing it out there, something that participants and others can engage with. It is not so much about procedures and bigger issues. I feel like they're harder to ... they're harder to make interesting in a discussion. But if we choose a topic that is big in media, society and policy debates and multistakeholder dialogue, that could be interesting. I say AI is one. I'm sure there are many others. That is just an idea.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And your point I think is also well taken that you would rather have a substantive discussion than a procedural discussion.

Other comments?

>> BRUNA: Maybe I can jump in. I have my hand up as well. Just about the approach as picking the GDC as a topic, I want to flag that the main sessions not talking about DCs or any of the intercessional work, main session.

We have an agreement reached by the MAG at the first MAG meeting of the year we will host one main session about the processes and the GDC. So maybe there is a slightly concerning overlap if the DCs decide to do a main session focused on the GDC as well. What we discussed at the beginning of the year in an attempt to avoid having so many overlapping sessions about the same topics or repetitive discussions. Just to flag that there is a compromise by the MAG with a main session on the processes and GDC as such.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that. That is obviously very relevant comment. Yes avoid duplication and overlap always makes sense. At the same time they can also be different angles to approach the same theme. This is a brainstorming session. When you say about the GDC, can look at the thematic elements. Other comments?

>> WOUT: This is Wout. I think last year we did well explaining what DCs are and what they will produce. On the other hand Mark is

not here because he couldn't be here. He was disappointed about policy brief number five because nowhere were Dynamic Coalitions mentioned des Pete we had participated personally in the session and seemed to respond positively about the work conducted by the Dynamic Coalitions. Either the message didn't come across or seen as not relevant. One of the two.

So should we hammer harder this year on what the Dynamic Coalitions are and what we do? Or do we decide to go in a different direction? The fact is it did not come across good enough. So should we in part as this repeat what we did last year? Thinking out loud here. And the other one to tackle specific topic is always possible, but will we agree with and think about 30 different DCs on a specific topic. And also one that is not repetitive of for example, already policy networks tackling topic like AI. Also here, what could be a specific topic. I think we need more time to think that over.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that.

(Overlapping conversations)

Maarten.

>> MAARTEN: Okay. Hearing this, maybe a hybrid version. In our thinking for the DC, think of a contribution to the GDC should be based on what we work towards as a discussion with the IGF. I think that is something that this is not the only one. Basically the IGF is the message we want to give to the GDC there.

I can see if you do that in the joint session that the theme would be very much the same theme as for the IGF, which is reaching what we want. And I would not be surprised if someone would focus more on AI. And some focus more on data. Some focus more on inclusion. But I think if we all prepare the main message of what we think is relevant from our perspective, that that would be a very interesting session overall. If we prepare enough in time, we can group the themes better than just one after one and really have maybe a couple of themes based on the practice of what's the different Dynamic Coalitions want to bring to the table.

So very much like Wout says, show what we do. I think the common theme is what we want and group within that based on the inventory beforehand of the focus of the different DCs. Just for a way forward.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think that's a very constructive thought. It recall it is -- I think we did that a few years back. That we asked for each DC to prepare a paper beforehand as an entry ticket into the main session. That would be a similar way, if I got it right, that you would ask each DC to say, make a draft, one pager, two pager to say what they see as their contribution to the GDC and based on the first draft regroup them and create some substantive clusters. Where we group them together. And have a main session devoted to the potential input DCs provide to the GDC. Did I get that right? Correct me Maarten if I misunderstood.

>> MAARTEN: Yes, the prework is needed for useful groupings to make the messages more powerful.

>> CHAIR: That could give us some time if you follow this

proposal that we set the deadline for the first draft to arrive. Let's say -- well, obviously we just at the start of the summer holidays in the northern hemisphere, which is always a difficult time as people are a little bit offline and off the grid for a few weeks. Nevertheless, we could thinking out loud and this year's IGF is earlier than previous years. If you have a deadline by mid-August, we could then give us another month, well, even that might be a bit too tight. When should the main session -- I don't know whether Celine, you can provide an answer, if you work it backwards.

By when should we have the main session proposals up and ready to be shipped and printed? Usually in the U.N., there is a six week rule that ahead of the meeting should be all the written materials should be ready six weeks beforehand. That would be -- almost August. Yeah. I think even four weeks. I don't know, Celine, do you have a hard and fast answer to that?

>> CELINE: So I suggest that the main session is discussed during the upcoming MAG meeting when planning the main sessions to see if it can be scheduled during the week. And as of mid-July, I would say, so after the MAG meeting, I would say that we can continue with the DC main session preparations, in case the MAG agrees to the DC main session. We don't have to have a specific detailed concept note. I would suggest again to have a DC main session, that it is discussed during the MAG meeting and we can continue forward.

>> CHAIR: But you haven't answered my question. By when should the final concept for any main session be ready? How many weeks before the meeting.

>> CELINE: This I have to say I don't know. Because they would -- the MAG members would start planning the main sessions during the week of the MAG meeting. Yeah, thank you very much, Bruna. There is no defined deadline yet. We can let you know after.

>> WOUT: This is Wout. The way ahead is set in stone.

They will decide on their main session. There will be at least one main session to fill in, that could be for the Dynamic Coalitions. It would be good, in my opinion, if at the 10, 11, 12, depending on when it is discussed, that we at least have an outline of what we tried to do. I would suggest that a few volunteers work over the coming week, because that is what we're talking about. Next week. And it has to be ready that we have an outline of what we would propose to do at the IGF. And if we have that, that should be enough for now. Because then you start finding people, et cetera.

>> CELINE: Thank you, Wout. Markus, so you know, Alisa and Bruna have their hand raised.

>> CHAIR: Alisa, please.

>> ALISA: Yeah. I might be reiterating what Bruna said. I want to point out that the MAG is looking at preparing a main session on the GDC. So I wonder to what extent it would be really useful of the time of the DCs to allocate towards a main session on the GDC, in relation to the Dynamic Coalitions. As I'm getting the sense that the discussion is moving towards having a session on -- well, having a DC main session on the GDC.

To be honest, I'm not sure if I would be thatch inclined to allocate the time towards a DC main session if it would be specifically on GDC, because we're looking at having a session on that.

So I wanted to give you a warning that I am cautious on that.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you for that. But again, I think it would be a totally different session what the DCs would propose. Whereas the MAG will look at the GDC from an institutional perspective. Whereas here, we would look at it more what the DCs can bring into the discussion in terms of substance. But I get it that it might be a difficult concept to cell as the mag is also working on GDC and see it differently.

But okay, I see various hands up. Bruna, Maarten, Amali and Wout.

>> BRUNA: I guess what I'm telling you in terms of making this easier for the approval. Last year, I recall that there was somehow problematic overlapping between the policy network on the fragmentation and the main session on fragmentation that occupied almost an entire morning with similar discussions. And it was also an IGF where there was a lot of discussions on this topic, too, as one of the subthemes. So a lot of the debates that were hosted by the MAG at the beginning of the year was to avoid overlapping. Because obviously the approaches can be different. The discussions can all somehow lead to the same places in terms of on the substance.

My -- when we decided back then that we would do a main session on the GDC, the procedural approach was seen as a good one. Because the consultation process would have ended already. And whether and how you can engage with Delegations on the substance of the GDC is unclear. Having tried to engage as part of Civil Society with submissions, is problematic as far as with the co-facilitators. And so my question to you guys is whether it is -- is it still relevant to discuss substance and how each DC can contribute to the GDC if the discussions are going to be concluded, if we will have probably a new paper out by September. And my question is like -- how are you seeing the opportunity for engaging with missions in terms of the substance, if the core discussions or debates might have already sailed by then? Wouldn't it be more interesting to have a discussion on another topic and draft like Resolutions or considerations, suggestions for the GDC process instead of entirely focusing on that given that the process is opaque and don't have clear actions on when and how to engage? That is my one question for you guys.

Secondly, maybe I'm mistaken here, but I never saw the DC session as a main session.

It is a distinct session, but not part of the track of main sessions the MAG normally discusses. This year we have an opening and haven't decided yet whether we are attaching to the subthemes or doing something else. I wouldn't see these two process as directly attached ones. Whether there should be a spot for DC or if the MAG decides on eight, there is not a spot for the DC. I'm assuming that there will be a slot for one session, main session for

DC but not part of the track of main sessions to decide on.

To separate things. I might be mistaken on this. There are a process, two things, one is what the MAG decides and then part of the intercessional work. We're aware of that in far as the decisions and not blamed for something we're not responsible for. Thanks, Markus.

>> CHAIR: There is also -- we had a DC main session since 2017, I think. It was always considered to be a main session. But that is a question of what is a main session? The definition of a main session used to be a three-hour session in the main session room. But you are right. It was not an MAG main session. Not the main session put together by the MAG, but it was approved by the MAG as such.

Your other comment, obviously they are well taken. Give us food for thought on the consideration. We have other speakers.

>> MAARTEN: My other proposal is not about the procedures, but fireworks, the best each DC has to do as for as the theme for the Internet we want. To get that across will have the interest of people. And I think that's why I also think that it is crucial and we're such a rich number of groups together, that we do bring that as such I agree with Marcus that this is a process in which all DCs are invited. We need a cutoff time. It is not just about what we want to tell, it is about delivering a message that is relevant and interesting and means we need to have time. So we would need to have inventory before of what DCs want to contribute content-wise and then in due time we can always see how we can best bring this as input to the global dialogue that will continue one way or the other, GDC, IGF, whatever. It is the next way forward. I think the fireworks from the DCs, based on all the effort and work done will be welcome and good piece of content that will draw the attention of the IGF and the world.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that. Gives me a thought. Maybe we should take any reference to the GDC away, straight away as we have heard from the comments by the MAG members is doing. And could overlap what the MAG is doing. And bring it back to the main themes adopted by the MAG and say the DC contribution to the main theme and to use Maarten's words give the DC fireworks on that. Would that be more acceptable to the MAG and avoid the impression of creating duplication and overlap? A thought.

>> MAARTEN: Well said. Focus on the contribution that we can offer rather than the process around it.

>> CHAIR: The idea of your very first proposal, but the reference to the GDC might give the wrong impression that we also focus on procedural issues. So by taking away the reference to the GDC might clarify the misconception. We have a few more people that want to speak. Adam has joined and has his hand up. Amali first, and Wout and Adam.

>> AMALI: I think we should focus on something that is grassroots level. Interoperability. And want to pass participate on the Internet. It is about the Internet we want. And what is restricting

people is interoperability. We have a large group of people not being reached and large group of people that can't make use of the Internet for all the benefits it has. I think we are in a position as a group of DCs to talk about interoperability and how it can be improved to enable this. I'm suggesting that our topic be interoperability, something we know something about. We can give lots of examples. We can get the absolute support of Governance to go through with this. I hope this is considered as a topic. And hopefully it will be a firework. Thanks very much for listening to me. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that. Based on my past experience, it is always very difficult for that many Dynamic Coalitions to run around one single theme. But you made a proposal interoperability. Could this be a theme we could all rally around? This is open for discussion.

>> WOUT: That was sent and then from there will go to the U.N. This is basically what is already being discussed in the IGF. So there is no need for us to discuss the Global Compact as Dynamic Coalition. I agree with what is said before. What I would like to point out is that a lot of the Dynamic Coalitions have given input to the global digital compact, so when the MAG organizations organizes a main session, it is good to work with the Dynamic Coalitions or invite them to be part of the main session of the GDC because many of them have shown views and proposals. So in other words, it could well be that we could contribute to the main session of that MAG is willing to organize. The other way around. I think that is one where what was said about main sessions and policy networks what Bruna said is totally right. And they know which Coalition or Forum is working on a topic. If you coordinate there, there should be no overlap in the sessions. That is something which I would like to point out as well. Because otherwise, you do get two sessions which quite often happens that people are telling the exact same story in the next session you go to.

And finally where topics are concerned for our main session, I think that is going to be difficult to have only one session. I'm not 100% sure, isn't there a policy network on interoperability? That would be extensively discussed there. But then show general work first and then our topic, for 10 minutes, to be clear the diversity that is coming out of the Dynamic Coalitions and not a specific topic that perhaps is already discussed in many workshops or sessions? Thanks.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Adam?

>> ADAM: Apologies for being late. I wonder what was said before. So I'll jump in. I think we can anticipate that more than likely will be a DC main session or plenary session. Sometimes it is worth thinking of it as a plenary, because it is the main hall type of event.

Sort of what concerns me is the Agenda overall. We had 800 submissions for different types of sessions. Over 400 workshops and 23 DC proposals. Many of these look like workshops to me, which

raises a concern that some people -- this is not only for DCs, you see it across the Town Halls and others. The MAG has a process. It is an established IGF process for bottom-up taking of workshops and other discussion Forums to take place at the IGF. I don't see why there would be 23 sessions on the Agenda. Particularly as they look like workshops and others, this looks like an unfair way of getting around the process. What are you proposing? If you will propose a main session, I think you should, what will the topic be? Remembering as Markus and I will recall from I don't know, five, six, seven years ago. There have been absolutely awful DC main sessions. I think one of the worst sessions I have ever been in at the IGF was a DC main session where there were 15 people on stage that they said my DC does this, my DC does that. Please don't do that. This is a global conference. We need experts to talk about expert level issues. This sounds harsh, this is what we need. It will make an influence on the Global Digital Compact. We don't need people who really are not expert. I would not class myself as an expert on any topic that I expect to be on a plenary session. Please be careful with this. I don't want to be harsh. We have a very, very large number of sessions we will have to fill. And wide as the DC -- the DCs are no different. You have to meet your mandate. Very often DCs were reporting sessions, telling us what you did in the year. Those sessions can be interesting for those that might want to see a DC. Duplications on DCs. Two on health, two on blockchain. The whole point of the Coalition is to coalesce around the issue. You can't have two on the same subject. So ...

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that and your harsh words. It is important to be reminded there is a bigger environment out there that may look at us with critical eyes. I see Amali has her hand up.

>> AMALI: I want to respond to Adam. In the work for two decades. I want to share on the medical side why we have two DCs. We did invite the new DC to join us. We thought the focus to be different. This is where can you have the same topic but the focus can be very different. And we know that we are very much focused on artificial intelligence and so forth. The other DC sees it in a different manner. So we can have the same topic, but we can have different viewpoints. That's why we have two DCs. I want to share that. It is such a huge body of knowledge that quite honestly, Adam, we could even have more medical DCs with their focuses and so forth. I also want to say as a DC, we invite individuals to participate. I also am a Board member of European lone. And our DC seeks to get input of users. It is important for the stability of the Internet and usage. I want to say we have heard a lot of people saying they don't want to listen always to experts, but want to listen to other people's viewpoints. Because we're the voting public. In the end, the voting public will impact the policies of the Governance, democratic Governance. I want to say thank you for bringing this issue up and thank you for this opportunity.

>> CHAIR: It is important to understand we have two different Coalitions on an issue. Like Adam said the Coalition should be able

to coalesce. There is a question on how much room do we have to provide for space for Dynamic Coalitions. These are issues to be discussed. This is outside of my pay agreed. I think that is really up to the MAG to take these architecture issues and see how the IGF should be structured. A lot of it has grown over the years. Adam mentioned Town Halls, open Forums, there are many sessions that are now outside. Sew some extent, outside of the remit of the MAG. I see Celine, you have your hand up, you want to contribute.

>> CELINE: I want to thank Adam and for taking the floor. I want to make sure everyone here on the call is aware that we really received the double amount of session proposals, compared to the year before. And this will be -- so that will lead also to a more selective process let's say of what is happening during the IGF because of physical restrictions also. We have a certain amount of rooms. The IGF Secretariat is currently working on scheduling and also what is decisive is the MAG meeting that will happen from 10 to 12 of July to see what workshop proposals will be taken. But again, we received a lot of sessions, so this year, we'll have to be really more selective in general. Regarding all session times. This is what I wanted to share. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: May I follow up on that? Are you telling us that not every DC will have a guaranteed session?

>> CELINE: This is something that we'll really have to discuss internally with the IGF. It will depend on the schedule. And how we will make sure to fit all the DC requirements. The list that is posted on the website is currently a list of received proposals. And it will all depend on the scheduling. Yeah. But again, we try our best to accommodate the sessions receives.

>> CHAIR: Two hands up. Wout and Alisa. Wout.

>> WOUT: Thank you, Markus, and thank you Celine for your comments. They're totally justified. On the other hand, I won't talk about my own DC, because I can't speak for others. They have to do that for themselves. We work year round to come up with tangible outcomes at the IGF. And we basically have one opportunity to present them. And this is at the IGF. You run six Working Groups just take that out of 90 minutes and also trying to explain who you are and what you want to do in the future, there is not that much left. And also when we talk about official recognition of our reports for Best Practices fora and policy networks, it is possible to use the network of the IGF to have input and have oversight on the reports before they are published. Adaptation is harder for the DC. We only have the IGF to say this is what we propose as a report and to get some sort of feedback from hopefully a wider part of the community that did not participate in the DC itself for some reason. That makes it harder to discuss what you are saying Adam as taking time out of workshops. As dynamic Coalitions we're delivering tangible outcome. And the workshop delivers a talk shop, in most cases, and sometimes a little bit better. So that is two sides of the coin. And we need that quite clear when we discuss what are the outputs of the IGF. And the dynamic Coalitions produce tangible

outcomes.
It is not just my DC and BFs and BNs.
        >> CHAIR: Wout the way you describe your annual discussion of
the DC is the way the annual discussion of the DC should be. What
Adam said is he looked at the prescriptions and reading them sounded
more like a workshop. That is -- that was what he said in a way unfair
that some workshops have to go through the scrutiny of the MAG and
others make their own workshop and they have a guaranteed slot. But
that was essentially saying that not all DC session proposals like
as you described as the work that is going on throughout the year.
Which is a tangible output. Just to put that -- clear the way I
understood it. It was not a criticism of your DC by any means. Or
generic remark that some of the DC sessions looked like workshops
but they should not. Alisa, you have a hand up. Thank you for being
patient.
        >> ALISA: Thank you, Markus. Part of my ignorance on this,
because I have only been evaluating a lot of workshop proposals. As
a MAG member we don't evaluate the DCs or sessions from the DCs. But
have DCs handed in a proposal in how they intend to use their slot
or any slot? And if they haven't as of now, when should they hand
in any proposal? I will keep it with that.
        >> CHAIR: Yeah, thank you. That is a fair enough question. I
think Celine is the best to answer that question. Please.
        >> CELINE: Yes, thank you. One of the requirements is not only
have the annual report posted and published on the website, but also
to submit a proposal on time taking care of the same or respecting
the same deadlines as all other session time submissions. All have
already submitted. And we would not take any late submission
whatsoever. Another requirement is we only really accept one
session per DC. There are a few more session proposals per DC. And
we let them know. They had to post the annual report on the website
and had same deadline as all other sessions. It is only one proposal
per DC. I hope this answers your question. Thank you.
        >> CHAIR: Thank you. Now we have not that much time left. We
had a good discussion, an interesting discussion. And essentially
we achieved what we wanted to achieve, to have a brainstorming
session. It was a good and helpful brainstorming session. We have
to come round a bit and come to a conclusion. Let me try and put
a different thread together. We clearly get it that the link to the
GDC doesn't work. But at the same time, we did have a proposal for
one theme. That was also, again, reflecting my recollection of the
past seen as not manageable way forward. (Audio skipping) DC
difficult around (audio skipping) theme. (Audio skipping)
I go back to Maarten's original proposal and also the reframed
proposal with the fireworks. Why don't we take the overall theme
of this year's IGF, which is proposed the Internet you want. It is
now the Internet we want. But whatever it is, we can check that
easily on the IGF website or Celine can remind us. And that we work
on that and prepare the various fireworks coming from each DC what
each DC contribute to the Internet we want. And prepare a short

concise paper and that would be the DC contribution to the theme the Internet we want. And we could work on that, set the first deadline, which would be then maybe late July, it would interfere with some holidays. But we would have to be speedy in that. Have a first draft ready. Then we would have August to framework the session around these papers. And we would be then ready to submit even assuming the MAG approves such an approach by mid-September or so that we will have the session put together well in time for the annual meeting. And that we empower the Secretariat, that is Celine, to prepare a concept paper on that, which obviously we would circulate and see whether there's input from you and then be able to present it to the MAG meeting in two weeks' time. We will have a concept and see whether that would meet the approval of the MAG and whether we are given the green light to go ahead with such a proposal. Could this work is my thousand-dollar question? Or are there any strong concerns, objections?

My proposal would take away the concerns expressed by the MAG members about the overlap with the GDC session. So there could be no confusion on that. I see Wout gives a thumbs up. That is always very positive. To have positive feedback. And Maarten gives a + 1 as well. We can't have a voting function here. We don't usually try to work with some rough consensus. I don't see -- you have still the opportunity, if you really don't like it, please shout.

If you don't shout, can we take it that we have your tacit agreement to move along that way? It would be your homework would be to then think about what would your firework look like?

Again, to pick up on Adam's nightmare with a DC session. We said don't look backward what you have done. But look forward what can you contribute as a DC for the Internet you want. We as a DC we have done this, this, this, that is boring. But as a DC, we can do this and this.

Okay. I see more positive reactions. So far I have no shout of disapproval or concern. So ... can we then take it that we move along these lines?

So Celine, when do you think you would have a first concept paper ready?

(Overlapping conversations)
Give time to DCs to react.

>> CELINE: I suggest sharing through the beginning of next week. That is the earliest I can come up with something, unfortunately.

>> CHAIR: Maybe in the form of a Google Doc again?

>> CELINE: Yes, yes.

>> CHAIR: And give three or four days for them and then wrap it up. It doesn't need to be a perfect document. Perfect is the enemy of the good. It needs to be a good enough document. And clear and understandable. I think it would take into account most of the comments made in today's session and also address some of the relevant concerns.

So with that, I think we have a plan. All we need to do is work to implement the plan then. Is there any issue under any other

business? Yes, Wout, you have your hand up?

>> WOUT: Thank you, Markus. As an idea for the IGF, we heard Adam's worry for example, just now and Celine mentioning how many sessions come up. We have been discussing the impact or potential impact of the Dynamic Coalition for some time. Is it an idea to have some sort of bilateral meeting, SDC with the MAG, and discuss potential coordination so it is much clearer where alignment can be in the program for 2024? Is that an idea to do a separate session together so there is more understanding, perhaps about the work being done and also of the impact of the work that it would have in the IGF program for 2024?

Just floating this idea to see if we can work together perhaps in a better way in the future. Thanks.

>> CHAIR: And Adam has his hand up. Adam.

>> ADAM: That is a good idea and for the MAG to have a discussion with the Best Practices Forums and policy networks and to do it as a meeting sometime during the IGF in Kyoto. Looking forward to 2024.

When I won't be a MAG member. It makes it much easier to say this. Yippee. And yippee for you, too. But yeah, I think that is a good idea. I wouldn't anticipate being there, but in fact, him being there might be a distraction. I'm not sure. Perhaps going to him with the outcome instead of inviting him to the meeting.

I think there is more work to do between the various intercessional groups and the MAG rather than including someone that is not part of the process. He's a target of it, but not part of it. That is my thought. I think that is something to take to the MAG as something need to do in Kyoto.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for all of that. We have reached the end of our 90 minutes. So basically my suggestion would be that depending on the outcome of the MAG meeting, we schedule a session soon thereafter, yes, it will fall into the northern hemisphere holiday time. But we need to tend to take stock and see how to organize ourselves, but if the MAG approves the DC main session. My suggestion would stand the automatically triggering of the task of the DCs to produce a paper under this proposed heading for the DC main session with the end of July deadline. And it doesn't need to be a big paper. But I think a one, two-pager should be enough to really group the best ideas you have as your DC collectively to make this work. We could then really in early August have -- analyze the papers and see how we organize the session. But nevertheless, I would like to suggest having a taking stock session after the week after the MAG meeting. That would be the week 17th of July, yes?

With that, do I take it we have achieved our objectives for the discussion? And I would like to thank you all for this very constructive brainstorming session, which has helped a great deal. Thank you all. And good-bye. Enjoy your summer. Thanks.

(Thank-yous, good-byes)

(Concluded)

This text, document or file is based on live transcription.