

RAW FILE

IGF DYNAMIC COALITIONS COORDINATION GROUP
FEBRUARY 21, 2023
1400 UTC

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
Monument, CO 80132
719-481-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So, it's 3:00, according to my devices. And I just noticed it's not the agenda you sent out, Ryan. It must be an earlier version, but it doesn't matter too much. The main gist is there.

>> IGF SECRETARIAT: Yes, Markus, I just realized that. Sorry about that. I have a lot of documents on my desktop. I am going to open the latest one.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. While you are getting on, let me then start the meeting. There is, actually, one issue which is not on the agenda. That is the submission of the Annual Report. And I noticed that many of you have submitted the Annual Report. Some have asked for an extension of the deadline, which, essentially, is 31st of January. We agreed on that, and we also agreed to extend the deadline till mid-February, but we also noticed that not everybody has yet submitted the Annual Report. And I cannot overemphasize, I think, the importance that you stick to the very basic, common rules we all agreed to. And my suggestion, then, will be to extend the deadline for a few more days and make it maybe end of February to give you the opportunity.

But we agreed that in order to -- (video freezing) -- report which is not -- discussion the year before. There was a little bit of a misunderstanding of what the annual report is, and it's not the report of the meeting you held at the IGF meeting, but it should be an annual report of all the activities over the year. And not all Dynamic Coalitions have done that yet, and my suggestion would be to extend the deadlines for a few more days, let's say, until the end of this month.

And now we have the latest version of the agenda, the agenda that was sent out to the list up on the board, and the point I was just making, I suppose, will go under any other business under extension of the deadline for submitting the report, and it would be understood that people, Dynamic Coalitions who have not submitted the annual report by then will not be listed as active Dynamic Coalitions.

With that, can we look at the agenda and approve the agenda as it has been proposed? Can I take it, unless there are objections or suggestions for improvements/additions, that we approve the agenda as it is? Wout, please, you have the floor.

Wout, we can't hear you.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: And video on, yes. It's all there now, I hope.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. I think I would like to add the document that I've got compiled on the potential outcomes for 2023, of all the Dynamic Coalitions that have responded, that I sent this morning, and to discuss how we're going to submit that and to whom at the upcoming MAG meeting. So, that's the topic I would like to suggest.

And the second one is that I just see Adam leaving the meeting, that we, perhaps, need official MAG liaison, because to be honest, I was a bit shocked when I found out recently that Adam wasn't a liaison at all but just following voluntarily. So, I thought he was officially commissioned, sort of, to this group, but then we found out he wasn't. And, perhaps, it's time that it is formalized in one way or another. So, that's the two topics that I would like to add to the agenda.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, we can discuss that under Any Other Business. With that, can we then agree to the agenda as amended, based on the proposals submitted by Wout? I can see no objections, so I take it that we can move on that basis. So, the agenda can then be considered to be adopted and we can move to the next agenda item. That is review of individual DC responses for GDC consultation. And with that, I move over to Mark, as you have been driving this process. Can you update us on that, please?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Markus. And hello, everybody. Mark Carvell with the ISDC Coalition, and I'm assisting the coordination move with the consultation of the GDC, the Global Digital Compact. And so, it's down to me, really, to engage with you all on how we go about submitting a coordinated input into the GDC process, in line with the current questionnaire consultation, which is undertaken by the tech envoy's office. And the deadline is 31 March.

So, we set -- well, first of all, I've put in the chat the three questions that we sent out for all the Dynamic Coalitions to consider in preparing their inputs into a coordinated submission to Tech Envoy, so you will see that in the chat.

So, first question, as a reminder, was about identifying which of the proposed seven thematic areas that were initially proposed by the Secretary-General's report, our common agenda, which are now embodied in the Tech Envoy's consultation, the seven proposed thematic areas. Which of these would your Dynamic Coalition in particular wish to consider an element in the submission, bearing in mind your particular coalition's vehement and so on.

And the second question is, the opportunity which is there in the Tech Envoy's consultation, to propose additional thematic areas. Is there such an additional area that your coalition would like to see added to those seven, which are already defined as thematic areas for the Compact? So, that's the second question, what additional thematic area would you like to see? And then, if you have such a proposal, just give some rationale for it, you know, why it's such an additional theme should be added.

And then, the third question is -- relates, really, to the role of Dynamic Coalitions generally in the GDC process. We heard in the main session, which we held in Addis at the IGF, Amman Deep, the Tech Envoy, saying he really did appreciate the

opportunity and the contribution that the Dynamic Coalitions could make, as year-round, focused areas of IGF activity, the contribution that they could make both to the preparation of the Compact, what its scope is and what it should say in terms of principles and commitments to action, and then also, secondly, this is something always to bear in mind -- secondly, how the contribution of Dynamic Coalitions could make to landing the Compact after it's agreed and presented at the Summit of the Future in September next year, September 2024. So, the follow-through from the Compact, if you like, in terms of actions and so on. The Dynamic Coalitions, he thought, would also have contribution to make there. So, that third question is about that, you know, what do you think? How should we describe the role of the Dynamic Coalitions as intersessional activities in the GDC process at this time and also beyond, after the summit in 2024, 2025, I guess.

Okay, that's what we're doing. We set a deadline for you all of the 20th of February. We haven't had any final submissions ahead of that deadline yesterday. I've had a couple of responses from coalitions to say that they aren't ready, they're not finalized, but they're working on it. And I guess, generally, there's a lot of anxiety about, you know, how to engage in the GDC process, beyond what we're doing, you know? I think a lot of stakeholders are finding it a little difficult to work out how to contribute to this process, be it the Tech Envoy's consultation, the future rollout of thematic deep dives that have been announced by the co-facilitators of the summit process, (?) and Sweden, which are going to roll out through June. So, there's the whole process of DGC engagement for stakeholders is quite complicated and quite extended. And I think that's explaining why a lot of people are not ready yet to get their final thinking and consultations undertaken ahead of our deadline and some of the other deadlines that have also been set for consultations.

So, Markus and I have talked about this, and we have considered -- I think it would be valuable to give you a bit more time to respond to our consultation regarding the Dynamic Coalitions, and we propose to give you until the fifth of March for you to submit your final inputs into this process.

And I know, you know, a lot of coalitions signaled to us, before Addis, that they were very alert to what the GDC is about and what its significance is as a milestone, if you like, on digital cooperation and Internet governance leading up to the WSIS-2020, into 2025. If the GDC goes well in strengthening the whole multistakeholder process on cooperation, it all goes well for successful outcome of the WSIS plus 20 in 2025. So, I know a lot of you are aware of this. That is, we shouldn't miss this opportunity, as coalitions of experts, multistakeholder, focused on specific issues, highly relevant to the compact, and we need to get our inputs into this crucial preparatory stage, which is fully open to stakeholder engagement.

After June/July, we're not sure, you know. We're hoping, and some governments are pressing for this, that the process will remain open, but it's not guaranteed, so this really is the time to get to our contributions into this process. So, fifth of March. There you go. You've got an extra bit of time, and you know, we really hope that you will be able to help us out.

And on the mechanics, what I'm doing -- you got the questions there. When you submit your responses to these questions in Word form or however you want to do it, email or

whatever, I will compile them into a Google Doc of a first draft of the submission, then we'll send it out to you again for your agreement for you to make corrections to or add to, and then we'll polish it up and then get it off to the tech envoy by the 31 March deadline. So, that's the mechanics for doing it.

Starting point is those three questions. Okay, Markus, I hope that's the sort of account of where we are and what we need in the next couple of weeks. So, back to you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this and also thank you for giving the broad picture of all the difficulties. And also, I think the whole process is a bit confusing, and also, the particular moment in time is not particularly conducive for this kind of process of global crisis, which, it started, after the process was started, but people have other things, other worries and other things on their mind, so it's a difficult process. But as you rightly said, it is very important that we are present, and I think the non-governmental stakeholders in particular, that they make their presence felt and show their importance and that their voice is being heard and that it's not turning into a top-down governmental process.

I think there's a big risk, also, as opposed to WSIS, which was Geneva-driven, this process is New York-driven, and the environment in New York is much more governmental than in Geneva. Geneva has much more opened up. It's a more technical environment, and Geneva delegations are more used to interact with non-governmental stakeholders; whereas, New York tends to be more classical, intergovernmental, UN process.

Are there any comments/questions? And I think you essentially anticipated Agenda Item 3 on my main ideas/structure for the first draft compilation, but we touched on that also at our last call, that we think there's a need for a common chapeau which describes the collective existence of DCs and then goes into the more nitty gritty, the more granularity of the various questions.

But Mark, would you like to also comment on Agenda Item 3? Anything to add at this stage?

>> MARK CARVELL: No. I mean, if you look at the tech envoy's website on the consultation, the questionnaire survey, they do allow for the kind of chapeau narrative that you've indicated, we've discussed, and we've agreed we should do, to be added in a submission. I think there's some flexibility in the formatting to do that. And I think they call them additional -- I forget now what the website is -- additional submissions. So, there's about 11 or 12 submissions of which are narrative texts.

So, we can respond to the seven topics and an eighth or more additional topics to the seven, and also have this kind of chapeau text and I'd be very happy to do a draft of that based on your contributions. And yeah, I think that's what I would just underline. We have some flexibility. We can do some narrative chapeau but also be quite specific on thematic areas. Yeah.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there comments/questions? Wout, please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Thank you, Mark, for this very good overview of our plans. I've been asked by five different organizations if I wanted to submit something for the GDC, and this is EuroDIG, it is the NLIGF, so the Dutch IGF, I've been asked to -- my own Dynamic Coalition, this group, and

the IGF itself, I think?

And with all I notice how hard it is to get input, NLIGF did not receive anything, I understand. EuroDIG is struggling to receive anything. You see here that we have one draft response, I think at this point in time, so we're doing a lot of work, but who is actually planning to submit anything before the fifth of October present in this call? And then we're not even talking about the Dynamic Coalitions that are not on this call. So, who is actually planning to submit something? That is the question, I think, that lays before us, because otherwise, we're doing all this effort for who? So, perhaps, people can respond in the chat what they plan to do before the fifth of March or whether they are going to submit anything on their own, because that's also an option. But I think this is a relevant question for Mark and for you to know what is coming at you in the coming two weeks. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, yes, I mean, we said Dynamic Coalitions are also free to make an individual input, but at the last call, I think there was very broad agreement that there was merit in having a collective document, and I think, you know, even if we don't get any thematic input, there would still be merit in a collective input explaining what the Dynamic Coalitions are, as we are quite a unique animal in the UN zoo, as a self-constituted, bottom-up group. And I think there is merit in explaining just that. But obviously, if we can underpin it with some thematic evidence, it would be all the better.

But you know, my take is, as an answer, even if you don't get any individual Dynamic Coalition submission, there would still be merit in just making the overall global narrative of what the Dynamic Coalitions are. Who wants to respond to Wout's question or other comments? I see there's some comments in the chat.

Okay, Maarten agrees and another says some don't have any plans to submit, but there are individual schools that make submission. Other comments? Yes, Maarten, your hand is up.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Happy to speak up. I think in general, just let's make sure that we do have a collective response and thinking in our contributions to Mark, particularly what you would like to have in that collective response. If next to that, one or two or three or whoever DCs have additional specific input that they want to deliver, that should be welcome as well. But I think a collective response of the role of DCs and how this could work, and from that perspective, how that can play a role in a healthy digital compact, I fully support that. So, Mark, you can count on something from me. How much will be coordinated, I don't know, but I hope at least it will make sense.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. And good to have you back on the DC Coordination group calls, Maarten. And also, I think we do have some -- the paper that -- again, it was Mark that was holding the pen that we produced last year for the expert group meeting. I think it was very helpful just in explaining the background of Dynamic Coalitions, and there's something that can be drawn on for this input, I think.

But in terms of ending the substantive thematic input, we have to wait until fifth of March to see whether we actually get anything or not. And I suppose, Mark, you can already start working on the overall narrative bit of what Dynamic Coalitions are and how they can contribute. And also, I think important

point that was made in Addis was also that Dynamic Coalitions can be part of the implementation of DGC, yeah.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah. Actually, I was looking at my EGM paper just this morning, actually, as an aid memoir. So, I'm very mindful, I can pick out elements from that to include in the chapeau.

And I think the other thing to sort of highlight as a potential opportunity is this additional topics issue. I mean, if Dynamic Coalitions feel, for example, cybersecurity, where is that in the proposed schema of themes? It's not clear, is it? I don't know, Child Protection, you know, green digitalization. It's not there. I mean, that's something we've highlighted in EuroDIG consultation, because EuroDIG has had very extensive discussions about the whole green agenda -- recycling and all of this -- what digital does for environmental sustainability. Over the last two-three years, EuroDIG has done a lot of -- has discussed this extensively, but I don't see it in the proposal for the Compact. So, I think an opportunity for Dynamic Coalitions is to use what we are doing as a group collective effort to support additional themes.

A lone voice may not be so successful. However good the proposal is. But if it's the lone voice of one individual or one group, it may not get that much recognition, but if you want to submit it through us, in this coordinated Dynamic Coalition track, it may help. So, I flag that as a sort of opportunity to bear in mind as well. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Good point. Other comments? One of my personal concerns is we move from Internet governance to digital governance, and there is a risk that we lose some important concept on the way. In the Internet governance discussions, we have developed WCAG WSIS, the concept of -- it was a working definition of Internet governance, but it was essentially the basis of the governments cannot do it alone and they have to work with other stakeholders, and that was broadly accepted in the Internet governance framework.

Now we move into the digital world. All of a sudden, it's not Internet governance anymore. And my fear is that we are losing this, what I considered was a great achievement of the WSIS process, the notion that there was actually an article/paragraph agreed on by governments in the WSIS that agreed that governments cannot do it alone and they need to cooperate with the other stakeholders. And how we save this from the WSIS context in the DGC context, I think it will be important in negotiations to make sure that we actually make sure that this agenda doesn't get lost. Wout, you have your hand up.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. To respond to that, in the fall, I was present at a meeting held by Mills Mueller and his Internet Governance Project in the Hague, actually. That's why I attended. And that was exactly the agenda: Should we move from Internet governance to digital policy, was the main question. And he said that this is basically because the challenges now are way beyond just the governance of the Internet, but also it's become political, it's become, et cetera. And we discussed that for two days with people from all over the world were in the room.

And what my point was, that the fear is that you throw the baby away with the bath water because you can move into the big, global challenges that are going on at this moment at the political and economic level, but that is being discussed

between nation states, basically, and where do the multistakeholder -- the other multistakeholder ultimately go? And most people agreed with my answer to his question, and even Millson himself recognized there would be some danger of the stakeholders disappearing from the discussion if you take it away from Internet governance.

That does not go to say that a lot of these huge questions impede on the work that we do, because of course, the challenges between China and the United States and Russia's war, et cetera, do come into our discussion, because if the Internet gets fragmented because of this, then it directly challenges what we are discussing. So, that doesn't take away that we have huge challenges, but I think you're right, Markus, that we need to focus on Internet governance, and that has a lot of different faces nowadays, more and more, but the name should not change, in my opinion.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There is very little that we can do to that. The name has been changed. And yes, I also take it there are lots of big challenges, but it's also the working definition of Internet governance as it was then accepted, made also clear that Internet governance is more than just the DNS. It goes well beyond that. And it was then part of the report, related to the abuse and use of the Internet and the whole digital world relies on the Internet, you know. It's not just digital in a little -- it's the connectivity that makes a difference of the digital world. But it's neither here nor there.

We had huge achievements in WSIS, and that was the notion of multistakeholder cooperation, and that seems to be getting -- losing a bit -- I mean, I was a little bit concerned, the consultations in New York with stakeholders was -- they split stakeholders into different groups. There was a consultation for governments, one, I think, for business and the tech community, and one for civil society. That's precisely missing the whole point of multistakeholder, of having all the people in the same room at the same time, where they actually interact and learn from each other, and that was the achievement of WSIS and the learning process. And I think because we did that then was that we actually reached an agreement, that we -- but that's just, shall we say, an undercurrent of the concerns, the difficulties we may be facing and the game that leads back to a New York-driven process where their experience in the multistakeholder -- whatever they say, they pay lip service to the notion of multistakeholder cooperation, but then in reality, it tends to be more government-led. But as long as we are aware of that and we do whatever we can to throw a spanner into the workings of whatever happens in New York. Mark, yes, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah. Just an example of that, actually, what you're saying about the UN and New York. Consultation with the member states on the GDC on the third were recorded. You can get a recording of that. The consultations with the private sector and the tech community on the tenth, which I look at, on behalf of EuroDIG, were not recorded. There's no recording. So, that, I think, is an example of, what is it, an imbalance, as well as non-inclusive approach to the stakeholder consultations. And the three-minute statement format is, again, not conducive to effective consultation and learning and sharing, in my view. So, there are lots of parts of this whole process. And the overlap of the tech envoy's consultations with the programme of deep dives on themes running until the end -- until

mid-June -- again, that's, you know, it's confusing and it's difficult to navigate. And I think that whole approach has a lot of flaws, as you say. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yeah. Well, I think we all agree on that and we have to be aware of that, but that should not stop us from doing our best to make a cohesive and coherent input into that process.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Markus, some people did point it out -- because I presented on behalf of IS3C in the Friday 10 meeting, and some people pointed out that it was not right the way it was divided, because different stakeholders in different rooms. Then we found out it wasn't recorded on the 10th, so nobody knows, actually, who was not present, what was said by stakeholders. So, that is, as Mark said, is a flaw of the process. Perhaps it was an accident, I don't know, but the fact is, there's no recording of anything that was said there.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah. Wow. Yeah, let's -- my take would be, it was not thought through properly, and whether accident or not, but it just shows a lack of experience with multistakeholder processes, I think, and was not -- I don't think it was an evil intention, but it's just a lack of clear concept, I think, or flawed concept, as Mark also mentioned, but we have to live with it.

Can we move on to the next agenda item? There was the proposal that was first made. I think it was Wout who put it forward in late last year, moving, discussing the last year's IGF, to have an intersessional event of all of the intersessional processes and if there is appetite among the DCs, I'm not sure whether the other intersessional processes would be interested, but they clearly, I think, those most clearly related to the DCs are the BPFs and the PNS, the policy networks. The NRIs have more of their own life cycle and identity, but nevertheless, they they would also merit in having an intersessional where all these processes could discuss how to improve on cooperation. And if we agree to put that forward, I suppose we should present it to the next MAG meeting, which will be early next month.

I briefly discussed it with Chentetai whether the Secretariat would have the capacity to support it. I mean, it's understood, I think, to have a physical meeting would be overambitious, and I don't think that would be feasible, but at least to have an online meeting. And I think there was the one leading up to Katowice, there was some kind of online prep meeting as well. Could be along the same -- held in the same way. Ryan, did you also have the opportunity to discuss it with your Secretariat colleagues? Would there be an appetite from your colleagues to support such an event?

>> IGF SECRETARIAT: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I have discussed with my colleagues, and the Secretariat expressed support for DCs to have an intersessional events. They welcome it. So, yes, please plan on it, if the DCs intend to.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Well, I mean, the question is, you know, we need the support of the Secretariat. And if the Secretariat says, say from the beginning, we don't have the capacity to support it, then there's little point in pursuing it. But I take it, then, the Secretariat will be able and willing to and even welcoming such an event. So, do I also take it that -- well, the first reaction to this proposal was definitely positive, and I would like to open the floor. Would there be agreement among the DCs to go ahead and propose it to

the MAG that we envisage such an event in May or June? I mean, a date would have to be found, whenever it makes most sense. But also, bearing in mind that this year's IGF is much earlier. I think it would also be a useful time to take stock where we are and maybe also check our deadlines to work towards that event. Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you very much. As you know, from points I've made in previous meetings, I'm very keen on this because I see it as serving two, maybe three key objectives. It's raising awareness of what coalitions are doing. And I say "awareness," amongst the broader IGF community and also the governance of the IGF, and that includes the leadership panel as well as the MAG members who may not be close (?) coalitions. It's an opportunity for them to be seized of what's going on amongst these Dynamic Coalitions and their contribution to the strengthening of the IGF, and some coalitions are moving forward with clear aspirations to submit outcomes for IGF endorsement, and IS3C is one of them, and there may be others, too. So, there's that objective.

And also, I think it's inducive to more joining up, and there may be a policy network or BPF that's oblivious to what a specific Dynamic Coalition is doing on a particular aspect relevant to being to the BPF or PN, so it's connecting up transversely across intersectional activities I think is more likely to happen if you actually bring everybody together so that they do, virtually and physically, together, so that they understand, ah, you could do that for us, you know, and it saves us doing that as part of the BPF, you know, just contribute from the Dynamic Coalition. So, that kind of sort of opportunity I think is much more likely to happen when you have some sort of intersessional stop take of what everybody is doing. And you know, you don't have these silos that I think have bedeviled the IGF in the past.

And then, I think the third objective is, it helps project a forward look within a more strategic IGF vision amongst all these intersessional activities. If it's framed with, you know, not just sort of a snapshot what's happening now but what actually is coming up ahead and the direction that these intersessional tracks could take in a converging way, in terms of strategy for the upcoming IGF and subsequent IGFs, if, hopefully, the IGF does develop a more multiyear, strategic approach, which I think is one of the key recommendations as The High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation and the Experts Group meeting in New York.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> MARK CARVELL: The other point is, the MAG Open Consultation is in June 28-30 in Geneva. If it could be convened, this intersessional event, proximate to that or even part of that program, that's ideal, in my view, in terms of timing. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, on the last point, yes, that would obviously be discussed, and it could be a sort of half-half. The part of it will be physical as part of the MAG meeting, but maybe another day will be then more online event, but that could be discussed. But the point you made, the importance of having all the intersessional components of having exchanges among themselves and see how they relate to each other I think would be particularly important. Rajendra?

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: I think it's a good idea. We have enormously benefitted from the calls, but if you set the meeting

around May/June. I like Mark's ideas to host on the sidelines of MAG. We can also meet the broader committee. And this also brings the commitment -- the DCs I am a part of, we are having an ambitious agenda, and we have dedicated people from our team, so I think it will be great to have that to further our way forward. I think it's a great idea. We should pursue it. But have a clear idea, you know, why we want to do, what it is we want to do it and why we're doing this meeting in May or June. I think having that objective is very important.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Other comments? Or can I take it we have broad support for that to go forward? And then we would submit it to the MAG meeting early next month in Vienna. I gather we have agreement on that.

And then can we move to the next agenda item? We have blueprint for DC governance framework. We touched on that little bit at the last call. There was a request for those DCs who have it to submit their own internal rules of procedure, internal governance framework, to Secretariat. I'm not sure whether all of the DCs who have one framework in place have done so or not, and my question would be, what would be the next steps?

My suggestion would be to agree on some core principles that all DCs should have in a governance framework, as we have the core principles of open archives, open access, all DCs subscribed, but it would go a little step further. (Video frozen)

That should be part of a governance framework. Would that make sense, or does anyone have other ideas? How to move the next steps.

>> RAJENDRA GUPTA: I understand that in the DC environment, we have some principles that we have, which we follow, but for the entire DCs at intersessional, there is no overarching, broader framework, except for the diversity and inclusiveness that we follow as the stakeholders. I think it's high time that every DC has it, and happen (?) over the next week or so, but this is something that should be in the consensus on the governance framework, even on the delivery.

I think in the last IGF main session, the chair of the MAG actually brought out this issue that we should promote action-oriented and believe in delivery, so I think that will also lead to that. That's going to be very important for us.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Other thoughts? I'm just looking to those with experience in corporate governance. I see two board members of ICANN on the call. Just thinking aloud, what would you think is important to have in place.

I think one important bit of governance is usually also to have term limitation, that you should not forever endeavor. I mean, we see that quite often in not-for-profits, the people dig themselves in, into a position that with ISOC chapters as well. And I think ISOC moved also to make sure that there's some kind of term limitation. There are other elements, I think that -- there are other commonalities, but I'm just picking the brains of those with experience in this environment, what you would consider important. Avri, yes.

>> AVRI DORIA: I think that having a charter for any of these DCs that sets out its way of working is a good thing. I think, as long as we're working -- and so, having that, and having that reviewed by the coordination group to say, "Yep, that's a charter!" But having any specific requirements for it seems to me to sort of move, again, away from DCs are self-forming, self-generating, you know, doing their own

creativity about their governance. So, I would be -- I would be, you know, worried about saying, "But you've got to have term limits" or you've got to have this or you've got to have chairs and vice chairs, or no, we don't like vice chairs, so let's just have chairs, or let's not call them chairs, you've got to have leaders. And for us to get into any of that at a top level, yes, then we start imitating the GDC type of thing of, top level will tell you what you need to give us.

But I think that the having of a charter, the having of a how do you do it, and can you describe it might be an interesting first exercise, but leave it bottom-up, in terms of them self-generating who they are and how they regulate, as long as they can tell you how they do it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you for that. And I think it's also fits in -- we agreed many times that there's no one size fits all. Each Dynamic Coalition is different. So, there's Mark, there's Wout, and there was Rajendra in the chat. Take it in turns, Mark, then Wout, then Rajendra.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, I have a lot of sympathy with what Avri is saying. It is, I think, a great, positive thing about coalitions, that they are self-forming and they, you know, they're not -- they don't have to fit into a strict format, and we should preserve that in order to advance their innovative spirit, if that's the right word.

But the point I would make, I think -- I mean, coalitions vary. I mean, some are very outcome-oriented, and I think there, you need some sense of a common approach, if that's the right word. I mean, if coalitions, as some of them are, are very much focused on developing tangible outcomes, they have to be credible; they have to be able to gain respect by the broader IGF community and by the people that these outputs are aimed at, you know, private sector, governments, and so on. So, you need some, I think, broadly accepted criteria about how those outcomes are developed. And we've certainly given thought to that in IS3C, and in order to reassure who we are making recommendations to, that these have been fully developed on a consensus basis and subject to consultation, and the process can be examined and the results, therefore, are credible, and you should respect these outcomes. That's the point I would underline in terms of governance. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Wout?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus. I think that what's been said in chat and by Mark reflects the concerns that we were having when we delivered our letter to the MAG that was not addressed, really, in June, in a little bit, in our general meeting at the IGF, that we're producing tangible outcomes, but how do we make them credible? One is to make our own process transparent, basically, and that we allow people to respond to the process, but the other one is that it needs to be adopted in one way or another by the IGF process, and that is something that we cannot do ourselves but need the assistance from -- and there goes my question from others again -- who do we actually address with our outcome? It's not the MAG.

(Captions concluded with a hard stop at 14:55 UTC)

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a

totally verbatim record of the proceedings.